

Unveiling the Alpha:

The Doctrinal Fall of Jones and Waggoner Before 1888

Many Adventists today—whether inside the organized denomination or outside of it—continue to promote the writings of A. T. Jones and E. J. Waggoner, largely due to these men's connection with the 1888 Minneapolis General Conference. What is rarely acknowledged, however, is that none of their actual sermons from 1888 survived. The materials commonly circulated and quoted today were written years later—both men had already abandoned the foundational doctrines of the Advent faith. This is why their writings must be examined. Had they already stepped off the platform before 1888? The evidence shows that their doctrinal decline had already begun well before the 1888 Conference. Tragically, many sincere believers now treat their post-1888 writings as infallible truth, elevating these men to near-prophet status, and blindly claiming Ellen White endorsed everything they taught. But the question must be asked: Did Ellen White truly write all those glowing reports about Jones and Waggoner—or was someone else holding the pen? Has there ever been a true prophet who flattered men?

This publication documents the theological errors Jones and Waggoner were teaching from 1882 through 1916—errors that led directly into their support of Kellogg and the alpha of apostasy. We also examine Jones' 1893 General Conference sermons, which many still treat as doctrinally flawless, but when placed beside the plain teachings of Scripture and the Spirit of Prophecy, the contradictions are clear. These men were not upholding the original Advent platform—they were dismantling it piece by piece. Well before 1903, both had openly joined Kellogg in promoting pantheistic doctrines of devils. Their embrace of evangelical ideology was not a minor detour; it was a direct fulfillment of the alpha of apostasy we were warned of by Inspiration.

Truth or Error? Assessing the Doctrinal Purity of Jones and Waggoner After 1888

There are several statements attributed to Ellen G. White that give the appearance that she fully supported the teachings of A. T. Jones and E. J. Waggoner during and after the 1888 General Conference Session. It is a serious error to assume that she endorsed all their teachings or that she worked alongside them to carry out their message—especially during this critical time. The historical record shows that she was not collaborating with them, and her support was never unconditional. To claim that they consistently taught pure, unadulterated truth is misleading. The following statement, often cited to prove their doctrinal soundness, must be examined in its proper context and measured against the full testimony of Scripture and the Spirit of Prophecy.

1888 Materials, p. 1336— “The Lord in His great mercy sent a most precious message to His people through Elders Waggoner and Jones. This message was to bring more prominently before the world the uplifted Saviour, 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.” [Letter 57, 1895 - Written to O. A. Olsen, from Hobart, Tasmania, May 1, 1895.]

Several important points must be clearly understood: Ellen White did **not** endorse everything Jones and Waggoner taught at the 1888 General Conference Session. Neither did she support all of their teachings in the years that followed as being 100% pure and unadulterated truth. In fact, she was compelled to write letters of correction in response to doctrinally unsound positions they had already been promoting for years prior to 1888—errors that placed souls at risk of confusion and spiritual deception. The following sections presents documented evidence to firmly establish these facts.

1888 Materials, pp. 163, 164— “Dr. Waggoner has spoken to us in a straightforward manner. There is precious light in what he has said. *Some things presented in reference to the law in Galatians, if I fully understand his position, do not harmonize with the understanding I have had of this subject*; but truth will lose nothing by investigation, therefore I plead for Christ's sake that you come to the living Oracles, and with prayer and humiliation seek God. ... *Some interpretations of Scripture given by Dr. Waggoner I do not regard as correct.*” [Minneapolis, Minnesota, November 1888 - Ms 15, 1888.]

1888 Materials, p. 566— “...Brother Jones and Brother Waggoner. *Do I place them as infallible? Do I say that they will not make a statement or have an idea that cannot be questioned or that cannot be error? Do I say so? No, I do not say any such thing.* Nor do I say that of any man in the world.” [Manuscript 56, 1890 - Remarks of Mrs. E. G. White at the Bible School February 7, 1890.]

In the early part of 1890, Ellen White issued a warning to A. T. Jones regarding certain imbalanced remarks he had made in his public presentations on the righteousness of Christ—especially in connection with the relationship between faith and works.

Letter 55, 1890— “*I commenced a letter to you but did not finish it in regard to statements that I heard you make that there were no conditions implied in our receiving the righteousness of Christ.* Now whatever may be your position in this, please, withhold the statements of this character for it does confuse the mind. *There are promises on condition and when one such statement may be incautiously made, then a capital is made out of it.*” [To A. T. Jones – February 17, 1890.]

Just over three years later, in April of 1893, Ellen White reiterated her warning to A. T. Jones in *Letter 44*, once again addressing concerns over his theological imbalance.

1888 Materials, pp. 1165 & 1166— “*Brother A. T. Jones, I wish to call your attention to another matter. I was attending a meeting, and a large congregation were present. In my dream you were presenting the subject of faith and the imputed righteousness of Christ by faith. You repeated several times that works amounted to nothing, that there were no conditions. The matter was presented in that light that I knew minds would be confused, and would not receive the correct impression in reference to faith and works, and I decided to write to you. You state this matter too strongly. There are conditions to our receiving justification and sanctification, and the righteousness of Christ....”*

“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 us under a law, that we must ask if we would receive, seek if we would find, and knock if we would have the door opened unto us. Christ offers Himself as willing to save unto the uttermost all who come unto him. He invites all to come to Him...”

“The young man who came to Jesus with the question, ‘Good Master, what thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life?’ and Christ saith unto him, ‘Why callest thou me good? There is none good but one, that is God:...”

“But when the young man heard that saying, he went away sorrowful: for he had great possessions.’ Then when you say there are no conditions, and some expressions are made quite broad, you burden the minds, and some can not see consistency in your expressions. They cannot see how they can harmonize these expressions with the plain statements of the Word of God. Please guard these points...”

“Christ said, ‘If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow me.’ I feel such an intense interest that every soul shall see, and understand and be charmed with the consistency of the truth. The evidence of our love to Christ is not pretension; but practice. My brother, it is hard for the mind to comprehend this point, and do not confuse any mind with ideas that will not harmonize with the word.... Do not go to any extreme in anything, but keep your feet on solid rock.” 8LtMs, Lt 44, 1893

Pantheism at the Root of 1888

RH January 1, 1889, par. 3— “***The crisis is now upon us.** The battle is to be waged between the Christianity of the Bible and the Christianity of human tradition.*”

Why did Ellen White declare that “*the crisis is now upon us*” in January of 1889? The timing is significant. Just months earlier, from October 17 to November 4, 1888, the General Conference Session of the Seventh-day Adventist Church was held in Minneapolis. This meeting became a turning point in Adventist history, largely due to the theological emphasis on “righteousness by faith” and renewed questions concerning the authority of the writings of E. G. White. The message of justification by faith alone was chiefly promoted by E. J. Waggoner, with the support of A. T. Jones. While some perceived revival in their messages, their teachings also ignited deep controversy and division. Notably, their ideas did not originate at Minneapolis—Waggoner had been advancing this line of thought since at least 1882. What they presented in 1888 was not new light, but the maturing fruit of a long-nurtured spirit of rebellion against the original foundation—the platform established at the beginning of the Advent movement. These statements will be proved beyond doubt throughout this publication.

Before continuing, it’s crucial to recognize a key fact: In May of 1886, A. T. Jones and E. J. Waggoner were appointed co-editors of the *Signs of the Times*.

The General Conference Daily Bulletin; Wednesday, MARCH 1, 1899 Volume 8; Number 12; Page 119;

THE DESIGN OF SANITARIUMS.

“Address of **Dr. J. H. Kellogg**, Thursday Evening, February 23.

As Dr. Waggoner was telling you the other day, we never eat anything good, but we are tasting God. It is a sacred thing to eat. **This grows out of the fact that God is in everything.** You may perhaps think that that is a new thought, but if you look back, in the ***Signs or the Times*** about **eleven years**, you will find that message. **God is everything; he is all, and in all,—in everything we eat.**”

This is unmistakably pantheism—and Kellogg openly acknowledged that Waggoner had been teaching it! Let’s do some simple math. In the General Conference Daily Bulletin dated February 23, 1899, J. H. Kellogg plainly states that this teaching had been presented for the past eleven years. Subtracting eleven from February 1899 brings us to February 1888. That is nine months BEFORE the famous 1888 General Conference session. That means, by Kellogg’s own admission, pantheism was being taught in the Signs of the Times, who’s editors were Jones and Waggoner, as early as February 1888! Let that sink in! If A. T. Jones, E. J. Waggoner, and J. H. Kellogg were already embracing pantheistic views in 1888, then how could Jones and Waggoner possibly have delivered a pure and sound doctrinal message on “Righteousness by Faith”? Now, let us go back six days and examine the very statements made by E. J. Waggoner to which Kellogg was referring too.

The General Conference Daily Bulletin; Thursday FEBRUARY 23, 1899

Volume 8; Number 7; Page 57;

Twelfth Meeting, Tuesday, 2:30 P. M., February 21.

“E. J. Waggoner:... God gives that which makes man. Does he then leave the man to go on breathing by himself?--No; he goes on and breathes the breath of life into his nostrils eighteen times a minute. Brethren, God is wonderfully near.... The air that we breathe is life to us. God breathed into Adam's nostrils the breath of life, and we are breathing that same breath to-day. Every moment God is breathing the breath of life into the nostrils of every living being.... There is a wonderful connection between this air we breathe and the Spirit.... When a man knows and recognizes that every breath he draws is a direct breathing of God into his nostrils, he lives in the presence of God, and has a Spirit-filled life.... The just shall live by faith; that is, the just shall breathe by faith; eat, drink, and clothe themselves by faith.... There is power, life, in the pure water, because God's life is in it.... "The seed is the word of God," He sowed the seed of his own word. Now when you have a handful of good seed, that seed has the life of God in it. You have got the same thing that God put into the ground when corn first grew. When this is made into bread, life is in it still. We do not see the life, but it is there, and it is the life of God. It is his body, and we take his body and get life.

This is unmistakably pantheistic language. E. J. Waggoner was openly preaching it at the 1899 General Conference, and according to J. H. Kellogg, he had already been teaching these views as early as February 1888. Can the words of a man promoting such serious theological error be trusted to deliver a sound doctrinal message? Yet, we should not base our conclusion on a single piece of evidence? Let us weigh the facts carefully and determine—by the weight of evidence—whether the message of A. T. Jones and E. J. Waggoner, before or after 1888, is truly a foundation upon which we should stake our eternal salvation. There is more evidence to follow.

FALSE DOCTRINE 1889

At the camp meeting held in Kansas in May 1889, Elder A. T. Jones taught that the Sabbath commandment refers solely to man's spiritual needs and has no connection whatsoever to physical needs or the need for rest.

The 1889 Camp Meetings Sermons, p. 1 – Sermon entitled – “Keeping the Sabbath”—“Now let us notice another point. **The commandment is not given, as men assert, because of man's physical necessities. Man's physical nature or needs are not considered at all.** Man's spiritual nature alone is considered. Man is to rest simply because God did so. Not because his physical nature needs it. ... **This argument that man needs a day of rest in seven is a fraud and based upon a fraud.** There is nothing in the commandment or its requirements in reference to man's physical wants.”

IBID., p. 52 – Sermon entitled – “The Evil Effect of Sunday Laws”—“Further, **man's physical needs are not considered in it at all.** We are to work six days because God did so, and rest the seventh day because He did; not for us to rest because it may endanger our health, **but**

we work and rest because the Lord did so, and not because man needs “one day in seven for physical rest.””

TRUE DOCTRINE

Exodus 23:12 “Six days thou shalt do thy work, and on the seventh day thou shalt rest: that thine ox and thine ass may rest, and the son of thy handmaid, and the stranger, may be refreshed” “thou shalt rest ... may be refreshed” — explicitly to give physical rest to people and animals also.

*Deuteronomy 5:13–14 “Six days thou shalt labour, and do all thy work: But the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thine ox, nor thine ass, nor any of thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; **that thy manservant and thy maidservant may rest as well as thou.***

“that thy manservant and thy maidservant may rest as well as thou” — shows equality in physical rest.

Mark 2:27 “And he said unto them, The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath.”

“for man” — for man’s benefit, which includes his need for physical rest.

The Spirit of Prophecy as well plainly affirms that the Sabbath was given by God for both the spiritual and physical well-being of man. The following direct statement places Elder Jones in clear contradiction to the counsel of the Lord’s appointed messenger on this matter.

Spirit of Prophecy, Volume 2, pp. 196 & 197— *“The Sabbath was made for man," to give him rest and peace, and remind him of the work of his Creator, not to be a grievous burden.”*

Special Testimony to Battle Creek Church – 1898, p. 34— *“In giving the Sabbath, God considered man's spiritual and physical health.”*

FALSE DOCTRINE 1890

In his 1890 book ‘Christ and His Righteousness,’ E. J. Waggoner taught that when Christ took on human flesh and assumed our nature, He overcame temptation and sin by drawing upon His own divine nature and the power that inherently dwelt within Him.

Christ and His Righteousness, pp. 28 & 29— *“One more point, and then we can learn the entire lesson that we should learn from the fact that "the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us." How was it that Christ could be thus "**compassed with infirmity**" (Heb. 5:2), and still know no sin? 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. On the contrary, we are simply 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 was inseparably connected with the invisible God, and which was more than able successfully to resist the weaknesses of the flesh. **There was in His whole life a***

struggle. The flesh, moved upon by the enemy of all righteousness, 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 all that men can possibly suffer, He returned to the throne of the Father as spotless as when He left the courts of glory. When He lay in the tomb, under the power of death, "it was impossible that He should be holden of it," because He "knew no sin."

"But someone will say, "I don't see any comfort in this for me. To be sure, I have an example, but I can't follow it, for I haven't the power that Christ had. **He was God even while on earth; I am but a man.**" Yes, but you may have the same power that He had if you want it. He was "compassed with infirmity," yet He "did no sin," because of the Divine power constantly dwelling within Him."

TRUE DOCTRINE

Christ overcame every temptation while taking upon Himself the fallen nature of humanity—not as Adam before the fall, but in the seed of Abraham, bearing the likeness of our sinful flesh. His victory was accomplished through unwavering faith and complete dependence on His Father's power—not by drawing upon His own divine nature to resist temptation, as Waggoner falsely taught.

Heb 2:16, 17 *"For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him **the seed of Abraham.** (Not Adam before his fall) **Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren,** that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people."*

John 5:19 & 30 *"Then answered Jesus and said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, **The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do:** for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise. ... **I can of mine own self do nothing:** as I hear, I judge: and my judgment is just; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me."*

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

John 14:10 *"Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? the words that I speak unto you I speak not of myself: **but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works.**"*

Redemption, Book 2, p. 87 *"There are many who fail to distinguish between the rashness of presumption and the intelligent confidence of faith. **Satan thought that by his temptations he could delude the world's Redeemer, to make one bold move in manifesting his divine power,** to create a sensation, and to surprise all by the wonderful display of the power of his Father in preserving him from injury. He suggested that Christ should appear in his real character, and by this masterpiece of power, establish his right to the confidence and faith of the people, that he*

was indeed the Saviour of the world. If Christ had been deceived by Satan's temptations, and 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."

Spirit of Prophecy, Volume 2, pp. 92 & 93 *"In becoming man's substitute, and conquering where man had been vanquished, Christ was not to manifest his divine power to relieve his own suffering, for fallen man could work no miracles in order to save himself from pain, and Christ, as his representative, was to bear his trials as a man, leaving an example of perfect faith and trust in his Heavenly Father."*

FALSE DOCTRINE

Waggoner taught that the forgiveness of sins consists in their immediate cancellation from the books of record in heaven, thus promoting the idea of **instant sanctification**.

Christ and His Righteousness, pp. 65, 66 "But we will carry the figure a step further, and that will relieve the matter of all difficulty. Zech. 3:1-5 furnishes the solution; it reads thus:

"And he showed me Joshua the high priest standing before the Angel of the Lord, and Satan standing at His right hand to resist Him. And the Lord said unto Satan, The Lord rebuke thee, O Satan; even the Lord that hath chosen Jerusalem rebuke thee; is not this a brand plucked out of the fire? Now Joshua was clothed with filthy garments, and stood before the Angel. And He answered and spake unto those that stood before Him, saying, Take away the filthy garments from him. And unto him He said, Behold, I have caused thine iniquity to pass from thee, and I will clothe thee with change of raiment. And I said, Let them set a fair miter upon his head. So they set a fair miter upon his head, and clothed him with garments. And the Angel of the Lord stood by."

Waggoner goes on to say: "Notice in the above account that the taking away of the filthy garments is the same as causing the iniquity to pass from the person. And so we find that when Christ covers us with the robe of His own righteousness, He does not furnish a cloak for sin, but takes the sin away. **And this shows that the forgiveness of sins is something more than a mere form, something more than a mere entry in the books of record in heaven, to the effect that the sin has been cancelled.** The forgiveness of sins is a reality; it is something tangible, something that vitally affects the individual. It actually clears him from guilt; and if he is cleared from guilt, is justified, made righteous, he has certainly undergone a radical change."

TRUE DOCTRINE

The prophet Ezekiel teaches that if a righteous man turns from his righteousness and commits sin, he shall die for the sins which he has committed. The righteous man's sins which had previously been forgiven him are obviously not canceled as far as God's records are concerned.

Ezekiel 18:24 & 26 *"But when the righteous turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, [and] doeth according to all the abominations that the wicked [man] doeth,*

shall he live? **All his righteousness that he hath done shall not be mentioned: in his trespass that he hath trespassed, and in his sin that he hath sinned, in them shall he die.** ... When a righteous [man] turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and dieth in them; for his iniquity that he hath done shall he die.”

Jesus’ parable of the unmerciful debtor plainly teaches us that the forgiveness of our sins is conditional, and in the parable, the unmerciful debtor had to pay back **the entire debt** his master had previously forgiven him. See *Matthew 18:23-35*. This indicates that the forgiveness of our sins does not cancel the heavenly record, it remains until Christ pronounces “*He that is unjust, let him be unjust still: and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still: and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still: and he that is holy, let him be holy still.* *Rev 22:11* The censor is thrown down, *Rev. 8:5*; and judgment is closed, no character change is then possible. *Rev. 22:11*.

Waggoner’s teaching contradicts the Heavenly Sanctuary doctrine, which shows that forgiven sins are recorded in the heavenly books. See: *Dan. 7:10; Ecc. 12:14; Rev. 20:12*

4SP 265, 266 also known as the 1884 GC, pp. 265 & 266— “Important truths concerning the atonement may be learned from the typical service. A substitute was accepted in the sinner's stead; but the sin was not canceled by the blood of the victim. A means was thus provided by which it was transferred to the sanctuary. By the offering of blood, the sinner acknowledged the authority of the law, confessed his guilt in transgression, and expressed his desire for pardon through faith in a Redeemer to come; but he was not yet entirely released from the condemnation of the law. On the day of atonement the high priest, having taken an offering from the congregation, went into the most holy place with the blood of this general offering, and sprinkled it upon the mercy-seat, directly over the law, to make satisfaction for its claims. Then, in his character of mediator, he took the sins upon himself, and bore them from the sanctuary. Placing his hands upon the head of the scape-goat, he confessed over him all these sins, thus in figure transferring them from himself to the goat. The goat then bore them away, and they were regarded as forever separated from the people. ... As the sins of the people were anciently transferred, in figure, to the earthly sanctuary by the blood of the sin-offering, so our sins are, in fact, transferred to the heavenly sanctuary by the blood of Christ. And as the typical cleansing of the earthly was accomplished by the removal of the sins by which it had been polluted, so the actual cleansing of the heavenly is to be accomplished by the removal, or blotting out, of the sins which are there recorded. This necessitates 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. The cleansing of the sanctuary therefore involves a work of investigative Judgment. This work must be performed prior to the coming of Christ to redeem his people; for when he comes, his reward is with him to give to every man according to his works. [REV. 22:12.]”

DOCUMENTING ERRORS OF A. T. JONES' 1893 GENERAL CONFERENCE SERMONS

FALSE DOCTRINE

A.T. Jones taught that the Protestant Churches had not joined themselves to another husband other than Jesus until 1892. Sermons are taken from the 1893 General Conference Daily Bulletin

SERMON 4, p. 93 “**They say it, and it is so. Until now these churches had not joined themselves to the powers of the earth.** They had many bad ways; they were doing many things that were out of harmony with the gospel; they had fallen away from Christ; but a woman may leave her husband, and yet not be joined to another man; there is hope for her still to come back to her husband. But when she has joined herself to another man, what then? - She is gone completely; she is an adulteress indeed; she cannot be brought back. **Although they had wandered away from Christ, yet they had not joined themselves to another until 1892.** Then they deliberately joined themselves to another, - to the government of the United States, and seized upon the power of this nation. They made this their husband, their dependence, and source of help, instead of the Lord. Are not these churches just as truly apostate as the Papal church herself when she did it? Is not Babylon the mother and daughters complete? What is she the mother of? - "Harlots and abominations of the earth"; (Rev. 17:4, 5) and so they themselves are the daughters, - it has been said for them, and not one of them has disputed it.”

TRUE DOCTRINE

The Testimony of Jesus teaches that in 1844, when the Protestant Churches fell under the preaching of the 2nd Angel's message, they became Babylon; and that since that time [that is, since 1844], Satan has taken full possession of them as a body. When the Protestant Churches rejected the 1st Angel's message of the 2nd Advent of Jesus, the Lord rejected them.

1858 Great Controversy, p. 189 “*I saw the state of the different churches since the second angel proclaimed their fall. They have been growing more and more corrupt; yet they bear the name of being Christ's followers. ... Satan has taken full possession of the churches as a body.*”

4SP -1884 Great Controversy, pp. 232 & 233 “*When the churches spurned the counsel of God by rejecting the Advent message, the Lord rejected them. The first angel was followed by a second, proclaiming, "Babylon is fallen, is fallen, that great city, because she made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication." [REV. 14:8] This message was understood by Adventists to be an announcement of the moral fall of the churches in consequence of their rejection of the first message. The proclamation, "Babylon is fallen," was given in the summer of 1844, and as the result, about fifty thousand withdrew from these churches. ... God looks down upon these apostate bodies, and declares them daughters of a harlot. **To secure the favor and support of the great men of earth, they have broken their solemn vows of allegiance and fidelity to the King of Heaven.***”

Thus the Protestant Churches were indeed rejected of the Lord and joined to another husband well before 1892!

FALSE DOCTRINE

Jones uses quotations from the skeptic historian Gibbon. Two examples are his sermons at the General Conference Session held in Lincoln, Nebraska, from February 9-16, 1897 SERMON 6, p. 126 & SERMON 12, p. 261

TRUE DOCTRINE

The testimony of Jesus makes it plain that Gibbon aligned himself with the cause of Satan and stood as an enemy of the Christian faith. His writings have caused immeasurable harm, the full extent of which will be known only in eternity.

R.H. January 8, 1880 “Gibbon, the skeptic, and many others whom God endowed with giant minds, and whom the world called great men, rallied under the banner of Satan, and used the gifts of God for the perversion of truth and the destruction of the souls of men. Great intellect, when made a minister of vice, is a curse to the possessor and to all within its influence.”

S.T. November 3, 1881 “Gibbon, the renowned historian, was not a great man according to God's standard. He was endowed with great intellectual powers, that he might make known to his fellow-men the knowledge of God. But Satan prepared his snares for this man, and he became entangled in the meshes of skepticism. His works breathe insinuations against God and against the world's Redeemer. He improved every opportunity to destroy confidence in the Bible and the Christian religion. Eternity alone can reveal the amount of harm wrought by his writings. The world pronounces Gibbon a literary success. God pronounces him a failure.”

“A beneficent Creator endows men with intellectual powers, that, consecrated to his service, they may become co-workers with Christ and angels in the work of human redemption. Yet how many, like Byron and Gibbon, employ their talents to pervert the simplicity of truth, and bring contempt upon the Christian religion, as unworthy the attention of intelligent men. Those who are engaged in this work little know what they are doing. But in the day of Judgment how fearful will be their accountability.”

“Intellectual power, when opposed to the principles of true religion, becomes a minister of vice. Its influence tends to deface the image of God in man, and to bring him down to the level of the brute creation. Whatever, tends to banish thoughts of God from the mind becomes a curse, not only to the possessor but to all within the sphere of his influence. Better would it be for the gifted skeptic, better for the world, to be deprived of the brilliant talents that are devoted to the service of Satan. The greater the gift perverted and abused, the greater will be the evil wrought and the greater the condemnation in the day of final reckoning.”

The following statement from the pen of inspiration was written in 1891, and is a warning against using or recommending the books of Satan's agents [for example, Gibbon].

R.H., November 10, 1891 “Shall those who have known the oracles of God recommend our

students to study the books that express pagan or infidel sentiments, that they may become intelligent? Satan has his agents, educated after his methods, inspired by his spirit, and adapted to do his works; but shall we co-operate with them? Shall we, as Christians, recommend the works of his agents as valuable, even essential to the attainment of an education?"

This warning was read by Elder S. N. Haskell at the 1893 G. C. Session, and appears in the **General Conference Daily Bulletin, 1893 p. 443**. Jones should have been aware of this inspired counsel regarding Gibbon and his works, given some 4 years before his sermons.

FALSE DOCTRINE

Jones taught that Jesus gives us a spotless character as a gift, not that it is "*our work of a lifetime*."

SERMON 6, pp. 125 & 128— "The dearest treasure that mortal times afford is not spotless reputation: the dearest treasure that either mortal or immortal times afford is spotless character; **and the only spotless character that ever appeared in this world is the character of Jesus Christ. And that character he comes and gives to you and me, a free blessed gift from Him who made it.**"

"... Then about the reputation. Let that go. He gives a character - a character which he himself wove from infancy to the grave - that is complete in every respect; and he says, "Take it and put it on, and you shall come to my wedding supper." That is the character, and that is the covering that he draws over his people so that the plagues cannot touch them, and no power of the enemy can overcome or defile it. "I will greatly rejoice in the Lord, my soul shall be joyful in my God; for he hath clothed me with the garments of salvation, he hath covered me with the robe of righteousness." Isa. 61:10. Thank the Lord ... **Instead of reputation God gives us character.**"

SERMON 14, p. 347— "Now the Lord wants us to be covered; he wants us to be covered, so that the shame of our nakedness shall not appear. He wants us to have his perfect righteousness according to his own perfect **idea** of righteousness. He wants us to have that character that will stand the test of the judgment without a hitch, or a question, or a doubt. **Let us accept it from him as the free blessed gift it is.**"

A.T. Jones contradicts himself on this point, also teaching that character is transformed in co-operation with God, being a progressive work.

SERMON 10, p. 207— "Christ is to be in us, just as God was in him, and his character is to be in us, just as God was in him, and his character is to be woven and transformed into us through these sufferings and temptations and trials which we meet. And God is the weaver, but not without us. It is the co- operation of the divine and the human -- the mystery of God in you and me - the same mystery that was in the gospel and that is the third angel's message. This is the word of the Wonderful Counselor."

[Voice: "Was not the character woven without us?"] Yes, but it will not become ours without us. So we are led through these fiery trials and temptations to be partakers of the character of Christ, and these trials and temptations that we meet reveal to us our characters and the importance of having his, so that through these same temptations that he passed through, we become partakers of his character, bearing about in the body the righteousness of the life of the Lord Jesus Christ."

SERMON 20, p. 454— "Now the righteousness of God in Jesus Christ is that which makes us righteous, which saves us, which sanctifies us, which is all in all to us. When we have obtained that righteousness, and that righteousness is there according to righteousness, God's idea of righteousness, what is it that witnesses to the righteousness of God in the believer in Jesus? [Congregation: "The Law."] The law of God. But here is this work of Christ growing up in the individual, that progressive work; that is the work of sanctification, - the work of sanctifying; for that is the thought, the work of sanctifying. It is the growth of Christ in the individual. When Christ has grown to the fulness there, then that is the completed work of sanctification."

TRUE DOCTRINE

Does God give us a holy character as a gift? NO! As we are required to overcome as Jesus overcame [See *Revelation 3:21*], did God the Father give Jesus a holy character as a gift when he was upon earth? **NO!** [In the previous quotations on this issue, A. T. Jones sermons #10, & 20, is correct on this point, and not the A. T. Jones sermons #6 & 14. Truly the man seemed confused. Either it is a gift given to us, or it is the work of a life time. **It cannot be both.**]

Spirit of Prophecy, Volume 3, p. 260. "*In the intercessory prayer of Jesus with his Father, he claimed that he had fulfilled the conditions which made it obligatory upon the Father to fulfill his part of the contract made in Heaven, with regard to fallen man. He prayed: "I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do. [That is, he had wrought out a righteous character on earth as an example for men to follow.] And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was."*

1884 Great Controversy, p. 305 "*It is the privilege and the duty of every Christian to maintain a close union with Christ, and to have a rich experience in the things of God. Then his life will be fruitful in good works. When we read the lives of men who have been eminent for their piety, we often regard their experiences and attainments as beyond our reach. But this is not the case. Said Christ: "Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit." "As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine, no more can ye, except ye abide in me." "He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit." [JOHN 15:8, 4, 5.] The prophets and apostles did not perfect Christian character by a miracle. They used the means which God had placed within their reach, and all who will put forth a like effort will secure a like result."*

Christ's Object Lessons, p. 331 "*But Christ has given us no assurance that to attain perfection of character is an easy matter. A noble, all-round character is not inherited. It does not come to us by accident. A noble character is earned by individual effort through the merits and grace*

of Christ. God gives the talents, the powers of the mind; we form the character. It is formed by hard, stern battles with self. Conflict after conflict must be waged against hereditary tendencies. We shall have to criticize ourselves closely, and allow not one unfavorable trait to remain uncorrected."

Christ's Object Lessons, pp. 311 & 312 *"This robe, woven in the loom of heaven, has in it not one thread of human devising. Christ in His humanity wrought out a perfect character, and this character He offers to impart to us. "All our righteousness are as filthy rags." Isa. 64:6. Everything that we of ourselves can do is defiled by sin. But the Son of God "was manifested to take away our sins; and in Him is no sin." Sin is defined to be "the transgression of the law." 1 John 3:5, 4. But Christ was obedient to every requirement of the law. He said of Himself, "I delight to do Thy will, O My God; yea, Thy law is within My heart." Ps. 40:8. When on earth, He said to His disciples, "I have kept My Father's commandments." John 15:10. 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."*

A.T. Jones often over-emphasized faith to the exclusion of works. Neglecting to clarify the necessity of obedience and sanctification. Making statements that sound antinomian and using strong, dismissive language about the law's role in salvation. He encouraged a spirit of combativeness rather than careful, balanced teaching. These were the extremes Ellen White repeatedly warned against, and that Jones ultimately acknowledged he had fallen into.

A.T. Jones: "I know that I have made strong expressions at times. I do not deny that. But I did not intend to say what some have understood." GCB 1893, p.416.

FALSE DOCTRINE

A.T. Jones taught that the Lord was going to raise up many prophets among God's people.

SERMON 7, p. 153— "Thank the Lord, he is not going to be content much longer with one prophet! He will have more. He has done a wonderful work with one. And having done such a great work with one, what in the world will he do when he gets a lot of them?"

This statement by A.T. Jones was made approximately six to eight months before he became entangled with Anna Philips, a false prophet. It seems that Satan gave Jones exactly what he was seeking.

REBUKE FROM THE PROPHET

The Prophet of the Lord rebuked Jones' for publicly endorsing Anna Philips' false

visions.

Letter 103, 1894. *“Dear Brother, - I know that we are living near the close of this earth's history; startling events are preparing for development. I am fully in harmony with you in your work when you present the Bible, and the Bible alone, as the foundation of our faith. Satan is an artful foe, and he will work where he is by many least expected. I have a message for you. Did you suppose that God had commissioned you to take the burden of presenting the visions of Anna Phillips, reading them in public, and uniting them with the testimonies the Lord has been pleased to give me? No, the Lord has not laid upon you this burden. He has not given you this work to do. . . . How is it, my brother, that you have taken up these communications, and presented them before the people, weaving them in with the testimonies God has given Sister White? Where is your evidence that these are of God? You cannot be too careful how you hear, how you receive, how you believe. **You cannot be too careful how you talk of the gift of prophesying, and state that I have said this and that in reference to this matter. Such statements, I well know, encourage men and women and children to imagine that they have special light in revelations from God, when they have not received such light. This, I have been shown, would be one of Satan's masterpieces of deception. You are giving to the work a mold which it will take precious time and wearing soul labor to correct, to save the cause of God from another spasm of fanaticism.**”* [Letter written to A. T. Jones, March 15, 1894.]

FALSE DOCTRINE

A.T. Jones promoted the unsound error that one need not study all the Scriptures on a given subject, but should simply accept a single Bible passage and believe it without regard to the broader testimony of Scripture.

SERMON 15, p. 361— “Another thing: Do you believe now - let us have that settled before we go any further. I want to know how many people in this house actually believe, right down honestly in their hearts, that God is able to say what he means when he says it? [Congregation: “Yes.”] Then when you and I read what he says, just as he says it in the Bible, **I want to know whether it is any use for you and me to go over to some other part of the Bible and hunt up some other text to see whether that does not contradict this? Is the Lord able to tell his own story in his own way without contradicting himself?** [Congregation: “Yes.”] We have been at that long enough. So I do not propose to harmonize any texts of Scripture in all the work that I shall have to do here in this institute. I think the Lord has everything straight, exactly as it is. I do not think he needs any of my help. I think rather that I need his help to see that there is no contradiction at all. And I think that if there appears to me to be a contradiction, then I need more of his Spirit to see that there is none. And instead of trying to harmonize the supposed contradiction, I am going to say that the Lord knows all about that; and I am going to wait until he gives me breadth of mind enough to see it is no contradiction there at all.”

“So what I want here to decide now, and forever, is that when you read anything in the Bible, that that means exactly what it says, and you need not hunt up anything in the Bible to see whether that tells the other side of it. There is no other side; it is all one.”

TRUE DOCTRINE

If someone accepted Jones's foolish statement, they would be forced to regard the following false doctrines as true, relying solely on a single isolated scripture.

The Secret Rapture- Matthew 24:40 & 41

The Conscience State of the Dead - Revelation 6:9-11

Eternal Burning Hell- Revelation 20:10

Thankfully the Word of God and the Testimony of Jesus rebuke A.T. Jones' unsound teaching.

Isaiah 28:9-13 *"Whom shall he teach knowledge? and whom shall he make to understand doctrine? [them that are] weaned from the milk, [and] drawn from the breasts. **For precept [must be] upon precept, precept upon precept; line upon line, line upon line; here a little, [and] there a little:** For with stammering lips and another tongue will he speak to this people. To whom he said, This [is] the rest [wherewith] ye may cause the weary to rest; and this [is] the refreshing: yet they would not hear. **But the word of the LORD was unto them precept upon precept, precept upon precept; line upon line, line upon line; here a little, [and] there a little;** that they might go, and fall backward, and be broken, and snared, and taken."*

Matthew 4:4 *"But he answered and said, **It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.**"*

Luke 24:27 *"And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, **he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself.**"*

R.H. October 9, 1883 *"Some portions of Scripture are, indeed, too plain to be misunderstood; but there are others whose meaning does not lie upon the surface, to be seen at a glance. Scripture must be compared with scripture; there must be careful research and patient reflection. And such study will be richly repaid. As the miner discovers veins of precious metal concealed beneath the surface of the earth, so will he who perseveringly searches the word of God as for hid treasure, find truths of greatest value, which are concealed from the view of the careless seeker."*

4SP 1884 Great Controversy, p. 416: *"We should day by day study the Bible diligently, weighing every thought, and comparing scripture with scripture. With divine help, we are to form our opinions for ourselves, as we are to answer for ourselves before God."*

FALSE DOCTRINE

Jones taught that the heathen are incapable of doing any good at all. He also claimed that the enmity God places within man does not enable him to do good.

SERMON 12, pp. 258 - 260 *"The man who finds that hatred of evil, that desire for something better, that will to do good, is that the doing of good? [Congregation: "No."] Can he do the good that he is drawn to, by that impulse? [Congregation: "No."] Let us read in Romans and see what is done. Rom. 3:10, "As it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one." And the 12th verse:*

"They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one." Is that so? [Congregation: "Yes, sir."] Then how can we talk about a heathen doing good? Does he do good? "There is none that doeth good, no, not one." [A voice: "If a man has Christ, he can do good."] But if he has Christ, he is not a heathen. What we are talking about is the heathen."

"... "For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not." What is it that is present with us? To will to do good. Then what did that putting of enmity there against Satan - what was that the doing of? Is not it setting the man free to will? Yes. Was it anything more than that? [Congregation: "No."] Now think carefully of this; I mean on this point. There are other things in it, of course; but did that do any more for the man to enable him to do right things and glorify God, did it do any more for him than to set free his will, that he might choose which master he would have? [Congregation: "No."] It put the hatred there, and gave him the knowledge of something better. It gives the hatred of evil, leads him out towards the good; but does it enable him to do the good? [Congregation: "No."]"

TRUE DOCTRINE

The Testimony of Jesus specifically mentions the heathen doing good to the Lord's servants. And also states that there will be those in the Kingdom of God who have never heard of Jesus Christ or of his sacrifice.

Zechariah 13:6 "And one shall say unto him, What are these wounds in thine hands? Then he shall answer, Those with which I was wounded in the house of my friends."

Romans 2:14, 15 & 26 "For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves: Which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and [their] thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another;) ... Therefore if the uncircumcision keep the righteousness of the law, shall not his uncircumcision be counted for circumcision?"

R.H., September 20, 1898 "In the day of final reckoning, Christ does not present before men the great work he has done for them in giving his life for their redemption. He presents before them the faithful work they have done for him. What surpassing love is this! He even mentions the work of the heathen, who have no intelligent knowledge of the law of the Lord, but who have done the very things the law required, because they have heeded the voice speaking to them in the things of nature. When the Holy Spirit implants Christ's Spirit in the heart of the savage, and he befriends God's servants, the quickening of the heart's sympathy is contrary to his nature, contrary to his education. The grace of God, working upon the darkened mind, has softened the savage nature untaught by the wisdom of men. And these uneducated heathen, in all their cruelty, are regarded in a more favorable light than are those who have had great light and evidence, but who have rejected the mercy and reproof of God."

"Christ implants his grace in the heart of the savage, and ministers to the necessity of the missionary, even before he has heard or comprehended the words of truth and life. Behold that

*crowd collected about God's servant to harm him! But the Lord is working upon the heart and mind of perhaps one man to plead in behalf of his servant; and when the war council has determined the destruction of the Christian's life, the intercession of **that savage** turns the decision, and his life is spared. O, the love that goes forth to **the savage** for this one act! To such Christ says, in the Judgment: "I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me in: naked, and ye clothed me: I was sick, and ye visited me: I was in prison, and ye came unto me." "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world."*

The grace that Christ implants in the heart of man creates the enmity against Satan and gives man the power to resist Satan.

Genesis 3:15 “*And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.*”

4SP -1884 Great Controversy, p. 325 “*The grace that Christ implants in the soul creates the 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. Whoever is seen to abhor sin instead of loving it, whoever resists and conquers those passions that have held sway within, displays the operation of a principle wholly from above.*”

FALSE DOCTRINE

A.T. Jones **KNEW** with “**perfect security**” that he was saved! In other words, Jones’ taught the “I am saved” doctrine!

SERMON 16, p. 379— “**Let us read on now, in Rom. 4:3-5:** *"For what saith the scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness. Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness." **Believeth on him that justifieth who?** [Congregation: "The ungodly."] **Who is it, in this world, that the Lord justifies?** [Congregation: "The ungodly."] **The ungodly; I am glad of it; for that assures me everlasting salvation.** If it were otherwise there would be no hope for me. If God justified people who were only half saints that would leave me out. If he justified people who had only one good thing, that would leave me out. If he justified people who had only a little good about them, that would leave me out. But thank the Lord, he is so good, he loves me so much, he has such wondrous power, the divine power of his righteousness is so great, that when he pronounces that word upon such a corrupt sinner as I am it makes me through and through righteous in the sight of God. [Congregation: "Amen."] That is the worth of God's word "righteousness."*

“And because he is so good; because there is such divine power in his righteousness; and because he justifies the ungodly; **therefore, I have the perfect security of his everlasting salvation.**”

SERMON 18, p. 417— “Now, can't we praise the Lord. Then everybody in this house that wants to do it, you just go right ahead now. I will say amen to every word of it; for my soul magnifies him, too, brethren. My soul praises him, too, brethren; because he is my Saviour; **he has completed the work; he has done his gracious work; he has saved me; he saves all.** Let us thank him forevermore.”

TRUE DOCTRINE

The Bible and Spirit of Prophecy contain numerous plain and unmistakable warnings over the years against the false “I am saved” doctrine, which A. T. Jones clearly promoted in his 1893 sermons. Here are just a few of these inspired references.

1. Ezekiel 18:24 *“But when the righteous turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and doeth according to all the abominations that the wicked man doeth, shall he live? All his righteousness that he hath done shall not be mentioned: in his trespass that he hath trespassed, and in his sin that he hath sinned, in them shall he die.”*

2. Matthew 24:13 *“But he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved.”*

This shows salvation is conditional on endurance to the end.

3. John 15:6 Jesus speaking— *“If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered; and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned.”*

4. Romans 11:20–22 *“Well; because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not highminded, but fear: For if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee. Behold therefore the goodness and severity of God: on them which fell, severity; but toward thee, goodness, if thou continue in his goodness: otherwise thou also shalt be cut off.”*

5. 1 Corinthians 9:27 Paul speaking of himself— *“But I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection: lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway.”*

6. Galatians 5:4 *“Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace.”*

Shows that one can “fall from grace.”

7. Hebrews 3:12–14 *“Take heed, brethren, lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief, in departing from the living God. **But exhort one another daily,** while it is called To day; lest any of you be hardened through the deceitfulness of sin. For we are made partakers of Christ. **if we hold the beginning of our confidence stedfast unto the end.**”*

8. Hebrews 10:26–27 “For if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries.”

9. 2 Peter 2:20–22 “For if after they have escaped the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, **they are again entangled therein, and overcome, the latter end is worse with them than the beginning.** For it had been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than, after they have known it, to turn from the holy commandment delivered unto them. But it is happened unto them according to the true proverb, The dog is turned to his own vomit again; and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire.”

R.H., June 17, 1890 “We are never to rest in a satisfied condition, and cease to make advancement, saying, “I am saved.” When this idea is entertained, the motives for watchfulness, for prayer, for earnest endeavor to press onward to higher attainments, cease to exist. No sanctified tongue will be found uttering these words till Christ shall come, and we enter in through the gates into the city of God. Then, with the utmost propriety, we may give glory to God and to the Lamb for eternal deliverance. As long as man is full of weakness,--for of himself he cannot save his soul,--he should never dare to say, “I am saved.” It is not he that putteth on the armor that can boast of the victory; for he has the battle to fight and the victory to win. It is he that endureth unto the end that shall be saved. The Lord says, “If any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him.” If we do not go forward from victory to victory, the soul will draw back to perdition. We should raise no human standard whereby to measure character. We have seen enough of what men call perfection here below. God's holy law is the only thing by which we can determine whether we are keeping his way or not. If we are disobedient, our characters are out of harmony with God's moral rule of government, and it is stating a falsehood to say, “I am saved.” No one is saved who is a transgressor of the law of God, which is the foundation of his government in heaven and in earth.”

Bible Echo, May 15, 1892 “As we come to feel our utter reliance upon Christ for salvation, are we to fold our hands, and say, “I have nothing to do; I am saved; Jesus has done it all”?--No, we are to put forth every energy that we may become partakers of the divine nature. We are to be continually watching, waiting, praying, and working. But do all that we may, we cannot pay a ransom for our souls. We can do nothing to originate faith, for faith is the gift of God; neither can we perfect it, for Christ is the finisher of our faith. It is all of Christ. All the longing after a better life is from Christ, and is an evidence that he is drawing you to himself, and that you are responding to his drawing power. You are to be as clay in the hands of the potter; and if you submit yourself to Christ, he will fashion you into a vessel unto honor, fit for the Master's use. The only thing that stands in the way of the soul who is not fashioned after the divine Pattern is that he does not become poor in spirit; for he who is poor in spirit will look to a higher Source than himself that he may obtain the grace that will make him rich unto God. While he will feel

that he cannot originate anything, he will say, "The Lord is my helper."

Kress Collection, p. 120.2 *"But those who after being prayed with say, **I am saved, have no real understanding of what it means to receive Christ. No man can say, I am saved, until he has endured test and trial, until he has shown that he can overcome temptation. Those who fail to do the work which God has said should be done soon lose the right perception of spiritual things, and become blinded as to the character of the truth. They are unfitted to do the work which would make them complete in Christ.**"*

Christ's Object Lessons, p. 155 *"Peter's fall was not instantaneous, but gradual. Self-confidence led him to the belief that he was saved, and step after step was taken in the downward path, until he could deny his Master. Never can we safely put confidence in self or feel, this side of heaven, that we are secure against temptation. Those who accept the Saviour, however sincere their conversion, should never be taught to say or to feel that they are saved. This is misleading. Every one should be taught to cherish hope and faith; but even when we give ourselves to Christ and know that He accepts us, we are not beyond the reach of temptation. God's word declares, "Many shall be purified, and made white, and tried." Dan. 12:10. Only he who endures the trial will receive the crown of life. (James 1:12.)"*

COL 155.2 *"Those who accept Christ, and in their first confidence say, **I am saved, are in danger of trusting to themselves. They lose sight of their own weakness and their constant need of divine strength. They are unprepared for Satan's devices, and under temptation many, like Peter, fall into the very depths of sin. We are admonished, "Let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall." 1 Cor. 10:12. Our only safety is in constant distrust of self, and dependence on Christ.**"*

FALSE DOCTRINE

Jones taught that confession is not specific, but we need only to state "Lord, they are sins," and then the sinner is forgiven. He taught that only confession is necessary for the forgiveness of sins. And also Jones taught that when a person confesses their sins they are gone, blotted out, cast into the depths of the sea etc.

SERMON 17, p. 405 "The Bible says, *"If we confess our sins he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins."* What does God show them for anyway? The only thing that he shows men their sins for, is that he may take them away. **When he shows me sins, I say, "Lord, they are sins." And what then? They are forgiven. They are gone.... Micah 7:19: "He will turn again, he will have compassion upon us; he will subdue our iniquities; and thou wilt cast all their sins into the depths of the sea." Then where are they?** [Congregation: "In the depths of the sea."] **How do you know?** [Congregation: "He says so."] **Then you know that, don't you?** Then how in the world is anybody going to bother you about getting your sins back to you? *Ps. 103:12: "As far as the east is from the west, so far hath he removed our transgressions from us."* **How far are they away from you now, you who have confessed them? How far are they away?** [Voice: "As far as the east is from the west."] **Why don't you say so then?** Satan comes and says, "They are not

forgiven; every sin is right there before your face; don't you see them?" Are they? [Congregation: "No."] Says one, "I have seen them there." It is nothing of the kind. Satan is a magician, and can make things appear so, that are not so. But you look at them and say, "Yes, that is so." It is not so. The Lord says they are as far from us as the east is from the west. They are in the depths of the sea, and they are as white as snow. Thank the Lord."

"Isa. 38:17, and that verse is the last one we need to-night. "Behold, for peace I had great bitterness; but thou hast in love to my soul delivered it from the pit of corruption: for thou hast cast all my sins behind thy back." How many? [Congregation: "All."] Behind his back. Where are they, then? [Congregation: "Behind his back."] We are before his face, and the sins are behind his back; who is between us and them? [Congregation: "God."] And he is upon his throne, isn't he? Then when I have confessed my sins to the Lord, he and his living eternal throne stand between me and those sins, and Satan and everybody else in this universe cannot bring them back; for he has got to get the Lord and his throne out of the way before they can get those sins back to me again. And I am going to be glad of it."

TRUE DOCTRINE

Our confession of sin should be specific, and not as Jones states, "Lord, they are sins," and then the sinner is forgiven.

1. Leviticus 5:5 *"And it shall be, when he shall be guilty in one of these things, that he shall confess that he hath sinned in that thing."*

God required the sinner to acknowledge the specific sin committed.

2. Proverbs 28:13 *"He that covereth his sins shall not prosper: but whoso confesseth and forsaketh them shall have mercy."*

Confessing means uncovering—not hiding—the specific wrongs, so they can be forsaken.

3. Psalm 32:5 *"I acknowledged my sin unto thee, and mine iniquity have I not hid. I said, I will confess my transgressions unto the Lord; and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin. Selah."*

David emphasizes openly admitting his specific sins rather than concealing them.

Testimony, Vol. 5 p. 693 *"True confession is always of a specific character, and acknowledges particular sins. They may be of such a nature as only to be brought before God, they may be wrongs that should be confessed before individuals who have suffered injury through them, or they may be of a general kind that should be made known in the congregation of the people. But all confession should be definite and to the point, acknowledging the very sins of which you are guilty."* 5T 693

Confession of sin is only ONE requirement for the forgiveness of our sins. We must also forsake the sins, make restitution where necessary, and forgive others freely; these are all necessary steps in obtaining the forgiveness of our sins.

Proverbs 28:13 *"He that covereth his sins shall not prosper: but whoso confesseth and*

forsaketh [them] shall have mercy.”

Ezekiel 33:14, 15 “Again, when I say unto the wicked, Thou shalt surely die; if he turn from his sin, and do that which is lawful and right; [If] the wicked restore the pledge, give again that he had robbed, walk in the statutes of life, without committing iniquity; he shall surely live, he shall not die.”

Matthew 6:12 “And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors.”

Matthew 18:35 “So likewise shall my heavenly Father do also unto you, if ye from your hearts forgive not every one his brother their trespasses.”

1 John 1:9 “If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us [our] sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.”

In Summary:

A.T. Jones misquotes scripture concerning our sins being completely disposed of by God when we confess our sins. If this teaching of Jones was true, it would destroy the truth of the Heavenly Sanctuary doctrine, we will later prove that E.J. Waggoner was teaching the same.

Jesus’ parable of the unmerciful debtor plainly taught that the forgiveness of our sins is conditional, and in the parable, the unmerciful debtor had to pay back the entire debt his master had previously forgiven him – See *Matthew 18:23 – 35*.

When our sins are forgiven, our sins are **TRANSFERRED** to the Heavenly Sanctuary, and they are **NOT** removed or blotted out from the Books of Heavenly Records as far as God is concerned, until our individual cases are determined in the Investigative Judgment. The blotting out of sins takes place at the close of the investigative judgment. *Lev. 16:8-26*

1884 Great Controversy, 4SP 265-267: *“Important truths concerning the atonement may be learned from the typical service. A substitute was accepted in the sinner's stead; but the sin was not canceled by the blood of the victim. A means was thus provided by which it was transferred to the sanctuary. By the offering of blood, the sinner acknowledged the authority of the law, confessed his guilt in transgression, and expressed his desire for pardon through faith in a Redeemer to come; but he was not yet entirely released from the condemnation of the law. On the day of atonement the high priest, having taken an offering from the congregation, went into the most holy place with the blood of this general offering, and sprinkled it upon the mercy-seat, directly over the law, to make satisfaction for its claims. Then, in his character of mediator, he took the sins upon himself, and bore them from the sanctuary. Placing his hands upon the head of the scape-goat, he confessed over him all these sins, thus in figure transferring them from himself to the goat. The goat then bore them away, and they were regarded as forever separated from the people.”*

“... As the sins of the people were anciently transferred, in figure, to the earthly sanctuary by the blood of the sin-offering, so our sins are, in fact, transferred to the heavenly sanctuary by the blood of Christ. And as the typical cleansing of the earthly was accomplished

by the removal of the sins by which it had been polluted, so the actual cleansing of the heavenly is to be accomplished by the removal, or blotting out, of the sins which are there recorded. This necessitates 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. The cleansing of the sanctuary therefore involves a work of investigative Judgment. This work must be performed prior to the coming of Christ to redeem his people; for when he comes, his reward is with him to give to every man according to his works. [REV. 22:12.]”

“Thus those who followed in the advancing light of the prophetic word saw that instead of coming to the earth at the termination of the 2300 days in 1844, Christ then entered the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary, into the presence of God, to perform the closing work of atonement, preparatory to his coming.”

*“It was seen, also, that while the sin-offering pointed to Christ as a sacrifice, and the high priest represented Christ as a mediator, the scape-goat typified Satan, the author of sin, upon whom the sins of the truly penitent will finally be placed. When the high priest, by virtue of the blood of the sin-offering, removed the sins from the sanctuary, he placed them upon the scape-goat. **When Christ, by virtue of his own blood, removes the sins of his people from the heavenly sanctuary at the close of his ministration, he will place them upon Satan, who, in the execution of the judgment, must bear the final penalty.** The scape-goat was sent away into a land not inhabited, never to come again into the congregation of Israel. So will Satan be forever banished from the presence of God and his people, and he will be blotted from existence in the final destruction of sin and sinners.”*

FALSE DOCTRINE

A.T. Jones taught that the sealing was going on in 1893.

SERMON 18, p. 416 *“Brethren, how can we get away from the seal of God? Then are we not right now, in the time of the sealing? [Congregation: "Yes."] And it is through the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ, is it not? Yes, sir; and then when that seal is received, when that is affixed there, then these can stand through the time of the plagues, through all the temptations and trials of Satan when he works with all power and signs and lying wonders. For the promise is "as thou hast kept the word of my patience, I also will keep thee from the hour of temptation, which shall come upon all the world, to try them that dwell upon the earth.”*

TRUE DOCTRINE

The sealing did **NOT** start in 1888 or in 1893.

1884 Great Controversy, 4SP 315 *“The Judgment is now passing in the sanctuary above. Forty years has this work been in progress. **Soon--none know how soon--it will pass to the cases of the living.**”*

Testimony Vol. 5, p. 692 *“Several times during the past winter [1888-89.] I have met the report that, during the Conference at Minneapolis, "Sister White was shown that the judgment, which*

since 1844 had been passing upon the righteous dead, had now begun upon the living." **This report is not true.** A similar rumor, which has been afloat for about two years, originated in this wise: In a letter written from Basel, Switzerland, to a minister in California I made a remark substantially as follows: "**The judgment has been over forty years in progress on the cases of the dead, and we know not how soon it will pass to the cases of the living.**" The letter was read to different persons, and careless hearers reported what they thought they heard. Thus the matter started. **The report from Minneapolis arose from someone's misunderstanding of a statement to the same effect as the one quoted from the letter. There is no other foundation for either report than this.**" 5T 692

FALSE DOCTRINE

A. T. Jones taught that the believer who is aware of Christ's personal presence within knows that this presence and power of Christ is automatically working in them continually "**always and in all things.**"

SERMON 22, p. 494 "A good many people think that when the apostles went out endued with the power to work miracles and all this, all they had to do when they came to a man who was sick, was to work a miracle and restore him. There was nothing of that kind at all; they could work no miracle at all, except as the Spirit of Christ with them signified the will of God in that case; so that - I care not how great apostles they were - they were dependent upon the direct guidance of the Spirit of God, in each individual case, and all the time; and that means us."

"The power is the personal presence of Christ in us," and the having the power is that, "and that does not necessarily mean in the sense of a thrill of power in us all the time; but it means an abiding faith that Christ is in us," and it means not only an abiding belief in that, but an abiding consciousness that he is there, that his power is there working in us, with us, for us, through us, **always and in all things**, to the glory of God alone, not at our bidding, not at our guidance in any sense."

TRUE DOCTRINE

The Testimony of Jesus makes it clear that Christ's apostles were not constantly under the direct inspiration of the Holy Spirit, but remained fallible human beings capable of making mistakes even after receiving the Holy Spirit at Pentecost.

1. Galatians 2:11-14 "*But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed. For before that certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles: but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them which were of the circumcision. And the other Jews dissembled likewise with him; insomuch that Barnabas also was carried away with their dissimulation.*"

Peter, even as an apostle after Pentecost, acted hypocritically and had to be publicly corrected by Paul.

2. Acts 15:37–39. *“And Barnabas determined to take with them John, whose surname was Mark. But Paul thought not good to take him with them, who departed from them from Pamphylia, and went not with them to the work. And the contention was so sharp between them, that they departed asunder one from the other: and so Barnabas took Mark, and sailed unto Cyprus.”*

Paul and Barnabas, both Spirit-filled apostles, had a sharp disagreement that led to their separation.

3. James 3:2 *“For in many things we offend all. If any man offend not in word, the same is a perfect man, and able also to bridle the whole body.”*

James, himself an apostolic leader, admits that “we all” stumble in many things—affirming human fallibility.

Sketches from the Life of Paul, pp. 212-214 *“The brethren hoped that by this act Paul might give a decisive contradiction of the false reports concerning him. But while James assured Paul that the decision of the former council (Acts 15) concerning the Gentile converts and the ceremonial law still held good, **the advice given was not consistent with that decision which had also been sanctioned by the Holy Spirit. The Spirit of God did not prompt this advice. It was the fruit of cowardice.** By non-conformity to the ceremonial law, Christians would bring upon themselves the hatred of the unbelieving Jews, and expose themselves to severe persecution. ... The disciples themselves yet cherished a regard for the ceremonial law, and were too willing to make concessions, hoping by so doing to gain the confidence of their countrymen, remove their prejudice, and win them to faith in Christ as the world's Redeemer. **Paul's** great object in visiting Jerusalem was to conciliate the church of Palestine. So long as they continued to cherish prejudice against him, they were constantly working to counteract his influence. He felt that if he could by any lawful concession on his part win them to the truth, he would remove a very great obstacle to the success of the gospel in other places. **But he was not authorized of God to concede so much as they had asked.** This concession was not in harmony with his teachings, nor with the firm integrity of his character. **His advisers were not infallible. Though some of these men wrote under the inspiration of the Spirit of God, yet when not under its direct influence they sometimes erred. It will be remembered that on one occasion Paul withstood Peter to the face because he was acting a double part.**”*

Ellen White herself, though an inspired messenger of the Lord, acknowledged that she sometimes made mistakes. How then could Christ's personal presence have been working through her **“always and in all things”**? We live on Satan's territory, and it is a daily choice, and daily battle to overcome temptation.

Manuscript Releases, Volume 7, p. 284 *“I wish that self should be hid in Jesus. I wish self to be crucified. **I do not claim infallibility, or even perfection of Christian character. I am not free from mistakes and errors in my life.** Had I followed my Saviour more closely, I should not have to mourn so much my unlikeness to His dear image.”--Letter 27, 1876.”*

Original Testimony, No. 12, pages 89, 90 *“The relation I sustain to this work demands of me an unfettered expression of my views. I speak freely, and choose this medium to speak to all interested. What appeared in Testimony No. 11 concerning the Health Institute, should not have been given until I was able to write out all I had seen in regard to it. I did not design to say anything upon the subject in No. 11, and sent all the manuscript that I designed for that Testimony, from Ottawa Co., where I was then labouring, to the Office at Battle Creek, stating that I wished them to hasten out that little work, as it was much needed, and as soon as possible I would write No. 12, in which I designed to speak freely and fully concerning the Institute. The brethren at Battle Creek especially interested in the Institute, knew I had seen that our people should cast in of their means to establish such an institution. They therefore delayed the publication of No. 11 to write to me that the influence of my testimony in regard to the Institute was needed to immediately move the brethren upon the subject, and that No. 11 would wait till I could write. This was a great trial to me, as I knew I could not write out all I had seen, for I was then speaking to the people six or eight times a week, visiting from house to house, and writing hundreds of pages of personal testimonies and private letters. This amount of labor, with unnecessary burdens and trials thrown upon me, unfitted me for labor of any kind. My health was poor, and my mental sufferings were beyond description. Under these circumstances I yielded my judgment to that of others, and wrote what appeared in No. 11 in regard to the Health Institute, being unable then to give all I had seen. I did wrong. I must be allowed to know my own duty better than others can know it for me, especially on matters which God has revealed to me. I shall be blamed by some for speaking as I now speak. Others will blame me for not speaking before. The disposition manifested to crowd the matter of the Institute so fast has been one of the heaviest trials I have ever borne. If all those who have used my testimony to move the brethren, had been equally moved by it themselves, I should be better satisfied.”*

FALSE DOCTRINE

In 1893 A.T. Jones believed and stated that the church had reached a time when all its trials and difficulties were over, and that from then on it would be free from unconverted people.

SERMON 22, p. 498 *“But that is only a part of it. Here is the most blessed promise it seems to me, that ever came to the Seventh-day Adventist church. "For henceforth there shall no more come into thee, the uncircumcised and the unclean." Thank the Lord; he has delivered us henceforth from unconverted people; from people brought into the church to work out their own unrighteousness, and to create division in the church. Church trials are all gone; thank the Lord; all mischievous talebearers and tattlers are gone. The church now has something better than that to talk about. They can now talk of saving fallen men and women. They will have a goodness, and a joy, and a holiness and a glory that is in Jesus Christ, to talk about, which is real indeed, and we know it.”*

“... Brethren, there is another thing that belongs there now. When God has graced his Church with his power and his glory, and the power of his Spirit, the most dangerous place in this world for a hypocrite to be, in is that church. Ananias and Sapphira tried it, and that

lesson was recorded as a lesson to all people, from this day forward, at least. There is no place now in the Seventh-day Adventist Church for hypocrites. If the heart is not sincere, it is the most dangerous place that that man ever was in in the world.”

TRUE DOCTRINE

Jesus taught that the righteous (wheat) and the wicked (tares) remain together in the church until the harvest at the end of the world. And Paul warned that false teachers and unconverted people would remain a threat within the church even after his time.

Matthew 13:24–30 (Parable of the Wheat and Tares) “Another parable put he forth unto them, saying, The kingdom of heaven is likened unto a man which sowed good seed in his field: But while men slept, his enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat, and went his way. But when the blade was sprung up, and brought forth fruit, then appeared the tares also. So the servants of the householder came and said unto him, Sir, didst not thou sow good seed in thy field? from whence then hath it tares? He said unto them, An enemy hath done this. The servants said unto him, Wilt thou then that we go and gather them up? But he said, Nay; lest while ye gather up the tares, ye root up also the wheat with them. Let both grow together until the harvest: and in the time of harvest I will say to the reapers, Gather ye together first the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them: but gather the wheat into my barn.”

Acts 20:29–30. “For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them.”

Paul clearly taught that evil people and deceivers will not disappear from among God’s people, but will increase in influence and wickedness over time.

2 Timothy 3:13 “But evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving, and being deceived.”

The Testimony of Jesus also warned us that we are never to expect the time when the whole church will be revived.

R.H., March 22, 1887 “Are we hoping to see the whole church revived? **That time will never come.**”

FALSE DOCTRINE 1891 – 1892

A. T. Jones, E. J. Waggoner, along with W. W. Prescott went to extremes in their teachings and practices regarding prayer for the sick. They urged people to simply believe they were healed after prayer and to abandon medical treatments for their recovery. Tragically, some individuals in Battle Creek died as a result of following this extreme teaching. The lesser-known history of Jones’s and Waggoner’s extreme views on this subject is documented below.

Manuscripts and Memories of Minneapolis 1888, p. 183— “At present there is a somewhat strained condition of things. I have great respect from **Brn. A T. Jones, E. J. Waggoner, and Prof. Prescott**, and believe that they have been the instrumentalities in the hands of God of doing much good. **But in connection with their work there have been some extreme expressions used, and at times extreme positions taken, which have not strengthened the good work that they were trying to do**, but on the other hand it has given others an opportunity to criticize, which it seems to me might have been avoided. ... **The positions that have been taken on healing, and some other matters, have brought about, as I have stated, quite a strained condition of things.** I feel so very thankful for the testimonies that you have sent, and especially the one dated at Victoria, Australia, January 21, addressed to “The Brethren and Sisters in Battle Creek, and to all who need these words.” I think this testimony will have a great tendency to relieve the situation, and will help the brethren that I have mentioned to understand how they can make their work more effectual for good, and will also show others the wrong course they are taking in their criticism and opposition.” [O. A. Olsen to E. G. White; letter dated March 10, 1892.]

Mrs. White wrote at least two Testimonies to try and correct this extreme teaching of Jones and Waggoner. “To the Brethren and Sisters in Battle Creek, and to all who need these words” – Letter 93, 1892 - dated January 21, 1892

Examining the “Confession of Faith”

This letter—sometimes referred to as a manuscript—was the final document written by Dr. E.J. Waggoner, found on his desk following his sudden death on May 28, 1916. On pages 3 and 4, Waggoner plainly identifies it as a “Confession of Faith,” a summary of his beliefs at the end of his life. However, these were not newly adopted convictions; as he admits on page 5, he had been moving in this direction for many years. Most notably, Waggoner states that he could no longer labor within the Seventh-day Adventist ministry because he no longer identified himself as an Adventist. This was the end result of a path he began as far back as 1882—a gradual but deliberate departure from the truth. Tragically, the very views outlined in this final letter—once seen as apostasy by the men of the “Church”—are now widely accepted, not only by the corporate church but also by many so-called “independent ministries.” The result has been a complete shift away from the original platform of truth, leaving many adrift in dangerous theological error. We will now continue to evaluate the beliefs of Dr. E.J. Waggoner from his “confession of faith.”

In the following letter, all emphasis is supplied by the publisher. This letter is included in its entirety in appendix “A.”

“My Dear Brother:

Ever since you were here last summer I have had it on my mind to write you a long letter, in which I could express myself as freely as though I were talking to you.... You were kind enough to express the hope that I might again be connected with “the work.”.... I was glad for the kind wish, and for the brotherly spirit that prompted it; and it furnished an additional reason why I should write this letter as a sort of “Confession of Faith,”.... It is indeed as a confession of faith, and not as an expression of disbelief of old doctrines, that I should like to have you consider this partial statement of my ground for knowing that I could not be accepted into the S.D.A. ministry even if I were ever so willing. I want you as an old and loved friend to know, as nearly as I can make it known, where I stand....” Pages 3, & 4

Page 5— “Christ is primarily the Word of God, the expression of God’s thought; and the Scriptures are the Word of God simply because they reveal Christ. **It was with this belief that I began my real study of the Bible, thirty-four years ago.** At that time Christ was set forth before my eyes “evidently crucified” before me. I was sitting a little apart from the body of the congregation in the large tent at a camp-meeting in Healdsburg, one gloomy Sabbath afternoon. I have no idea what was the subject of the discourse. Not a text nor a word have I ever known. All that has remained with me was what I saw. Suddenly a light shone round me, and the tent was, for me, far more brilliantly lighted than if the noon-day sun had been shining, and I saw Christ hanging on the cross, crucified for me. In that moment I had my first positive knowledge, which came like an overwhelming flood, that God loved me, and that Christ died for me. God and I were the only beings I was conscious of in the universe. I knew then, by actual sight, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself; **I was the whole world with all its sin**.... I

resolved at once that I would study the Bible in the light of that revelation, in order that I might help others to see the same truth.”

“The Confession of Faith” Pg.5 -E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #1. an Extra-Biblical Revelation as the Foundation of Faith: “Suddenly a light shone round me... I saw Christ hanging on the cross... God and I were the only beings I was conscious of in the universe... I knew then, by actual sight...”

Why this is wrong:

This experience mirrors mystical and charismatic experiences that are rooted in subjective feeling rather than objective Scripture. Waggoner then places his personal vision as the starting point for his real understanding of the gospel, not the Word of God. This kind of mystical experience **places personal vision above Scripture** and **shifts the foundation of faith** from the **written Word of God** to **subjective revelation**. It mirrors the **spiritualistic mysticism** of Rome, spiritualism, and modern charismatic movements where experience supersedes divine instruction. Faith must be built on the **sure Word of God**, not private emotional encounters.

Scripture Refutations:

- *“So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.” Romans 10:17*
- *“To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.” Isaiah 8:20*

All claims of truth must be tested by God’s written Word, not by visions or inner experiences. If Waggoner’s “actual sight” is not grounded in and tested by Scripture, it is without light, no matter how spiritual it feels.

- *“We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed... Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation.” 2 Peter 1:19–21*

Peter, who witnessed the transfiguration of Christ (a literal vision), says that **Scripture is “more sure”** than even that experience. Waggoner’s private vision cannot supersede the written Word.

Private revelations are not the foundation of faith.

- *“The prophet that hath a dream, let him tell a dream; and he that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully. What is the chaff to the wheat? saith the Lord.” Jeremiah 23:28*

God Himself distinguishes between dreams (chaff) and His Word (wheat). Personal experiences—even if vivid—are not equal to or above Scripture. **Placing subjective sight above objective revelation is spiritual deception.**

- *“Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth.” John 17:17*

Scripture is always the foundation of divine revelation—not feelings, visions, or inner impressions, which is spiritualism.

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 5- E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #2. No Connection to Scripture or Human Witness. “Not a text nor a word have I ever known... no text and no human being was connected with the experience.”

Why This is Wrong:

This directly contradicts the biblical principle that truth must be tested by the Word of God. Waggoner disconnects his revelation from the Bible, which opens the door to spiritualism, pantheism, and mysticism. This statement **detaches spiritual experience from both Scripture and Christian witness**, which is a hallmark of **spiritualism and mysticism**. By claiming **no biblical text** and **no human confirmation**, Waggoner's experience is made **self-validating**—thus placing it beyond testing or accountability. The Bible consistently teaches that all truth must be **rooted in Scripture** and is confirmed through **God-ordained witnesses**.

Biblical Response:

- *“All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness. That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.” 2 Timothy 3:16, 17*

The Bible alone is the complete guide for doctrine and experience. A so-called gospel “experience” with no connection to Scripture is not from God. This text makes it clear that all spiritual experience must be instructed and tested by the Word.

- *“Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world.” 1 John 4:1*

Waggoner's testimony rejects the testing principle. By claiming no Scripture or human witness was involved, **he effectively places his experience above examination**, which is the gateway to deception. All spiritual experiences must be tried by the Word, not accepted blindly.

- *“These were more noble... in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the scriptures daily, whether those things were so.” Acts 17:11*

A true revelation from God will always be in harmony with Scripture and subject to its authority. Even the **apostle Paul** was not exempt from testing by Scripture. If Paul's teachings had to be verified by the **written Word**, then **any spiritual experience**—especially one as subjective as Waggoner's—must also be **subject to biblical scrutiny**.

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 5- E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #3. “I was the whole world with all its sin.”—Regarding the VISION seen in 1882.

Why this is Wrong:

This statement reflects pantheistic mysticism—blurring the line between the individual and the collective, between the sinner and sin itself, and between Christ and humanity. To say, “**I was the whole world with all its sin**” is not biblical. It is a mystical claim of absorption into universal sin, implying a **loss of personal identity**, and suggesting that individuals themselves embody universal sin. This pantheistic mysticism keeps people locked into the idea that they must remain part of the collective group, and cannot and must not separate from sin and sinners as they are part of that universal sin. But the Bible says: *“Behold the Bridegroom cometh, Go ye OUT to meet him.” Matthew 25:6*

Biblical Response:

A. Christ alone bore the sin of the world.

- *“Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.” John 1:29*

Jesus—not the believer—takes away the world’s sin.

B. Christ alone was made sin for us

- *“For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.” 2 Corinthians 5:21*

He was made sin—not us. We receive righteousness—not the world’s sin.

C. Each person bears their own sin (until forgiveness)

- *“The soul that sinneth, it shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father; neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son...” Ezekiel 18:20*

Each person is accountable for **their** sin—not the world’s.

D. Christ alone is the substitute for all

- *“All we like sheep have gone astray... and the LORD hath laid on him the iniquity of us all.” Isaiah 53:6*

Our collective iniquity is laid **on Christ**—not on any believer.

E. Confession is personal—not universal

- *“If we confess **our sins**, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.” 1 John 1:9*

We confess our own sins—not the world’s.

F. Christ is the Only Mediator for the world’s sin, This is what the Name Jesus means!

- *And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt **call his name JESUS**: for he shall save **his people from** their sins. Matthew 1:21*
- *For there is one God, and **one Mediator** between God and men, **the man Christ Jesus**; Who gave himself a ransom for all...” 1 Timothy 2:5-6*

Only Christ mediates and ransoms for **all**—we cannot be the mediator.

G. We can’t bear others’ sin

- *“For every man shall bear his own burden.” Galatians 6:5*

We are responsible for our **own** load of sin and guilt—not the world’s

H. Bearing one another’s burdens is helping—not atoning for others

- *Galatians 6:2 “Bear ye one another’s burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ.*

This refers to *practical* help and intercession—not *becoming* the world’s sin.”

Conclusion:

Waggoner’s mystical claim that “I was the whole world with all its sin” contradicts Scripture. He resolved at once to study the Bible in the light of that revelation. **This is Backwards to what we should do!!!!**

These two pages of Waggoner’s final confession confirms that his theology early on became deeply mystical, pantheistic, and entirely detached from biblical authority. It reveals a man who allowed subjective experience to override divine revelation, and laid the groundwork for pantheistic interpretations of Scripture. This is why Ellen White warned so strongly about “another spirit” behind the teachings being promoted shortly after 1888: *“The **crisis is now upon us**. The battle is to be waged between the Christianity of the Bible and the **Christianity of human tradition**.” RH January 1, 1889, par. 3*

“We have nothing to fear for the future, except as we shall forget the way the Lord has led us, and His teaching in our past history.” LS 196.2

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 6 -E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #4. “Paul’s experience on the way to Damascus was no more real than mine.”

Why This is Wrong:

Comparison to Paul’s Damascus Experience Waggoner equates his private mystical encounter with Paul’s direct audible, visible, and verifiable encounter with the risen Christ, witnessed and confirmed by others and later validated by Scripture. Waggoner here equates his isolated mystical vision with the historical, public, and verifiable appearance of the risen Christ to the apostle Paul. Paul’s Damascus experience was:

- Initiated by Christ Himself —Acts 9:4
- Confirmed by witnesses (audible and visible) -Acts 9:7
- Followed by instruction from a prophet (Ananias) -Acts 9:10-18
- Validated by Scripture and prophetic commission -Acts 9:11-12

Waggoner’s comparison dismisses the biblical safeguards surrounding divine revelation and promotes a subjective authority that cannot be tested or confirmed by the Word of God.

Biblical Response:

- *“And he fell to the earth, and heard a voice... And the men which journeyed with him stood speechless, **hearing a voice**, but seeing no man.” Acts 9:3–7*

Paul’s experience was **audible, external, and partially witnessed** by others. Waggoner’s private vision had **no such external verification**. The comparison is illegitimate and self-elevating. Paul’s experience became part of the written Word and served to confirm the gospel — not contradict it. No private impression should ever be set above, or given equal authority to a divinely inspired and canonized encounter such as Paul’s.

- *“Truly the signs of an apostle were wrought among you... in signs, and wonders, and mighty deeds.” 2 Corinthians 12:12*

Paul’s apostleship—including his Damascus experience—was confirmed by public signs and fruits. True apostolic authority is not based merely on vision, but on Spirit-led power and doctrinal harmony. Waggoner produced no biblical signs to validate his vision.

- *“But I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me is not after man. For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ... Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem to see Peter...” Galatians 1:11–12, 18–19*

Paul’s experience was followed by testing and validation by the existing apostles (Peter, James, etc.). He did not exalt his vision above Scripture or the church. Waggoner, by contrast, claims no Scripture or human involvement—thus isolating his vision from the biblical model entirely.

- *“All along our pathway to the heavenly Canaan we see many souls that have made shipwreck of faith, and in their false movements have led others astray through the supposition that **they were led of God in special revelations**. I have had to write many, many pages to correct these errors.” 9LtMs, Lt 103, 1894, par. 22; 2SM 86.4*

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 6 -E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #5. Interpretation of the Bible through Mystical “Revelation” “I resolved at once that I would study the Bible in the light of that revelation...”

Why This is Wrong:

Waggoner here reverses the divine order: Instead of letting the Bible test his experience, he now uses his experience to interpret the Bible. This is dangerous and undermines "sola scriptura". Waggoner is here committing a **foundational error of spiritualism and mysticism**—placing **personal experience as the lens** through which Scripture is interpreted. This **reverses the biblical order**. Scripture is to be the **test of all experiences**, not the other way around. The result is a **subjective gospel** where feelings or visions dictate doctrine, not the written Word of God.

Biblical Response:

- *“To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.” Isaiah 8:20*

All experiences, revelations, or impressions **must conform to God’s Word**. Waggoner’s approach places his experience **above** the written Word—exactly what this verse condemns.

Scripture is the test, not experience.

- *“Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path.” Psalm 119:105*
- *“We have also a more sure word of prophecy... no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation.” 2 Peter 1:19–21*

Peter, who had a literal vision of Christ’s transfiguration, said that **Scripture is even more certain** than what he saw. Revelation is **not private**, and we are not to interpret God’s Word through private, mystical lenses. Waggoner’s method contradicts this principle.

- *“All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.” 2 Timothy 3:16–17*

It is Scripture alone that furnishes the believer for faith and practice—not visions or mystical impressions. Waggoner’s decision to interpret the Bible through his revelation contradicts the sufficiency of Scripture and violates the principle of sola scriptura.

- *“But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed.” Galatians 1:8–9*

Even a heavenly being (or vision) that teaches a different understanding of the Gospel must be rejected. This shows that no supernatural experience or “light” is to be trusted over the revealed Word of God. The Gospel is not interpreted by mystical visions, but by the unchanging truth already delivered.

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 6- E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #6. Confusing the Word “Christ” with Scripture Itself. “Christ must be the beginning and end of all Scripture, as He is the Author and Perfecter of faith.”

Why this is Wrong:

While this is partially true, this statement blends **Christ as the living Word** (John 1:1) with the **written Word** (Scripture) in a way that blurs the distinction between **revelation** and **inspiration**.

Why it's problematic:

- Waggoner subtly promotes the idea that the revelation of Christ is **the only test** of Scripture's authority, thus opening the door for **subjective interpretation**.
- It fits the pantheistic error that **God is in everything**, including every word or thought, **regardless of its scriptural harmony**.

Biblical Response:

- *"Search the scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me." John 5:39*

Jesus Himself draws a clear line: the Scriptures are the written testimony **about** Him. They are not **HIM**, nor are they to be interpreted by feelings or impressions. The **authority lies in the Scriptures**, not in the subjective experience of "seeing Christ" in everything.

- *"And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself." Luke 24:27*

After His resurrection, Christ did not point the disciples to a mystical revelation or inner light, but walked them through the **written Word**—"*Moses and the prophets*"—to show who He was. Scripture interprets Christ; not the other way around.

- *"...that ye might learn in us not to think of men above that which is written..." 1 Corinthians 4:6*

Paul warns against going **beyond what is written**, even in judging spiritual teachers. This is a direct safeguard against **elevating experience, impressions, or personal "light"** over the written Word of God.

- *"All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine..." 2 Timothy 3:16*
- *"To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Isaiah 8:20*

"The Confession of Faith" Pg. 6- E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #7. Impersonal and Mystical View of the "Word;" "In that living Word that was God in the beginning everything exists."

Why this is Wrong:

This makes creation and sustaining power be embedded in **"the Word"** in a **mystical way**—again blending **biblical truth** with **pantheistic nuance**. The phrasing implies a **force-like** attribute to the Word, rather than **God's direct, personal action**.

- It de-personalizes God, making Him a cosmic force or essence, operating through principles and energies.
- Supports the Kelloggian notion that "God is in everything"—the food, breath, flower, tree, air, matter Etc...—which was later condemned by Ellen White as **"the alpha of**

deadly heresies.”

“In the book “Living Temple” there is presented the alpha of deadly heresies. The omega will follow, and will be received by those who are not willing to heed the warning God has given.” SpTB02 50.2; ISM 200.1

Biblical Response:

- *“He spake, and it was done; He commanded, and it stood fast.” Psalm 33:9*
- *“By the word of the Lord were the heavens made... For He commanded, and they were created.” Psalm 148:5*

God speaks by **divine authority**, not through a mystical, ever-present “living Word” inherent in all creation.

- *“I am the Lord, and there is none else, there is no God beside me: I girded thee, though thou hast not known me: That they may know from the rising of the sun, and from the west, that there is none beside me. I am the Lord, and there is none else.” Isaiah 45:5–6*

God declares He is distinct from creation—there is none other.

- *“I am the Lord: that is my name: and my glory will I not give to another, neither my praise to graven images.” Isaiah 42:8*

God refuses to share His divine glory with anything created—He is separate and holy.

- *“In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.” Genesis 1:1*

God is the Creator, distinct from His creation.

- *“God that made the world and all things therein, seeing that he is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands; Neither is worshipped with men’s hands, as though he needed any thing, seeing he giveth to all life, and breath, and all things;” Acts 17:24–25*

God is not confined in, nor identical to, His creation. He sustains it, but is separate from it.

- *“But our God is in the heavens: he hath done whatsoever he hath pleased. Their idols are silver and gold, the work of men’s hands... They that make them are like unto them; so is every one that trusteth in them.” Psalm 115:3–8*

God is enthroned in heaven—transcendent, not a force within material objects.

- *“For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible... And he is before all things, and by him all things consist.” Colossians 1:16–17*

Christ created all things and sustains them, but He is before and above them, not identical with them. The Bible teaches God is the Creator, sovereign over creation, sustaining it, but distinct from it. Pantheism teaches that God is everything or in everything as a divine substance. This is false!

Upon this subject the Messenger of the Lord wrote: *“I have been instructed by the heavenly messenger that some of the reasoning in the book, “Living Temple,” is unsound and that this reasoning would lead astray the minds of those who are not thoroughly established on the foundation principles of present truth. It introduces that **which is naught but speculation in regard to the personality of God and where His presence is**. No one on this earth has a right to speculate on this question. The more **fanciful theories are discussed, the less men will know of God and of the truth that sanctifies the soul.**” SpTB02 51.3*

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 7- E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #8. “Creation Is Ongoing and Continuous” “Creation is first and last and all the time... God was not taken by surprise...” “No new work was instituted... the everlasting word... still continues to work effectually...”

Why this is Wrong:

- This teaches that **creation is still ongoing**, subtly suggesting that God’s power is **continually infused into matter** to sustain existence.
- This is not biblical **providence**, but pantheistic **continual emanation**.

Biblical Response:

- *“Thus the heavens and the earth were **finished**, and **all the host of them**. And on the seventh day God **ended his work which he had made**; and he **rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made**. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made.”* Genesis 2:1–3

God’s creation was completed at the beginning—He finished it and rested. It is not an ongoing, continuous act.

- *“For we which have believed do enter into rest, as he said, As I have sworn in my wrath, if they shall enter into my rest: although the **works were finished** from the foundation of the world. For he spake in a certain place of the seventh day on this wise, And God did **rest the seventh day from all his works**.”* Hebrews 4:3–4

The New Testament confirms creation was finished from the foundation of the world.

- *“By the word of the Lord were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth... For he spake, and it was done; he commanded, and it stood fast.”* Psalm 33:6, 9

Creation happened by God’s command—instant and complete, not a continuous unfolding or self-creating process.

- *“Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them.”* — Genesis 2:1
“He upholds all things by the word of His power...” — Hebrews 1:3

God sustains creation, yes—but not by *continuing to create*, nor by **being in the creation** itself.

Ellen White in the Spirit of Prophecy refuted this exact idea:

“This is the alpha of deadly heresies.” — ISM 200.1; SpTB02 50.2

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 7- E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #9. Misrepresentation of Redemption as Merely an Extension of Creation “Redeems all by the continued exercise of the same power that brought all into being...”

Why this is Wrong:

- This collapses redemption and creation into the same operation.
- Removes the **blood atonement** and the substitutionary **death of Christ** from the center of salvation, replacing it with **“creative power.”**
- ALL being redeemed/saved which is the false doctrine of Universalism.

This reflects the **pantheistic gospel** later echoed by Kellogg: salvation through divine life-force, not through the blood of a Substitute.

Biblical Response:

“Without shedding of blood is no remission [of sins].” Hebrews 9:22

This verse directly contradicts the idea that continued creative power redeems all. It establishes **blood atonement**—not ongoing creative force—as the absolute requirement for forgiveness. Redemption comes through a **substitutionary sacrifice**, not merely through God’s sustaining energy.

*“Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold... But with the **precious blood of Christ**, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot.” 1 Peter 1:18–19*

This clearly states **how redemption occurs**—not by any other divine action or sustaining power, but by **Christ’s sacrificial blood**. This contradicts any theory that makes redemption a mere function of creation or life force.

“In whom we have redemption through His blood, even the forgiveness of sins.” Colossians 1:14

“But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable... shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death.” Revelation 21:8

This verse **destroys Universalism**. Not all will be saved or redeemed. Some will be eternally lost. The idea that “all” are redeemed by some mystical or creative power **flatly denies the judgment and final destruction of the wicked** as Waggoner taught and wrote in his “Confession.”

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 7- E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine 10. Eternal Gospel Presented Without Change or Progression. “But no new feature has ever been introduced... God has not grown greater... as great... in the beginning as He could be...”

Why this is Wrong:

- While God’s character is unchanging (*Malachi 3:6*), this denies **progressive revelation** and the uniqueness of the events of the Incarnation, selfless life, death, resurrection, and accession of Jesus Christ.
- This takes away the significance of the types and shadows, blurring the Old Covenant with the New Covenant.
- It also implies that the **Gospel message** was already complete before sin, before the cross—even in the creation of angels.

Biblical Response:

• *“This is a great mystery... Christ and the church.” Ephesians 5:32*

• *“Which in other ages was not made known... but is now revealed.” Ephesians 3:5*

• *“God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, Hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed*

heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds.” Hebrews 1:1–2

These texts affirm progressive revelation—God did not give the full revelation of Himself or the Gospel at creation or during the Old Covenant. The fullness of the Gospel came through Christ, and especially in His incarnation and sacrifice. **This clearly contradicts the idea that “no new feature” has ever been introduced.**

- *“Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently... Searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow.” 1 Peter 1:10–11*

This shows that even the prophets did not fully understand the Gospel until it was revealed in Christ’s suffering and resurrection. The plan of salvation was not fully unfolded or understood before the cross. This directly contradicts the idea that the Gospel was “complete” before sin or the cross.

- *“For the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.” John 1:17*

This draws a sharp line between the covenants. The Gospel in its fullness—grace and truth—was not manifested under the Old Covenant, but came through the person and work of Christ. It reveals a new feature of God’s plan—the manifestation of divine mercy through the Death and triumphal resurrection of Christ—something not experienced before.

There is a progression in how God reveals Himself, culminating in Christ crucified, not simply creation. So the Bible does indeed teach a progressive revelation of the plan of Salvation; and in striving to do away with the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary, Waggoner has proven too much and unknowingly done away with the gospel of Jesus Christ.

A. Progressive Revelation of Salvation

- *“God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, Hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son...” Hebrews 1:1-2*

“Sundry times and divers manners” — progressive stages. Christ’s coming is a **new stage** of revelation.

B. Christ’s Sacrifice = New Covenant Feature

- *“Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you.” Luke 22:20*

New testament — new covenant. His shed blood is a **new feature** not present before Calvary. Old Testament — rites and ceremonies— Sacrifices and feasts.

C. A New and Living Way

- *“Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, By a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us...” Hebrews 10:19-20*

“New and Living Way” —introduced through Christ’s death.

D. Mystery Now Revealed

- *“Even the mystery which hath been hid from ages and from generations, but now is made manifest to his saints: To whom God would make known what is the riches of the*

glory of this mystery among the Gentiles; which is Christ in you, the hope of glory:”
Colossians 1:26-27

Hid before, now revealed — new feature in God’s plan.

E. Grace Now Fully Revealed Through Christ

- *“For the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.” John 1:17*
Christ brings **full grace and truth** in a way Moses’ law did not.

F. The Promise of the Spirit = New Feature

- *“(But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him should receive: for the Holy Ghost was not yet given; because that Jesus was not yet glorified.)” John 7:39*
The Spirit’s outpouring after Jesus’ glorification — new feature.

G. A Better Covenant with Better Promises

- *“But now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant, which was established upon better promises.” Hebrews 8:6*
Better covenant, better promises = new features compared to the old.

H. Christ’s Priesthood = New Order

- *“For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law.” Hebrews 7:12*
Priesthood **changed** — new feature introduced in salvation history.

God’s plan is eternal, but **the Bible clearly teaches new features were introduced** over time, culminating in Christ’s incarnation, death, resurrection, and heavenly priesthood. Waggoner’s claim that **“no new feature has ever been introduced”** is clearly **contrary to Scripture**.

This is a **Dangerous Blending of Truth and Error** which will lead the honest in heart into a seductive pantheistic thinking.

Waggoner’s language on these pages:

- Mixes **Christ’s creative power** with pantheistic mysticism.
- De-emphasizes the cross and substitutionary atonement.
- Promotes an impersonal force-based view of salvation.
- Prepares the reader for full-blown **pantheism**, just as Kellogg would articulate soon after.

This theology subtly undermines the *platform of truth* laid in the early Advent movement, and matches what Ellen White described as: *“You may have a theory of truth, and yet have no special fellowship with Christ.” 14LtMs, Ms 94, 1899, par. 5*

“The theories that lead to unbelief in the Word of God, and to a lack of the faith that works by love and purifies the soul, are theories of the enemy. They may be very pleasing, and very attractive, but they develop into strange doctrines, which unsettle faith in the past experience of

God's people, and take away the foundation pillars. These theories have come in amongst us, and have been a seductive power, robbing some of the faith that enables human beings to see where they are living in the history of the world. They are false theories, leading away from the truth into subtle errors.” PC 81.8 (Paulson Collection)

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 8- E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #11: “From the days of eternity of old until now Christ has exercised the threefold office of Prophet, Priest, and King.”

Why this is wrong:

This is a **false merging of Christ’s offices** across all time, particularly applying the **priesthood** and aspects of the **kingly office** before the cross or even before sin. It misrepresents Christ’s mediatorial role and confuses the **antitypical priesthood**, which began **after the cross**, not before. Scripture clearly teaches that he was First the Only begotten Son of God, then at his Incarnation he became the son of man, was a prophet while on earth, then became the Lamb of God, was slain for our sins. Rose again, and ascended to heaven and was glorified; and because of faithfully performing his role as son of man, is worth to take the books and open the records and intercede in behalf of man. He becomes King when he is finished with his high priestly role, throws down the censor, places the sins upon the scapegoat, then puts on his garments of vengeance and comes as King of Kings and Lord of Lords.

Scripture Refutation:

- *“For if he were on earth, he should not be a priest...” Hebrews 8:4*
- Christ could **not act as priest** on earth, because the priesthood was according to **Levi**, and He was of **Judah**. His heavenly priesthood begins **after the cross** (see *Hebrews 8:1–2*).
- Christ was **appointed High Priest after** being made perfect through **suffering** (v.8). This contradicts the claim that He functioned as priest from eternity past.
“But Christ being come an high priest... by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place...” Hebrews 9:11–12
- His priesthood is based on His sacrificial death, not on pre-creation status.

Christ Could Not Be High Priest Before his Incarnation or Cross—A Priest Must Be Human

“For every high priest taken from among men is ordained for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins. Hebrews 5:1

Christ had to be taken from among men. No human flesh = no priesthood.

He Became Man to Be High Priest

“Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people.” Hebrews 2:17

He had to become like us to serve as High Priest.— He Offered His Own Blood

“Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.” Hebrews 9:12

Priesthood required his shed blood—after the cross.—Appointed High Priest After Suffering
“Though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered; And being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him; Called of God an high priest after the order of Melchisedec.” Hebrews 5:8-10

He was called High Priest after suffering.—Priesthood Began After Ascension
*“We have such an **high priest**, who is set on the **right hand** of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens; A minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man.” Hebrews 8:1-2*

Heavenly priesthood began after ascension.—Not Priest on Earth
“For if he were on earth, he should not be a priest... Hebrews 8:4

No priestly ministry on earth before cross or ascension.—All Things Done in Order
“Let all things be done decently and in order.” 1 Corinthians 14:40

God’s plan of redemption done decently and in order:

- Prophet (earthly ministry- *Deut. 18:18; Acts 7:37*)
- Lamb of God (Sacrifice for our sins-*John 1:29*)
- Priest (Post-sacrifice & Ascension to heaven-Found worthy to open the books- *Rev. 5.*)
- King (Once the Priestly work is finished, he changes garments before Second Coming *Rev. 19:13,16*)

“The Confession of Faith” Pg.8- E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #12: “He was born to the throne, not merely in Bethlehem, but from His ‘goings forth.’”

Why this is wrong:

This claim suggests Christ was **already King** from eternity past, instead of (Prince) the Son of God, conflating His **divine pre-existence** with His **Messianic kingship**. Scripture shows that Christ’s **kingship** is something He is **appointed to, inherits**, and **will fully exercise only after** His priestly work is finished. The throne is not eternal in the sense of always being His role—it is a position to be **bestowed upon Him after His incarnation, sacrificial work, ascension, and Priestly work of intercession is finished in the courts above.**

Scripture Refutation:

- *“God hath made that same Jesus... both Lord and Christ.” Acts 2:36*

His kingship is **bestowed after his High Priestly role in the Investigative Judgment**, not exercised from eternity. This shows that His **position of authority and kingship** was **conferred**,

not eternally inherent. He was **not enthroned from His goings forth in eternity past**, but **after the investigative judgment priestly work is finished** and the **proclamation** made, **“He that is filthy let him be filthy still.”...**

- *“Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him...” Philippians 2:8–9*

Exaltation followed His humiliation and death. The **“Wherefore”** points to a cause-and-effect. Christ’s exaltation—**His enthronement and glorification**—is the result of His **humiliation and obedience**, not a state He already held from eternity. He was **not born to the throne**, but **exalted to it** after the closing priestly work.

- *“After purging our sins, He sat down and was made so much better than the angels, indicating a new role of authority.” Hebrews 1:3–4*

Christ **sat down** at the right hand of God (a **position of royal authority**) **after purging our sins**. This enthronement is clearly **sequential**, not eternal. He is **appointed King**, not exercising that authority from eternity past.

The Bible teaches Christ’s role as **High Priest** in the heavenly sanctuary *precedes* His final coming as **King of kings** to judge and reign. His priestly intercession must end before He returns in royal glory to execute judgment.

- *“So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation.” Hebrews 9:28*

“Without sin” — no longer as Sin-Bearer or Priest, but as Saviour and King. His intercession ends before His second appearing.

- *“And the temple was filled with smoke from the glory of God, and from his power; and no man was able to enter into the temple, till the seven plagues of the seven angels were fulfilled.” Revelation 15:8*

This shows a close of intercession—the sanctuary ministry stops before the final judgments fall. Christ finishes His priestly work before coming in judgment as King.

- *“He that is unjust, let him be unjust still: and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still: and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still: and he that is holy, let him be holy still. And, behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be.” Revelation 22:11–12*

Christ pronounces the final irreversible judgment (“let him be”)—marking the end of His mediatorial work—**before** coming as King with reward and judgment.

- *“And at that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people: and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time...” Daniel 12:1*

“Michael standing up” signifies the end of His intercessory role—He stands as Judge and Deliverer before the final time of trouble.

Christ’s priestly intercession ends before He returns as King of kings and receives his people and his Kingdom. The heavenly sanctuary closes (Rev. 15:8), final judgment is pronounced (Rev. 22:11–12), and He appears “without sin” (Heb. 9:28)—as Judge and King.

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 8- E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #13 “Christ has certainly ever been, since as the Living Word He has spoken for God.”

Why this is wrong:

This teaches eternal pre-existence without distinction or origin, the Bible presents a clear distinction: Christ was begotten of the Father, he is not co-eternal in the same sense as the Father. The Son had an origin—not in time as we know it, but as a real act of begetting from the Father—before all creation. This does not deny divinity, but establishes Sonship.

Scripture Refutation:

A. Begotten of the Father

“The LORD possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was. When there were no depths, I was brought forth...” Proverbs 8:22–25

This Messianic wisdom passage describes the origin of Christ, not as a created being, but as **brought forth or begotten by the Father**. He did not always exist independently, but was “possessed” and “brought forth” before the creation of the earth- which the Bible calls the Beginning- Gen. 1:1.

The Prophetic word says of this passage:

*“Through Solomon **Christ declared:** “The Lord possessed Me in the beginning of His way, before His works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was. When there were no depths, I was brought forth; when there were no fountains abounding with water. Before the mountains were settled, before the hills was I brought forth.... When He gave to the sea His decree, that the waters should not pass His commandment; when He appointed the foundations of the earth; then I was by Him, as one brought up with Him; and I was daily His delight, rejoicing always before Him. In speaking of His pre-existence, Christ carries the mind back through dateless ages. He assures us that there never was a time when He was not in close fellowship with the eternal God. He to whose voice the Jews were then listening had been with God as one brought up with Him.” ST August 29, 1900, par. 14,15*

B. God Had a Son to Give

“For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son...” John 3:16

Christ is not simply a Son by title or role—He is “only begotten” of the Father. This excludes the idea of eternal co-existence as a co-equal, unbegotten being. The Son is of the Father, not independent of Him.

C. Christ came from the bosom of the Father

“No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.” John 1:18

The begotten Son is in the bosom of the Father—a position of origin and closeness—not co-equal, but proceeding forth. This refutes the idea that Christ has always existed apart from being

begotten.

D. Truly the SON of God

“For unto which of the angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee?” Hebrews 1:5

This “day” of begetting is not symbolic—it refers to a specific act of the Father in bringing forth His Son. It denies that the Son has “certainly ever been” as a self-existent, co-eternal being. He is begotten, not un-originated or created.

E. Olam= Ancient times, before the world was created

“...out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from the days of eternity [Heb: olam].” Micah 5:2

What does olam mean? Hebrew: עולם (olam)

This word is often translated as: eternity; everlasting; ancient times; long duration. However, ‘olam’ does not always mean infinite or without beginning, as the English word *eternity* might imply. It more accurately means: “A duration concealed from view” — it can refer to a very long time, or time beyond human comprehension, past or future.

Christ’s “goings forth” (Hebrew: motsa’ot, plural of origin) are real and traceable—from the “days of eternity.” This supports that Christ came forth from the Father, not that He existed without source or origin.

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 8- E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #14: “God was ‘preaching peace by Jesus Christ’ centuries before Christ appeared in Judea.”

Why it’s wrong:

This is a misuse of **Isaiah 57:19**, reading back into the Old Testament a **New Covenant reality**. While God always desired peace and reconciliation, the **actual peace by the blood of His cross** (Col. 1:20) was not preached or understood **until after** Christ’s death.

Scripture Refutation:

- *“Having made peace through the blood of his cross...” Colossians 1:20*

Peace was **made**, not eternally present. **It required the death of Christ.**

- *“...The prophets searched diligently about “what, or what manner of time” the sufferings of Christ would occur. 1 Peter 1:10–12*

They **did not fully understand** the Gospel they prophesied; it was **revealed later**.

- *“But now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.” Hebrews 9:26*

The Gospel message, in **power and clarity**, is **post-cross**.

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 9- E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #15: “Christ’s priesthood must necessarily have antedated His offering of Himself... He was priest before His crucifixion.”

Why is this wrong:

The Bible clearly teaches that Christ's **High Priestly ministry began after** His sacrificial death and **resurrection**—not before. The Levitical type always showed that **the offering comes first**, then the priest enters to mediate **on the basis of that shed blood**.

Scripture Refutation:

- *“The priest **only entered with blood**; Christ became **High Priest** after His own offering, **entering the heavenly sanctuary**.” Hebrews 9:7, 11–12*

Christ became High Priest **after offering His blood**. Just as the Levitical priest entered the sanctuary **only after** making the sacrifice, so Christ entered the heavenly sanctuary **after Calvary**, not before.

- *“For if he were on earth, he should not be a priest, seeing that there are priests that offer gifts according to the law.” Hebrews 8:4*

Christ **could not serve as priest on earth** under the Levitical system. His priesthood is **distinct** and **heavenly**, and it did **not begin** until after His death, resurrection, and ascension. This makes it impossible that He served as priest **before** His crucifixion.

- *“Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchisedec. Though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered; And being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation... Called of God an high priest after the order of Melchisedec.” Hebrews 5:6, 8–10*

Christ was appointed as High Priest after His suffering. His priesthood followed the cross, not before it. His experience of suffering was a necessary preparation for His priestly role. He was not exercising that office during His earthly life.

This is **an appointment**, not an eternal function. He is **“called”**—meaning a definite beginning.

- *“But this man, **after he had offered one sacrifice**... sat down...” Hebrews 10:12–14*

His priestly session follows His sacrifice.

“The Confession of Faith” Pg.9 E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #16: “The thing itself [the Gospel] has not changed one iota... there can have been no change in any feature of the Gospel.”

Why this is wrong:

This confuses the **unchangeable plan** in the mind of God with the **progressive unfolding** of the Gospel in human history. The **types and shadows** in the Old Covenant pointed forward to Christ, but the **real substance (Christ's death)** was not experienced or fully revealed until the cross.

Scripture Refutation:

- *“The **Old Covenant is obsolete** and replaced by a **New Covenant** with better promises.” Hebrews 8:6–13.*

That's a **major change in features**. The **Old Covenant system** (based on types and shadows) was **replaced** by a **New Covenant** through Christ. That is a **major feature change** in the administration of the Gospel—showing a **clear progression** from shadow to substance.

- “*Before faith came, we were kept under the law... but after that faith is come...*”
Galatians 3:23-25

Before Christ, the Gospel was veiled in the ceremonial law and types. The “faith” (Christ and His work) was revealed later. This shows that the Gospel changed in clarity, structure, and access, after Christ’s sacrifice.

Shows a **transition** in experience and knowledge with the coming of Christ.

- “*The revelation of the mystery, **which was kept secret** since the world began, but now is made manifest...*” **Romans 16:25–26**

The Gospel was a **mystery**, now **revealed**—not always openly known. Paul calls the Gospel a “mystery kept secret” since the world began. Though God had a plan from the beginning, the Gospel was not fully known or revealed until after Christ’s death. This clearly shows a change in visibility and understanding—contrary to the idea that “nothing changed.”

“The Confession of Faith” Pg.10 E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #17: “The gospel was the same and as complete in the beginning as it is now.”

Why this is Wrong:

This denies the **progressive unfolding of truth** and the **historical reality of the cross** as the central event of the Gospel. It equates the **types and shadows** with the **reality** and **implies** that no change in the Gospel’s structure, understanding, or manifestation has occurred from Genesis to Calvary.

Scripture Refutations:

- “*The revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret since the world began, but now is made manifest...*” *Romans 16:25–26*

The Gospel was a “**mystery kept secret,**” not fully revealed from the beginning. Its full manifestation only came **after Christ’s death and resurrection**, disproving the claim that it was “complete” from the start.

- *A “better covenant” established with “better promises,” Hebrews 8:6–13*

Showing clear **progress** in the Gospel’s form.

- “*The Holy Ghost this signifying, that the way into the holiest of all was **not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing... until the time of reformation.***” *Hebrews 9:8–10*

The types and shadows of the Old Covenant did not reveal the full Gospel. The “way into the holiest”—direct access to God through Christ—was not yet opened. The Gospel’s structure and access changed dramatically after the cross.

- ***Before faith came...*** *we were kept under the law,*” but “*after that faith is come,*”
Galatians 3:23–25

We are no longer under a schoolmaster. What is the “schoolmaster”? “The law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ.” The “schoolmaster” is the law. But what part of the law? Careful reading of Galatians shows: Paul is especially referring to the ceremonial law, with its system of ceremonial washings, feasts, sacrifices, symbols, and regulations that taught Israel

about sin, atonement, all of which pointed them to Christ. It served as a tutor (Greek: paidagōgos), training and leading them to understand their need of the Messiah. Once Christ came, the purpose of that ceremonial system as a “tutor” was fulfilled.

Proof from Galatians itself:

- “Wherefore then serveth the law? **It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made...**” Galatians 3:19

“Till the seed [Christ] should come” shows it was temporary, pointing to Him. The “schoolmaster” was the ceremonial law of types and shadows. It taught the people about sin and the need for a Saviour. Once Christ came, believers no longer needed the “tutor” role of that system.

Hebrews 10:1 confirms it perfectly:

- “For the **law** having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually make the comers thereunto perfect.” Hebrews 10:1

“**Before faith came**” refers to the **time before Christ’s atonement**. This shows a **clear transition** in the Gospel experience—from **shadow to substance**, from **type to reality**, from **promise to fulfillment**.

“The Confession of Faith” Pg.10 E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #18: “Sin is a condition, not an entity.” “It is not like grain or wood or stone, that can be removed... it is, in fact, a mortal disease.”

Why this is Wrong:

This teaching redefines sin as merely a subjective condition, like a disease, rather than what the Bible defines it as: **a moral, legal transgression of God’s law**. It undermines accountability, dismisses substitutionary atonement, and nullifies the necessity of Christ bearing the guilt of sin. This false concept of sin is at the root of pantheism, spiritualism, and mystical healing gospel errors. This **redefines sin** in purely **subjective, internal terms**, undermining the objective **GUILT of SIN** before God’s law and denying the need for **substitutionary atonement**. It suggests that sin cannot be legally transferred or atoned for, but only internally dissolved through experience.

Scripture Refutations:

- “*Sin is the transgression of the law.*” 1 John 3:4

Sin is not merely a condition; it is a legal and moral violation of God’s law. This verse gives the **divinely inspired definition of sin: it is lawbreaking**, not merely a “condition” or “disease.” To treat sin as a sickness to be healed internally instead of guilt to be forgiven through Christ’s blood is to **reject the biblical foundation of the gospel**.

- “*And Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions... putting them upon the head of the goat... and the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities...*” Leviticus 16:21–22

On the Day of Atonement, the sins of Israel were **confessed over a scapegoat and borne away into the wilderness**. This type clearly shows sin being transferred and removed—not just subjectively “healed.” Sin here is treated as a real objective guilt, from disobedience to God’s commands, that can be legally transferred and borne by a substitute. This destroys the idea that sin is only an internal condition. The entire sanctuary system is built on the concept of substitution and legal atonement—not internal therapy.

- *“The Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all.” Isaiah 53:6*

Sin was objectively laid on Christ—not just as a feeling, but as **actual guilt and responsibility** transferred. Sin is not just something **within** us—it is something **laid on Christ**. This verse affirms the biblical reality of **substitutionary atonement** and proves that sin is a **real, transferable offense**, not just a subjective condition or moral dysfunction.

“The Confession of Faith” Pg.10, 11- E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #19: Christ does not bear our sins “apart from us,” but “bears them in us...” because He is identified with humanity.” “He bears our sins in us, and not apart from us. He bears them because He has come in the flesh...”

Why this is Wrong:

This teaching promotes a **pantheistic reinterpretation** of Christ’s atonement. By claiming that Christ bears sin “**in us**” because of shared humanity, it denies the **biblical doctrine of substitutionary atonement**. This is error! It blurs the line between Christ and the sinner, imputes sin to Christ by nature rather than by choice, redefines atonement as mystical union rather than legal substitution, reflects the Living Temple theology of J.H. Kellogg, which taught salvation through divine indwelling rather than a legal, substitutionary sacrifice. This teaching is a clear form of **pantheistic mysticism**—blurring the distinction between Christ and the sinner. It teaches **sin-bearing as identification**, not substitution. This view makes Christ **sinful by participation**, rather than the **sin-bearer by transfer**.

Scripture Refutations:

- *“For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin...” 2 Corinthians 5:21*

Christ bore sin **as a substitute**, not because He was “sin in us.” Christ was made to be sin for us—not because He was sinful, nor because He “bore our sin in us,” but because our guilt was imputed to Him by God. He knew no sin—He did not carry it within Himself by nature or identification, but by legal substitution.

- *“Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many...” Hebrews 9:28*

He bore sins **outside of us**, as a distinct offering. This shows Christ bore sin by offering Himself, not by being part of sinful humanity. His sin-bearing was outside the sinner, not mystically within them. This verse affirms substitutionary atonement, not mystical absorption of sin.

- *“He bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors.” Isaiah 53:12*

The bearing of sin is **for others**, not within them. The Bible plainly says that Christ **bore the sins of others**, not that He **carried them within the human race** by identification. This is a **legal bearing**—He was treated as guilty **in place of sinners**, not because He shared their condition.

The New Testament insists on both substitutionary atonement and transforming grace:

- *Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed. 1 Peter 2:24*

He bore them in his body—not in us—so that we could die to sin and live righteously.

- *“Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. For he that is dead is freed from sin.” Romans 6:6–7*

We are freed from sin’s power, not left in bondage.

- *“And ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins; and in him is no sin. Whosoever abideth in him sinneth not: whosoever sinneth hath not seen him, neither known him.” 1 John 3:5–6*

Christ takes away our sins—not just bears them “in us” in some mystical sense.

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 11- E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #20: “The cross of Calvary profits nothing unless it is erected in our own hearts....”

Why this is Wrong:

This teaching reflects subjective mysticism—the idea that the cross only has value when internalized or felt. It makes Christ’s objective, once-for-all sacrifice dependent on personal experience, thereby denying the sufficiency and finished nature of the atonement. This false view, replaces faith in an accomplished fact with experience-based salvation, denies the legal transaction of Calvary, reflects the mystical theology of Rome, spiritualism, and pantheism, where salvation is internal enlightenment, not legal substitution. This is **subjective mysticism**. It denies the **objective, once-for-all value** of Christ’s death by implying that its efficacy is dependent on internal experience. This is a denial of the finished work of Christ as the legal basis for our salvation.

Scripture Refutations:

- *“By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ **once for all**... For by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified.” Hebrews 10:10, 14*

The cross **objectively accomplished** salvation; it is not dependent on personal mystical realization. The power and value of the cross lies in the finished offering of Christ, not in whether it is “erected in our hearts.” This verse affirms an objective atonement, accomplished outside of us, independent of our feelings or experience.

- *“While we were yet sinners, Christ died for us... being now justified by his blood...” Romans 5:8–10*

Justification is by **His blood**, not our inward experience.

3. *“It is finished.” John 19:30*

The first step of the work of salvation was **completed at the cross**, not ongoing in mystical

human consciousness. Christ declared "It is **finished**" **on the cross**, his sacrifice as the sin bearer was complete, not waiting to be made real through internalization. The statement "profits nothing unless it is erected in our hearts" is a **denial of Christ's own declaration** and turns the cross into a **subjective process**, not a completed event.

"The Confession of Faith" Pg. 11- E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #21. Sin is a condition, not an entity. "Sin is not an entity, neither is it a debt,... to be cancelled by the payment of something (even of a life.)"

Why this is Wrong:

This teaching denies the legal and objective reality of sin as guilt before God's law and rejects the foundational truth of substitutionary atonement—that Christ paid the penalty (debt) of sin by giving His life. This blatant rejection of clear scripture rejects the Sanctuary message and Christ's sacrifice. It reduces sin to an abstract "condition" or internal moral flaw, eliminating personal responsibility before the law; The concept of legal debt, and the necessity of a substitute dying in the sinner's place. This view reflects pantheistic mysticism and moral influence theory, not the biblical gospel of Jesus Christ.

Scripture Refutations:

A. Sin is Counted or Imputed

- *"Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin." Romans 4:8*

Sin is something God **counts** or **does not count** against you. It is an *entity* that can be *imputed* (charged) or *not imputed* to an individual.

B. Sin is Forgiven or Remitted

- *"Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins..." Acts 2:38*

Remission = sending away, cancelling. Only an **entity** can be remitted.

C. Sin is Taken Away

- *"Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." John 1:29*

Sin is something that can be **taken away**—not just a condition but a burden lifted.

D. Sin is Laid on Christ

- *"All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the LORD hath laid on him the iniquity of us all." Isaiah 53:6*

Sin is *transferred* to a substitute. Sin is here described as an entity/something that can be **laid upon a substitute**—not a condition, but a **real burden**, requiring a life to be given. This clearly teaches it is an **entity and weight of sin**, not just its moral effect.

E. Sin is Borne by Christ

- *"Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree..." 1 Peter 2:24*

He *bore* sins. Sins are an **entity** he carried, not merely our feelings.

F. Sin is Washed Away

- “*Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood.*” *Revelation 1:5*

Sin is something that can be **washed away**. Implies it’s a real defilement, not just a condition of mind.

G. Sin Has Wages (Penalty)

- “*For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.*” *Romans 6:23*

Sin earns a wage—death. It’s a legal offense carrying penalty. Sin is not merely a condition—it **earns death as a legal penalty**. This verse directly contradicts the claim that sin is not a debt to be paid. The word “wages” refers to **what is owed**—a debt—due to sin.

H. Sin is Paid For

- “*But now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.*” *Hebrews 9:26*

Put away — removed by sacrifice. Sin demands payment—a real debt or offense. Jesus pays what we could not.

- “*But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and **the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all.***” *Isaiah 53:5-6*

Here sin is a burden transferred onto a substitute who suffers in our place.

I. Sin is called “debt” directly

- “*And forgive us our **debts**, as we forgive our **debtors**.*” *Matthew 6:12*

Jesus Himself teaches that sin is a debt needing forgiveness (cancellation).

- “*And forgive us our sins; for we also forgive every one that is **indebted** to us.*” *Luke 11:4*
- (parable of the unforgiving servant) also compares sin to a financial debt owed to the King. The King cancels it, but expects us to forgive others likewise. *Matthew 18:23-35*

J. Sin is Written or Recorded

Sin can be *recorded*. Not merely a vague condition.

- “*As far as the east is from the west, so far hath he **removed our transgressions from us.***” *Psalms 103:12*
- “*Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law: for sin is the transgression of the law.*” *1 John 3:4*
- “*And ye know that he was manifested to **take away our sins**; and in him is no sin.*” *1 John 3:5*
- “*Having forgiven you all trespasses; blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross.*” *Colossians 2:13-14*

These passages speak of sin as a legal record (a debt document) that needed to be cancelled by Christ's death on the cross. This is exactly what the false doctrine of E.J. Waggoner denies. The cross paid what we owed. These verses prove sin is not merely a condition—but an **entity** that can, and must be transferred, forgiven, carried, and removed in order for the sinner to be forgiven and saved at last.

K. Christ is our ransom price

- *“Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to **give his life a ransom** for many.” Matthew 20:28*

A ransom is the price paid to release someone from bondage—demonstrating that sin is an enslaving debt Christ pays for us.

L. Christ redeems us by payment

- *“**Christ hath redeemed us** from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.” Galatians 3:13*

“Redeem” means to buy back by payment.

M. We are bought with a price

- *“For ye are **bought with a price**: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's.” 1 Corinthians 6:20*
- *“Ye are **bought with a price**; be not ye the servants of men.” 1 Corinthians 7:23*

N. Jesus' blood is payment to remit sins

- *“In whom we have **redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins**, according to the riches of his grace.” Ephesians 1:7*
- *“In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins.” Colossians 1:14*

Two witnesses with the same testimony!

O. Jesus pays our legal penalty

- *“Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the **remission of sins** that are past, through the forbearance of God;” Romans 3:24-25*

“Propitiation” — satisfying God's wrath against sin by substitution.

P. He bore our penalty

- *“For he **hath made him to be sin for us**, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.” 2 Corinthians 5:21*

Christ takes the penalty (sin) on himself, so we go free. Therefore, Waggoner's claim that sin “is not a debt in the ordinary sense to be canceled” and that it is wrong to illustrate atonement as “payment of a debt” flatly contradicts the plain teaching of the Bible.

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 11- E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #22. “All the illustrations of the atonement for sin, as being the payment of a man’s debt by some benevolent person, give a faulty idea of the truth. A debt is something apart from the debtor, but sin is a part of the sinner; it is, indeed, his whole life. It cannot be removed, or satisfaction be made for it, by the abstract gift of a life...”

Why It’s Wrong:

This statement teaches a false, mystical understanding of sin and atonement. The key doctrinal errors are,

- A. Denial of sin as a transferable, legal debt. The author rejects the biblical portrayal of sin as a **debt** that can be **borne by another** (i.e., Christ), which is **central to substitutionary atonement**.
- B. Pantheistic idea of sin being identical with the sinner. Claiming “sin is a part of the sinner... his whole life” reflects a **pantheistic-mystical worldview**, in which **personal identity and sin are inseparable**, and sin is not a moral/legal violation but an **ontological condition**.
- C. Denial of satisfaction through a Substitute. By rejecting the idea that sin can be removed “by the abstract gift of a life,” the author **denies the very heart of the gospel**—that Christ paid the debt of sin **for others**.

Scripture Refutations

- *“But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities And the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all.” Isaiah 53:5–6*

Because sin is separable from the sinner, it can be legally transferred to our substitute. Scripture does not present sin as something dissolved through inner renewal, but as transgression and its guilt that was laid upon Christ. The atonement is not mystical—it is real, a legal transaction in which Christ bore the sinner’s guilt, in the sinners place.

- *“But your iniquities have separated between you and your God, and your sins have hid his face from you, that he will not hear.” Isaiah 59:2*

This verse teaches us that sin, transgressing his law, causes separation between us and God.

- *“As far as the east is from the west, so far hath he removed our transgressions from us.” Psalm 103:12*

Here we have the promise that God separates our sins **from us**—not that He keeps them “in us,” or bears them “in us.” It is an image of complete removal and deliverance, that we might be able to live in his sight. The day of atonement in Leviticus showed us how this was to be done.

- *“And Aaron shall... confess over [the scapegoat] all the iniquities of the children of Israel... and the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities...” Leviticus 16:21–22*

This is a **clear biblical type** showing that sin must be **separated from the sinner** and **legally transferred** to a **sin-bearer**. The author’s denial of this point contradicts the entire **sanctuary system established by God and shown to us throughout the old and new testament**.

- *“...having forgiven you all trespasses; blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his*

cross.”Colossians 2:13–14

Sin is treated here as a **legal record of guilt**, a debt that is “*blotted out when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord,*” *Acts 3:19*; not mystically dissolved through inward life. The phrase “payment of a man’s debt” is a **biblical illustration**, not a “faulty” one.

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 12- E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #23. The cross is not an event in time but a universal, eternal reality. “The cross of Christ is not an event of a day, but the great fact of eternity... No one ever had to look forward or backward, **but only upward and within, to find the cross.**”

Why It’s Wrong:

This statement presents the cross as a timeless mystical concept, rather than a real, historical act of substitutionary atonement accomplished at Calvary. It reduces the cross to an inner experience “within” making each of us demigods, and denies its objective, once-for-all reality in time and space. The power of the cross lies in a completed transaction, not in a subjective “**upward and inward**” awareness. Scripture repeatedly warns against trusting in our own hearts and emphasizes that salvation is found in Christ alone—outside of ourselves.

1. Denial of Historical Atonement: The Bible clearly teaches that the cross is a *definite event in time*—a substitutionary sacrifice that occurred on earth, at Calvary, under Roman authority. This was **not an ongoing inner reality**, but a one-time offering for sin.

2. Promotion of Mystical Subjectivism: Saying the cross is found “within” encourages introspective mysticism rather than faith in Christ. This replaces the gospel with self-centered spirituality and is a form of spiritualism—making man his own savior.

3. Pantheistic Language: “Upward and Within” language disconnects Christ from His objective work and places saving power within fallen man—a concept identical to New Age and Gnostic beliefs.

4. Denial of the Forward-Looking Faith of the Patriarchs:

The patriarchs did not look “within” to find the cross; they **looked forward in faith** to a promised Messiah who would shed His blood. Abraham saw Christ’s day and rejoiced, See: *John 8:56*—not by introspection, but by divine revelation.

Here are some pointed Bible texts that refute the idea of finding the cross “within” ourselves:

Scripture Refutations:

- “*But now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.*” *Hebrews 9:26*

Christ’s sacrifice is a historical event, not an eternal mystical principle. This verse decisively affirms that Christ’s atonement happened **once**—not repeatedly or mystically—but in a specific moment of time. He “appeared” (past tense) in human history to offer Himself. This undercuts the idea that the cross is an eternal, timeless essence. It was a historical event with a definite beginning and end, not something found “within” or stretched across eternity.

- “*And he bearing his cross went forth... where they crucified him...*” *John 19:17–18*

The cross is a definite act in history, not merely symbolic or internal.

- “We are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ **once for all**.” *Hebrews 10:10*
- “Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed.” *1 Peter 2:24*

This verse affirms that Jesus physically bore our sins—not symbolically or internally, but literally—in His own body at the cross. The healing from sin comes from His suffering and death, not from an inward search or inner light. The focus is on a real, bodily sacrifice on a real, wooden cross.

A. The heart is deceitful.

- “The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?” *Jeremiah 17:9*

This verse tells us that looking within ourselves is unreliable and spiritually dangerous. The idea that you can simply “look within” yourself to find the meaning or power of the cross of Christ is not biblical.

B. Salvation is outside of us, in Christ.

- “Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved.” *Acts 4:12*

Salvation is not found by introspection— but in Christ alone.

C. Christ crucified is an external historical event and proclamation.

- “But we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumblingblock, and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God.” *1 Corinthians 1:23–24*

The apostles preached the cross—it is proclaimed, not discovered mystically within.

D. Faith comes by hearing the Word of God.

- “So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.” *Romans 10:17*

We don’t generate saving faith from within ourselves—it is produced by hearing the external Word of God.

E. We are to deny ourselves, not seek within ourselves.

- “And he said to them all, If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow me.” *Luke 9:23*

Jesus calls us to deny self, not look within for the cross.

F. The gospel is a message to be believed, not self-discovered.

- “For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures.” *1 Corinthians 15:3–4*

Paul received and then delivered, passed on, the gospel; it is received, not invented or discovered internally.

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 12- E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine 24: “Its arms span eternity; through all the ages it stands unchanged- ...It has always been the one way of salvation for the sinner, and it will remain “the science and the song” of the saved through eternity.”

Why this is Wrong:

This suggests the cross is not rooted in Christ’s literal death, but is instead a timeless metaphysical process of giving life. This is mystical language that leads to pantheistic reinterpretation, where the meaning of the cross is severed from the historical death of Christ. This is not merely poetic language—it is a **pantheistic, spiritualist reinterpretation** of the cross. It denies the **literal, substitutionary, time-bound nature** of Christ’s death and replaces it with a mystical, “eternal” principle accessible through **self-introspection**. This undermines the gospel at its foundation by:

- Detaching the atonement from time, space, and history
- Replacing faith in Christ’s finished work with faith in subjective feelings
- Suggesting that salvation is “within,” in direct contradiction to Scripture
- Echoing Gnostic, New Age, and pantheistic teachings that divinize man.

Scripture Refutations:

- *“For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness...” 1 Corinthians 1:18*

The cross is preached as a message, because it is a real event with real implications, not a timeless concept.

- *“Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us...” Galatians 3:13*

The cross involves legal substitution, not abstract mystical life-sharing.

- *And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever. Revelation 5:13*

The song of eternity is about the Lamb Himself—Christ is the eternal subject of worship, not the cross.

- *And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent. John 17:3*

Eternal life is not merely remembering the cross, but knowing Jesus Christ forever.

- *“Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed.” 1 Peter 2:24*

This verse is clear and literal: Christ **bore our sins in His body**—not in theory, not in symbolism, not through mystical energy, and not “within” us. The location is specific: **“on the tree,”** a direct reference to the wooden cross at Calvary. The phrase “his own self” emphasizes His **personal substitution**. Healing from sin does not come from self-realization, but from the historical, bodily sufferings and death of Christ, and the sinners repentance, confession, and forsaking of the sins that took him there.

- *“Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he*

rose again the third day according to the scriptures.” 1 Corinthians 15:3–4

The gospel is grounded in **historical fact**, not mystical presence. Paul is defining the good news as something that **happened**—Christ died, was buried, and rose. These are real events, not internal realizations. To replace the objective gospel with subjective introspection is to preach another gospel *Gal. 1:6–9*.

- *“For I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing...” Romans 7:18*

Paul plainly testifies that there is **no righteousness within himself**. If the cross is something to be found “within,” then salvation becomes a self-generated phenomenon—which Paul utterly denies. Righteousness comes **from outside**, from Christ.

- *“Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day: and he saw it, and was glad.” John 8:56*

Abraham did not look “within” to find the cross—he looked **forward in faith** to the promised Redeemer. “My day” refers to the time of Christ’s ministry and sacrifice. The faithful saints anticipated a real event, not a spiritual “self awareness” renewal.

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 13- E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #25 “God gives His life that His children may be born again”—equating new birth with biological reproduction. “The mystery of the new birth is identical with that of the first birth; both are acts of creation by the gift of life.”

Why this is Wrong:

This equates regeneration ‘new birth’ with biological creation, diminishing the necessity of repentance, faith, and justification through the blood of Christ. It turns salvation into a naturalistic process, not a divine legal pardon. This teaching redefines the new birth as a naturalistic or mystical impartation of life, instead of a spiritual, moral transformation that involves: Conviction of sin; Repentance; Faith in the blood of Christ; Justification (legal pardon); Conversion (a moral change by the Holy Spirit).

By calling the new birth “identical” to the first birth, this doctrine **removes the legal, moral, and redemptive dimensions** of salvation and **reduces it to a biological or metaphysical event**. This is **pantheistic**, not biblical. The new birth is not the continuation of creation—it is the **miraculous result of believing the gospel and receiving Christ** *John 1:12–13*.

Scripture Refutations:

- *“Except a man be born again... that which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.” John 3:3–6*

The new birth is spiritual, not biological or mystical life infusion.

- *“Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour; that being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life.” Titus 3:5–7*

This text links **regeneration (new birth)** with both **renewing by the Holy Spirit** and **justification by grace**—not with biological creation. It shows that regeneration is a part of the salvation process that includes **mercy, justification, and spiritual transformation**. To say it’s

just “the gift of life” like physical birth strips the cross, repentance, justification and sanctification from the plan of salvation.

- *“But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name: which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.” John 1:12–13*

This passage **clearly separates the new birth from biological processes**. Believers are not born again through “blood” (heredity), “the will of the flesh” (natural generation), or “the will of man” (human choice), but by **divine intervention**. The new birth is a spiritual act, **conditioned on belief in Christ**, and is not automatic or natural. This exposes the falsehood of equating it with biological birth.

- *“Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God...”
1 Peter 1:23*

The new birth comes by faith in the Word, not life-force transmission. Peter uses **deliberate contrast** between biological generation (corruptible seed) and the spiritual birth which comes by the **Word of God**. This completely **destroys the idea that the new birth is “identical” to the first birth**. The new birth is based on truth, conviction, and surrender to the Word—not the mystical passing on of divine life like DNA.

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 13- E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine 26: “Sin causes the gift of life to be accompanied by pain... God must needs bear our sicknesses and take our death... But sin causes the gift of life for the new birth to be accompanied by pain, since God must needs bear our sicknesses and take our death.”

Why this is Wrong:

This teaching confuses physical pain and childbirth with spiritual atonement, and implies that God experiences death and suffering internally whenever someone is reborn. This is pantheistic—making God’s being mystically connected to all human pain and birth processes. This doctrine makes multiple **critical theological errors** and introduces **pantheistic mysticism**:

- 1. Confuses Physical Birth with Spiritual Regeneration.** It draws a direct parallel between **childbirth** (accompanied by physical pain due to sin) and the **new birth** (regeneration), implying that just as mothers suffer physically to give life, God suffers mystically or ontologically during each soul’s conversion.
- 2. Imposes Ongoing Suffering on God.** It suggests that God must continually “**bear pain and death,**” each time someone is born again. This denies the **once-for-all nature of Christ’s suffering** at Calvary and implies an **ongoing internal suffering** in the divine nature.
- 3. Pantheistic Error: Merging God with Human Suffering.** By claiming God *must needs bear* our death or sickness every time someone is reborn, this doctrine **mystically fuses God with human suffering**—as if He is *experiencing* each person’s conversion as His own death. This is **pantheism**: the false teaching that God is essentially in everything and experiences what creation experiences.

Scripture Refutations:

- *“Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; And deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage.” Hebrews 2:14–15*

Christ took part of flesh and blood **once** to destroy the devil and deliver us—not through a recurring mystical processes.

- *“But now **once** in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself... So Christ was **once** offered to bear the sins of many...” Hebrews 9:26–28*

Christ bore our sins **once**, not repeatedly. His death at Calvary was a singular, historical event—not something re-experienced spiritually or mystically each time someone is converted. The idea that God continues to suffer or die spiritually as people are born again is a denial of the finished work of Christ and strips the cross of its finality.

- *“Knowing that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him. For in that he died, he died unto sin **once**; but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God.” Romans 6:9–10*

Christ does not continually die or suffer. The pain and death He endured was final and complete. His current existence is in victory—not in repeated suffering. The teaching that God “must bear our death” each time someone is born again denies the resurrection victory and reintroduces a pantheistic cycle of divine suffering.

- *Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows: yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed. Isaiah 53:4-5*

Christ bore grief and sickness **on the cross**, not in a mystical process each time someone believes. Isaiah 53 refers to a **completed, substitutionary atonement**. While the benefits of His death are ongoing, His suffering is **not ongoing**. This is **critical**: Christ’s suffering was **substitutionary and sufficient**, not participatory in an eternal cycle of human experience. Jesus made the distinction plainly and directly in answer to Nicodemus’ question about this subject.

- *“There was a man of the Pharisees, named Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews: The same came to Jesus by night, and said unto him, Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God: for no man can do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him. Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God. Nicodemus saith unto him, How can a man be born when he is old? can he enter the second time into his mother’s womb, and be born? Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again.” John 3:1-7*

Jesus made a clear distinction:

1. Natural Birth (“born of the flesh”) It is the physical birth from a human mother; Produces physical life, but remains fleshly, natural, and fallen; “That which is born of the flesh is flesh”—no matter how good, moral, or religious, it is still just flesh.

2. Spiritual Birth (“born of the Spirit”) It is a supernatural work of God’s Spirit; Produces spiritual life—a new heart, new desires, new relationship with God; “That which is born of the Spirit is spirit”—it transforms us into children of God.

Summary of the Difference Natural birth gives physical life in this world but cannot prepare anyone for God’s kingdom. Being born again (spiritual birth) is essential to enter the kingdom of God—it is a spiritual regeneration by the Holy Spirit.

Pantheism Exposed

This doctrine implies that God is internally linked to all human experience, especially pain and death. This idea: Denies God’s transcendence (His existence **above** creation); Makes salvation a **shared divine-human experience**, not a legal and redemptive transaction; Replaces the cross with **ongoing divine agony**, effectively merging God with fallen creation, reducing him to the level of the creation. This is not biblical Christianity—it’s mystical pantheism disguised as theology.

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 13- E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine 27: “The cross exists from eternity to eternity... It may be said, therefore, that the cross exists from eternity to eternity, and that sin causes it... or we may say... the gift of God’s life... is the only way of entrance for that gift.”

Why this is Wrong:

This completely detaches the cross from the historical death of Christ and presents it as an eternal principle of life-sharing or mystical participation in God’s energy. It teaches a pantheistic gospel, not a biblical one. This teaching presents a mystical and pantheistic reinterpretation of the cross. Rather than affirming the cross as the historical, once-for-all substitutionary death of Christ at Calvary, it redefines the cross as an eternal force, a principle of suffering or life-giving energy, continually working wherever “God’s life” is shared.

1. Detachment from Historical Calvary:

This doctrine removes the cross from its biblical location in time and space (Golgotha, 1st century A.D.) and turns it into a timeless concept or cosmic law—denying that Christ’s physical death was the atonement.

2. Sin “Causing” the Eternal Cross:

To say that sin “causes” an eternal cross is blasphemous and illogical—as it implies that sin is co-eternal with God, and that God has been eternally suffering or crucified. This corrupts God’s nature and makes sin an eternal necessity.

3. Life-Giving Mysticism (Pantheism):

The phrase “the gift of God’s life is the only way of entrance” suggests that salvation is merely receiving divine energy, not receiving legal pardon through the blood of Christ. This reduces the gospel to a mystical awakening—not a judicial deliverance from guilt.

Scripture Refutations:

- “Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree...” 1 Peter 2:24

The cross is an event in time, 1st Century AD, not a timeless abstraction.

- “By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all. And every priest standeth daily... but this man, after he had offered **one sacrifice** for sins **forever**, sat down on the right hand of God.” Hebrews 10:10–12

The atonement of Christ was a single, complete event, **not an eternal mystical process**. The Bible says Christ offered Himself once, and after that act, He sat down—signifying that the first part of his work was finished. To say “the cross exists from eternity to eternity” denies this finality and reintroduces a spiritualist system of continual sacrifice, which the book of Hebrews utterly rejects.

- “For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us which are saved it is the power of God.” 1 Corinthians 1:18

The “cross” being preached is the message of Christ crucified—not an eternal energy. The power of God is revealed in the historical event of Jesus’ death, not in an ongoing mystical principle. Paul does not say the cross is an eternal element of divine existence—he points to a specific act that must be believed and proclaimed.

- “For when we were yet without strength, in **due time** Christ died for the ungodly. For scarcely for a righteous man will one die: yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die. But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.” Romans 5:6–8
- “And last of all he was seen of me also, as of one born out of **due time**.” 1 Corinthians 15:8
- “Who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in **due time**.” 1 Timothy 2:6

The love of God is revealed in the act of the cross, not as a timeless flow of divine life. The Bible places Christ’s death in “**due time**”—a fixed, appointed moment in history. He **died for the ungodly**, not as an eternal expression of divine life, but as a real, bloody, once-for-all act. This undermines any idea that the cross is a timeless mystical element. It was a **response to human sin**, not an eternal component of divine nature.

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 14- E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #28: The Cross Is Not a Historical Event but an Eternal Process. “Christ crucified was as much a reality... in the days of Moses and Isaiah as in the days of Paul... Neither at the cross, nor before or since, has there been any new feature introduced... Christ has from the foundation of the world been the Lamb slain; His life has always been the one perfect sacrifice for sin.”

Why this is Wrong:

This falsely teaches that the cross is an eternal, timeless event, minimizing the historical, once-for-all death of Jesus at Calvary. It implies that the atonement is a perpetual divine condition rather than a completed act of redemption.

Scriptural Refutations:

- *“By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.” Hebrews 10:10*

Christ’s body was offered once—not eternally or continually. The cross was a singular event in time, not an eternal mystery or metaphysical principle.

- *“For in that he died, he died unto sin once: but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God.” Romans 6:10*

Christ died once; He is not still dying, nor has He always been dying. Suggesting otherwise makes the cross an eternal suffering, which is both unbiblical and pantheistic.

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 14- E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #29: Salvation Is Ongoing Through “Life Sharing” Rather Than Legal Justification. “His life has always been the one perfect sacrifice for sin...”

“...men are re-created by the exercise of the same power by which man was originally created.”

Why this is Wrong:

This blends creation and redemption, suggesting that salvation is a life-giving process like physical creation, rather than a legal pardon based on Christ’s substitutionary death. It reflects pantheistic spiritualism, where divine life is mystically transferred to humanity.

Scriptural Refutations:

- *“Being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him.” Romans 5:9*

Salvation comes through justification by blood, not through sharing in God’s “life force.”

- *“And, having made peace through the blood of his cross...” Colossians 1:20*

Peace is not made by ongoing creation or inner life-sharing—it is made by the shed blood of the Christ, a real, completed transaction.

- *“In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins...” Ephesians 1:7*

Redemption is through His blood, not through being infused with divine life.

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 15- E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #30: Rejection of the Sanctuary and 1844 Judgment Message. “It is impossible that there could be any such thing as the transferring of sins to the sanctuary in heaven... there could, consequently, be no such thing, either in 1844, A.D., or at any other time, as the ‘cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary.’”

Why this is Wrong:

This statement directly denies the investigative judgment and the heavenly sanctuary cleansing as taught in Daniel 8:14 and Hebrews 8–9. It falsely claims that sin cannot defile heaven and thus rejects the biblical doctrine of Christ’s high priestly ministry and pre-advent judgment. This error

implies that sin cannot be represented in heaven or affect the sanctuary above, contradicting the plain teaching of Scripture that **the record of sin is in heaven** and that **Christ ministers there on our behalf**. The “cleansing of the sanctuary” in Daniel 8:14 is fulfilled in **the antitypical Day of Atonement**, which began in **1844**, when Christ entered the **Most Holy Place** of the heavenly sanctuary to begin the **judgment phase** of His priestly work. If no sin is transferred or recorded in heaven, then Christ’s **intercession, blotting out of sin, and mediation as High Priest** has no legal basis, and the plan of redemption is left unfinished.

Scriptural Refutations:

- *“And he said unto me, Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.” Daniel 8:14*

This prophecy clearly points to a cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary—a real event foretold in Scripture, not symbolic language to be spiritualized away, since the earthly temple was long destroyed when the 2300 days ended. The Hebrew word *tsadaq* (“cleansed”) implies restoration, vindication, and judgment. This is fulfilled in 1844, when Christ entered the Most Holy Place to begin the investigative judgment, reviewing the records of sin prior to the Second Coming. This prophecy must refer to a real cleansing in heaven—a judgment phase, not a metaphor.

- *“We have such an high priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens; A minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man.” Hebrews 8:1–2*

This passage affirms the existence of a real heavenly sanctuary and describes Christ as High Priest, actively ministering there. **His work is not ceremonial but legal and redemptive.** The sanctuary above is where sins are represented, confessed, and ultimately blotted out (see Acts 3:19). To deny that sins are transferred there or cleansed from it nullifies Christ’s high priestly ministry.

- *“It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified...” Hebrews 9:23–24*

This clearly teaches that the heavenly sanctuary itself must be purified—not with animal blood (as on earth), but with Christ’s blood. Why? Because sins are represented before God in heaven through the records and ongoing intercession of Christ. This aligns with the antitypical Day of Atonement—a real judgment work in heaven, not symbolic cleansing on earth. If the heavenly sanctuary must be cleansed, that necessitates the **presence and transfer of sin**—not literal defilement, but **legal records of guilt**.

- *“For on that day shall the priest make an atonement for you, to cleanse you...” Leviticus 16:30 (Day of Atonement Type)*

The earthly sanctuary was cleansed once a year to remove accumulated sins. This pointed forward to Christ’s final atonement and judgment work, that was to begin at the end of the 2300 day/year prophecy- in 1844.

Conclusion:

These two pages contain multiple serious doctrinal errors, including:

- Eternalizing the cross (pantheistic reinterpretation of atonement)
- Replacing justification with mystical “life-giving”
- Denying the investigative judgment and heavenly sanctuary cleansing

- Blending creation with salvation in a pantheistic framework

This theology is not biblical—it is mysticism disguised as Christianity.

The Bible teaches:

- The cross was historical and final
- Salvation is by legal justification through Christ's blood
- Christ is now ministering in the heavenly sanctuary, cleansing it in the pre-advent judgment

Any doctrine that contradicts these truths promotes a false gospel—one that leads to spiritualism, pantheism, and the rejection of the sanctuary message entrusted to the remnant.

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 15, 16- E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #31: There are three errors on pages 15 and 16 we shall evaluate, comparing them with the Word of God.

Error #1: Rejection of the Day-for-a-Year Principle in Daniel 8:14. The author denies that Daniel 8:14 refers to **2300 prophetic years**, instead treating it as literal time. This **destroys the 1844 sanctuary message** and removes the investigative judgment from prophecy. The phrase “evening and morning” clearly echoes **Genesis 1**, where it defines a **full day**. In **Daniel 8**, the context is prophetic—full of symbols (beasts, horns, sanctuary)—and therefore the time must also be symbolic.

Error #2: False method of interpretation that demands “Literal Terms in Symbolic Contexts.” Which is against **“Miller’s rules of interpretation” #8 “Figures always have a figurative meaning, and are used much in prophecy to represent future things, times and events -such as mountains, meaning governments, breasts Meaning kingdoms, waters, meaning people, lamps, meaning Word of God, day, meaning year. Dan. 2, 35, 44; 7:3, 17; Rev. 17:1,15.** The claim that the Hebrew word ‘yom’ must always mean a literal day ignores the **contextual use** of terms. Prophetic visions frequently use everyday terms symbolically, including time indicators. By insisting that terms must be literal unless explicitly defined otherwise, the writer **denies the inspired pattern of Prophetic writing.**

Error #3: Undermining Prophetic Symbolism to Discredit the Sanctuary Message. The idea that symbolic terms must be “absolutely clear,” or need “no explanation” shows a **deep misunderstanding of biblical apocalyptic literature**, which often **requires angelic interpretation** (e.g., *Daniel 8:15–26, Revelation 1:20*). By this logic, entire sections of Daniel and Revelation would be invalid.

Scriptural Refutations:

- “And he said unto me, Unto two thousand and three hundred days ^{H6153}; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.” *Daniel 8:14*
- “And God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night. And the evening ^{H6153} and the morning ^{H1242} were the first day.” *Genesis 1:5*

H6153 — (Strong). עֶרֶב. ‘ereb eh’-reb. From ^{H6150}; *dusk*: - + day, even (-ing, tide), night.

H1242 — (Strong) בֹּקֶר bôqer. “bo’-ker” From ^{H1239}; properly *dawn* (as the *break* of day); generally *morning*: - (+) day, early, morning, morrow.

The phrase “evenings and mornings” (*‘ereb bôqer*) used here is **identical** to the language of **daily sacrifices**, see: Daniel 8:11–13, where **morning and evening offerings** were made—thus forming one full **prophetic day** per cycle. Contextually, Daniel is in vision; everything is **symbolic: animals represent empires, horns represent powers**. Thus, **2300 evening-mornings = 2300 days = 2300 years**, consistent with prophetic time reckoning. The cleansing points directly to the **antitypical Day of Atonement**—begun in 1844.

- “*I have appointed thee each day for a year.*” Ezekiel 4:6

God explicitly declares the **day-for-a-year principle** in symbolic prophecy. In Ezekiel’s enacted vision, each prophetic day equals **one literal year**. This was not unique—it was a divine **method of interpreting apocalyptic time**, reaffirmed in *Numbers 14:34* and used in the 70 weeks prophecy of Daniel 9. The use of symbolic time is well established and must be applied to Daniel 8:14, which is part of the same prophetic structure.

- “*Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people...*” Daniel 9:24–27

In changing the time to literal time Waggoner destroys not only the 2300 day/year prophecy but the—70 prophetic “weeks” or 490 days—representing **490 years as well**. These were fulfilled **to the year** with Christ’s baptism (A.D. 27) and crucifixion (A.D. 31) Thus he (Waggoner) sweeps away the proof of the Messiah who came right on time. Daniel 9 is **an extension and clarification of Daniel 8:14**, tying the 2300 years to **real-world events**. The same Hebrew word *yom* is used—and it is **clearly symbolic** here. If *yom* can mean **year** symbolically in Daniel 9, it can in Daniel 8 as well. **There is no contradiction as Waggoner affirms**—only consistency in the Prophetic Word of God.

Biblical Truth Affirms:

- The day-for-a-year principle is **God-ordained-** *Ezekiel. 4:6; Numbers. 14:34.*
- *Daniel 8:14* refers to **2300 years**, not literal days.
- The “cleansing of the sanctuary” began in **1844**, marking the start of the

investigative judgment - *Hebrews. 8–9*

Apocalyptic prophecy uses symbolic time.

Daniel’s visions are symbolic:

- Beasts = kingdoms (*Daniel 7:17, 23*)
- Horns = kings (*Daniel 8:20–21*)
- Time periods = symbolic time (*Daniel 7:25; Revelation 12:6, 14; 13:5*)

If the visions use symbols consistently, the time elements also carry symbolic meaning.

The language in Daniel 8:14 fits symbolic time.

- “*And he said unto me, Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.*” Daniel 8:14

- The Hebrew is literally “evenings and mornings” (עֶרֶב בֹּקֶר, *ereb bôqer*.)
- Daniel 8:26 calls this a vision (*mareh*) needing interpretation.
- The context is apocalyptic, not straightforward historical narrative.

Prophetic visions in Daniel use symbolic time elsewhere (*Daniel 7:25*'s "time, times, and half a time" = 1260 years).

Jesus affirmed Daniel's prophecy is for the end time.

- *"When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet..." Matthew 24:15*

Jesus directs believers to Daniel's visions for understanding end-time events—indicating their future, prophetic, symbolic significance.

Historic fulfillment confirms the day-year principle.

- The 2300-day/year prophecy began with the decree to restore and rebuild Jerusalem - 457 BC, See: Ezra 7.
- 2300 years later = 1844 AD.
- Marks the beginning of the heavenly sanctuary's final cleansing of the Investigative judgment.

This is historically consistent and matches the structure of the 70 weeks (*Daniel 9:24–27*), which also uses day-year reckoning.

Waggoner's claim: "No reason to see these as years. It's literal evenings and mornings."

Is not biblical. This teaching is not just prophetically incorrect—it is a deliberate removal of heaven's judgment message for our time. And that aligns precisely with *Daniel 8:12*, where the *"truth was cast down to the ground."*

"Then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." Daniel 8:14 And the truth shall be restored.

"The Confession of Faith" Pg. 16- E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #32. Rejection of the Literal "Evenings and Mornings" *Daniel 8:14*. Claims the Hebrew *"ereb bôqer"* should not be translated as "days," undermining the day-for-a-year principle. Calls the expression "clumsy" and suggests it refers merely to sacrifices, not prophetic time. "I doubt if even the maintaining of a theory would have led anyone to light upon so far-fetched an interpretation.... Clumsy expression, instead of the simple and well-known word for "day," if the reader were intended to understand "day"?"

Why this is Wrong: This teaching destroys the foundational prophecy of *Daniel 8:14*, upon which the doctrine of the Investigative Judgment rests. Ignores the grammatical and contextual use of the Hebrew phrase *"ereb bôqer"* which in Genesis refers to full calendar days. Attempts to reinterpret prophecy through the lens of the daily sacrificial system, severing it from the time-based prophetic context intended by the angel's explanation and completely destroys the teaching of the sanctuary in heaven spoken of in Hebrews. Cuts off *Daniel 8* from its proper connection to *Daniel 9*, which gives the starting point for the 2300-year prophecy and ties it to the coming of the Messiah and the atonement.

Scripture Refutation:

- “Unto two thousand and three hundred days [Hebrew: *bôqer*]; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.” *Daniel 8:14*

The exact phrase appears in **Genesis 1** referring to full 24-hour days. The Hebrew reads: “*ereb bôqer*” – literally, “evening-morning.” The number 2300 **is not describing** individual morning and evening sacrifices (which would equal only 1150 days), but rather 2300 full prophetic days, pointing to years.

- “I have appointed thee each day for a year.” *Ezekiel 4:6*

This is the God-given method for interpreting symbolic prophetic time. Using this rule, the 2300 days of *Daniel 8:14* become 2300 literal years—a long-term prophetic period, not a short sacrificial cycle.

- *A day for a year principle again affirmed. Numbers 14:34*

Again, a day equals, 1. a year in symbolic prophecy. Denying this principle leads to gross misinterpretation and collapses the time structure of *Daniel* and *Revelation*.

Conclusion: ‘*Ereb bôqer*’ is a prophetic symbol for days—not sacrifices. The language supports a **2300-year** timeline pointing to the end of a prophetic period, not a literal set of sacrifices. The attempt to reduce “*ereb bôqer*” to nothing more than literal sacrifices ignores consistent biblical usage *Genesis 1*, Contradicts established prophetic interpretation *Ezekiel 4:6*; *Numbers 14:34*, And undermines the entire message of *Daniel 8:14*, the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary, and the 1844 beginning of the Investigative Judgment. This error is not simply a misunderstanding—it is an attack by E.J. Waggoner on the foundation of present truth and the sanctuary message given to Seventh-day Adventists at the beginning of the way.

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 16-17- E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #33. “The awkward picture (The chart used by SDAs) contradicts the words of the prophecy; but if it had been made true to nature and to the text, the little horn could not have been labeled ‘Rome.’” Rome cannot be the little horn because it didn’t come from one of the four Grecian divisions. The little horn of *Daniel 8* must arise out of one of the Grecian horns, so Rome is excluded. This interpretation is often favored by those sympathetic to **Catholicism** in order to **divert prophetic blame away from Papal Rome**.

Why this is wrong:

This misinterprets the grammar and vision of *Daniel*. The little horn is described as coming from one of the **four winds** (not necessarily horns), which allows for Rome’s emergence outside of the four Greek successors.

1. **It misreads *Daniel 8:9***, ignoring the grammatical and prophetic structure.
2. It falsely limits the little horn’s emergence to ethnic Greek political powers, despite Rome’s clear fulfillment of the horn’s actions.
3. **It deliberately protects the Roman Catholic Church from the prophetic identification given in Scripture**, which has been consistently understood by Protestant expositors for centuries to point to Papal Rome.
4. **It breaks the prophetic parallel between *Daniel 7* and *Daniel 8***, where the little horn

clearly symbolizes the same persecuting power—Rome in both its pagan and papal phases.

Scripture Refutation:

- “...and out of one of them came forth a little horn...” *Daniel 8:8–9*

The Hebrew grammar allows “them” to refer to **the four winds** (directions), not just the four horns (generals). The phrase “out of one of them” refers to the **four winds** mentioned in verse 8, not the four horns. In Hebrew grammar, “them” is masculine plural, agreeing with “**winds**” (*ruach*, masculine), not with “horns” (*qeren*, feminine). This grammatical detail allows for the little horn to rise **from the geographic territory** of the divided empire, but **not as one of the Grecian powers**—thus making room for Rome.

- Little Horn Comes From the Fourth Beast (Rome) “And it had ten horns. I considered the horns, and, behold, there came up among them another little horn...” *Daniel 7:7–8*
Daniel 7 parallels *Daniel 8*. In *Daniel 7*, the little horn arises from the **fourth beast**, clearly representing **Rome**. This little horn uproots three horns, speaks blasphemy, persecutes the saints, and reigns for a prophetic period—**all fulfilled by Papal Rome**, not a Greek division.

- Rome was the universal power in Christ’s day: “...there went out a decree from Caesar Augustus...” *Luke 2:1*

A parallel prophecy clearly shows the little horn coming from the fourth beast—Rome. *Daniel 7:7–8* Rome, not Greece, was the world power at the time of Jesus’ birth. Rome ruled the territory formerly held by the Greek divisions, fulfilling *Daniel 8:9*, which says the little horn “waxed exceeding great toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the pleasant land.”

Conclusion: The idea that Rome cannot be the little horn in *Daniel 8* is: Grammatically incorrect, Historically false, and Theologically dangerous, as it shields the Papacy—which Scripture clearly identifies as the persecuting power of the 1260 year prophecy.

This error aligns with Catholic writers—in their justification of Rome, that seek to erase the Protestant historical interpretation of prophecy. It contradicts, the biblical structure, the parallelism between *Daniel 7* and *8*, and the testimony of history that shows Rome rose from the west to dominate the former Grecian territories—exactly as the prophecy predicted.

This interpretation is a fulfillment of *2 Thessalonians 2:7* “the mystery of iniquity doth already work” — as Rome continues to obscure its identity in Bible prophecy. Prophecy allows for Rome to be the little horn, and its actions (persecution, blasphemy, exaltation) match precisely. We note that on page 25 of E. J. Waggoner’s “Confession of Faith” we find this little admission. “**I have often gone into a Roman Catholic Church during the celebration of the mass....**”

We would ask the question. Why would a prominent Adventist Dr. and speaker go OFTEN into the Roman Catholic church during the celebration of the mass? Was he Roman Catholic? Or was he actually a Jesuit?? If so why did he not let the SDA church know it? Is this why he is showing here on pages 16 and 17 such sympathetic overtones towards clearing Rome from being the “little horn” of Prophecy?

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 17-18- E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #34. “The 8th chapter of *Daniel* does not contain any long prophetic period, at the end of which sins are to be blotted out.” *Daniel 8* contains no long prophetic period? Thus the

cleansing of the sanctuary is denied. The 2300 days are not prophetic years, and Daniel 8 does not contain a long prophetic period tied to sin or the atonement.

Why this is wrong:

This directly rejects the central doctrine of the **Investigative Judgment** and Christ's **heavenly ministry** post-1844. It also disconnects Daniel 8 from Daniel 9, where the 70 weeks were cut off from the 2300-year prophecy. It denies the 2300-day/year prophecy as a time prophecy, stripping it of its day for a year application. **Rejects the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary**, which prefigures the final atonement and the Investigative Judgment. **Disconnects Daniel 8 from Daniel 9**, even though Gabriel explicitly returns to "make thee understand the vision" *Daniel 9:23*—the only vision not yet explained being the 2300 days. Furthermore **Waggoner's stance nullifies the sanctuary message and the core of Adventist doctrine**, leaving no biblical basis for Christ's high priestly ministry in the Most Holy Place commencing in 1844. This doctrine destroys the prophetic foundation of the **Seventh-day Adventist message**, removing the anchor point for, 1. The timing of the Messiah, 2. The antitypical 'Day of Atonement', and 3. The closing work of judgment before Christ's Second Advent.

Scripture Refutation:

- A Long Prophetic Period, "*And he said unto me, Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.*" *Daniel 8:14*

This verse contains a **time prophecy** using *evening-morning* (*'ereb bōqer*)—a term found in **Genesis 1** to describe full calendar days. 2300 **literal days** (6.3 years) do not match any historical or sanctuary-cleansing fulfillment. Using the **day-for-a-year principle**, the period spans 2300 years—placing the cleansing at the end of a long prophetic era (1844). Christ is become our High Priest in the heavenly sanctuary.

- A Day for a Year "*I have appointed thee each day for a year.*" *Ezekiel 4:6*

This is the **divinely established rule** for interpreting symbolic prophetic time. It applies directly to visions like Daniel 8, which contain **beasts, horns, and time periods**—symbols indicating the application of the **day for a year principle**.

- "*Now of the things which we have spoken this is the sum: We have such an high priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens; A minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man.* Hebrews 8:1–2

The 70 weeks prophecy is "cut off" (Hebrew: *chathak*) from a longer period—the 2300 days.

- "*Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to **finish the transgression**, and to **make an end of sins**, and to **make reconciliation for iniquity**, and to **bring in everlasting righteousness**, and to **seal up the vision and prophecy**, and to **anoint the most Holy**. Know therefore and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks: the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times. And after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself: and the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and unto the end of the war*

desolations are determined. And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week: and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate.” Dan 9:24-27

These 70 prophetic weeks (490 literal years) are **cut off** from a larger period: the **2300 years**. Gabriel’s explanation in Daniel 9 connects the **Messiah’s first coming** with the **starting point of the 2300-day prophecy** (457 B.C.). The same vision is being explained—showing continuity between Daniel 8 and 9. The earthly sanctuary service prefigured the heavenly; the Day of Atonement -typified final judgment. See: Leviticus 16

Conclusion: The cleansing of the sanctuary represents the beginning of Christ’s final atoning work in the Most Holy Place—which commenced in **1844**. This false teaching is a direct assault on the Most Holy Place ministry of Christ. It seeks to destroy the unique identity of the remnant movement raised up in 1844, and to erase the reality of an Investigative Judgment, where sins are to be blotted out prior to the Second Coming. By disconnecting *Daniel 8* from *Daniel 9*, and denying the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary, this doctrine fulfills the warning of *Daniel 8:12*: “*And it cast down the truth to the ground; and it practised, and prospered.*”

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 18- E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #35. “But what about the Investigative Judgment? Yes, indeed, what about it! In truth, there is no responsibility resting on me to say anything about it, because in the entire Bible, from *Gen. 1:1* to *Rev. 22:21*, inclusive, there is never once any mention of such a thing... the only way to avoid misunderstandings in Bible discussions was to keep clear of theological terms not found in Scripture... what a libel upon God it is to assume that He is under the necessity of investigating the record of men’s lives and characters, in order to ascertain whether or not He can take them to heaven.”

Why this is wrong:

What is the author implying? He is arguing, The concept of an investigative judgment is unbiblical. God doesn’t need to examine records—He already knows all. Therefore, any doctrine teaching that God “investigates” before deciding who goes to heaven insults God’s omniscience. This is a **rejection** of the biblical doctrine God brought to the notice of the Advent band when the little book was unsealed; that there is a pre-Advent judgment (an investigative judgment) before Jesus returns. This doctrine helps individuals to prepare for heaven.

Scripture Refutation:

While the *term* “investigative judgment” is not used in the Bible (just as “millennium,” “omniscient,” or “trinity” aren’t), the **concept absolutely is taught**.

A. God Has a Heavenly Record of Deeds

- “*I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of days did sit... the judgment*

was set, and the books were opened.” Daniel 7:9–10

Books are opened in heaven for judgment. There is a formal review of records before verdicts are rendered.

B. God’s Judgment Is Investigative Before Reward

- *“And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened... and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works.” Revelation 20:12*

Judgment is based on a record of deeds (“books”). God uses evidence—not because He lacks knowledge, but for justice and transparency.

C. Judgment Happens Before Christ’s Reward at His Coming

- *“And, behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be.” Revelation 22:12*

The decision (reward) is already determined *before* He comes. A judgment must occur before the Second Coming.

D. The Parable of the Wedding Guest

- *“And when the king came in to see the guests, he saw there a man which had not on a wedding garment.” Matthew 22:11–14*

The king (God) examines the guests before the wedding feast. An inspection of character (righteousness) occurs before acceptance.

E. The Investigative Nature of God’s Judgment

- *Psalm 51:4 “Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight: that thou mightest be justified when thou speakest, and be clear when thou judgest”*
- *“For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil.” Ecclesiastes 12:14*

Not a mere sentencing but an examination of “every work, every secret thing.”

“...that thou mightest be justified in thy sayings, and mightest overcome when thou art judged.”

Romans 3:4

Why Does God “Investigate” if He Is Omniscient? Not for His benefit—He knows all. For *created beings* (angels, universe) to see His justice. To demonstrate He is righteous and fairness in saving or condemning each soul.

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 19- E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #36. “We are expected to teach as a fundamental article of faith, that it has already taken God, assisted by hosts of angels, almost seventy-two years to go over the records....and still the work is not done. It brings God down to the level of man.”

Why This Is Wrong: This is mockery of divine timing and again brings God down to human level—ironically, the very thing the author accuses others of. God’s timetable is based on His longsuffering and mercy See: *2 Peter 3:9*, not human urgency. The judgment process is a solemn heavenly event with eternal consequences.

Scripture Refutations:

- *“I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of days did sit... the judgment was set, and the books were opened.” Daniel 7:9–10*
- *After this I looked, and, behold, a door was opened in heaven: and the first voice which I heard was as it were of a trumpet talking with me; which said, Come up hither, and I will shew thee things which must be hereafter. And immediately I was in the spirit: and, behold, a throne was set in heaven, and one sat on the throne. Rev 4:1,2*
- *“And I saw in the right hand of him that sat on the throne a book written within and on the backside, sealed with seven seals. And I beheld, and, lo, in the midst of the throne and of the four beasts, and in the midst of the elders, stood a Lamb as it had been slain, having seven horns and seven eyes, which are the seven Spirits of God sent forth into all the earth. And he came and took the book out of the right hand of him that sat upon the throne.” Rev.5:1,6,7*

These passages reveal a **heavenly court scene** in which **books are opened** before Christ receives His kingdom. This investigative phase is real and deliberate. The books of record are **not for God’s memory**, but for the **heavenly intelligences**— *1 Cor. 4:9*, to show that **God’s judgments are just**— *Rev. 15:3–4*. This contradicts the mocking attitude toward time and process in judgment.

- *“And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened... and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works.” Revelation 20:12*

This shows the principle of **record-based judgment**. While this refers to the final executive phase, it rests on the **investigative work already done**. The dead cannot be judged unless **the records have already been reviewed**. The mocking complaint E.J. Waggoner puts forth about time fails to see that **God operates in an orderly, just, and transparent way**.

- *“God shall judge the righteous and the wicked: for there is a time there for every purpose and for every work.” Ecclesiastes 3:17*

This verse teaches that **God has appointed times for judgment**, according to **His wisdom and purpose**, not man’s impatience or derision. To ridicule the idea of an extended judgment period is to question the divine prerogative of timing. It also reveals **unbelief in the solemnity of the process** God has ordained.

- *“But, beloved, be not ignorant of this one thing... one day is with the Lord as a thousand years... The Lord is not slack concerning his promise... but is longsuffering...” 2 Peter 3:8–9*

This directly rebukes the humanistic reasoning that says, “God is taking too long.” God’s **longsuffering and mercy** guide His timing—not man’s impatience or sarcastic assumptions. What the critic mocks as delay is really **God giving space for repentance and clarity**.

- *“Then they that feared the Lord spake often one to another... and a book of remembrance was written before him... and I will spare them... then shall ye return, and discern between the righteous and the wicked...” Malachi 3:16–18*

Here is clear evidence that **God keeps records**, and that He uses those records to **discern (judge)** between the faithful and the wicked. To scorn the idea that this process may take time is to **scoff at the recorded word of God** and **deny His justice and care** in saving only those who fear and obey Him. This doctrine denies the transparency, holiness, and patience of our God.

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 19-20- E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #37. “But is there not to be a Judgment? Most certainly; for the Scriptures teach that ‘when the Son of man shall come in His glory, and all the holy angels with Him, then He shall sit upon the throne of His glory, and the dead, small and great, of all nations, shall stand before Him to be judged; **but they nowhere say anything about any Judgment before Christ’s coming.**”

Why This Is Wrong: What the author is claiming. He admits there is a judgment. But insists the Bible only teaches judgment at or after Christ’s coming, not before. He explicitly denies any pre-Advent (before Jesus comes) investigative judgment.

Error #1: He ignores that Christ brings the reward WITH Him—implying judgment must already be complete before He comes.

Scripture Refutation:

- *“And, behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be.” Revelation 22:12*

Jesus says He already has the reward when He comes. Therefore, a determination (judgment) must precede His coming. He doesn’t do the judging after He comes, but comes with the verdict.

Error #2: He ignores that the “books” are opened for review before the Second Coming.

Scripture Refutation:

- *“I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of days did sit... the judgment was set, and the books were opened.” Daniel 7:9–10*

This heavenly judgment scene occurs before Christ’s kingdom is fully given Him. See: *Daniel 7:13–14*. It is an investigative, heavenly court session reviewing the records (books) before final dominion is granted. The “books opened” imagery is classic courtroom language of investigation.

Error #3: He denies the need to examine the record of life prior to separating those saved and those lost.

Scripture Refutation:

- *“And when the king came in to see the guests, he saw there a man which had not on a wedding garment: And he saith unto him, Friend, how camest thou in hither not having a wedding garment? And he was speechless. Then said the king to the servants, Bind him hand and foot, and take him away...” Matthew 22:11–14*

The king (symbolizing God) examines the guests before the wedding feast (symbolic of Christ’s kingdom). He inspects all guests to see who has the wedding garment (Christ’s righteousness). This pre-feast inspection symbolizes a judgment before the second coming celebration.

- *“For the time is come that judgment must begin at the house of God...” 1 Peter 4:17.*

Judgment begins with God's people. It must occur before the final punishment of the lost, which happens after Christ's return. By postponing the judgment until the Second Coming, the implication is that sin may be indulged in until that time, thus removing the present necessity of overcoming. This undermines the biblical call to character perfection and suggests that victory over sin is neither urgent nor essential in the Christian life.

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 20- E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #38. Judgment's Purpose Is Only for Human Understanding. “The object of the Judgment is not that God may learn all about men, but men may learn the truth about God...”

Why this is Wrong:

While it is true that judgment does reveal God's justice and character, this quote reverses the primary biblical purpose of judgment. It makes man the focal point of judgment—not in terms of being judged, but as a spectator of God's actions. This idea subtly denies; God's investigative work; The legal, forensic reality of judgment; and the Personal moral accountability before God. The Bible teaches that God is the Judge, the books are opened, and human beings are on trial. Judgment is not a mere educational display for man's benefit—it is a real process determining eternal destiny.

Scripture Refutation:

- “*God shall judge the righteous and the wicked...*” *Ecclesiastes 3:17*

It is **God's** judicial role, not merely a demonstration for man.

- “*For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil.*” *Ecclesiastes 12:14*

This verse shows that **God is actively evaluating human actions**, not staging a performance for man to observe. Judgment is about divine **discernment**, not human discovery.

- “*We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ...*” *2 Corinthians 5:10*

Judgment is about **accountability to Christ**, not about man learning something. This plainly reveals that judgment is a process of personal accountability. We are the ones being judged, not the ones judging God. There is a verdict rendered—not just a lesson taught.

- “*And the books were opened... and the dead were judged...*” *Revelation 20:12*

This records a **forensic process** based on the **written record**. Here again, the focus is on the judgment of people, based on their recorded works. It is forensic and outcome-based—not simply explanatory.

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 20- E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #39: The Sanctuary Message Is a Denial of the Atonement “The Seventh-day Adventist teaching concerning the sanctuary, with its “investigative Judgment” to precede the blotting out of sins, is virtually a denial of the atonement.”

Why this is Wrong:

This is a **serious false accusation**. Saying the Investigative Judgment denies the atonement is false. It does not deny Christ's sacrifice—it explains its full application.

Scripture Refutation:

The Bible shows the atonement has two parts:

- *Christ died on the cross for our sins Hebrews 9:26.*
- *He applies His blood for us in heaven Hebrews 9:24.*
- *There is a final cleansing of the sanctuary like the Day of Atonement -Leviticus 16:16–19; Hebrews 9:23.*

The Investigative Judgment is the completion of Christ's atoning work—not a contradiction. Shows the High Priest **applying** atonement in the sanctuary after the sacrifice. Atonement has both **sacrificial** and **ministerial** phases.

- *“And he shall make an atonement for the holy place, because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and because of their transgressions in all their sins: and so shall he do for the tabernacle of the congregation, that remaineth among them in the midst of their uncleanness. And there shall be no man in the tabernacle of the congregation when he goeth in to make an atonement in the holy place, until he come out, and have made an atonement for himself, and for his household, and for all the congregation of Israel. And he shall go out unto the altar that is before the LORD, and make an atonement for it; and shall take of the blood of the bullock, and of the blood of the goat, and put it upon the horns of the altar round about. And he shall sprinkle of the blood upon it with his finger seven times, and cleanse it, and hallow it from the uncleanness of the children of Israel.” Leviticus 16:16–19*
- *“Christ... by his own blood... entered in once into the holy place...” Hebrews 9:11–12*

Christ's **ongoing priestly work** is part of the atonement process.

- *“A minister of the sanctuary... which the Lord pitched, and not man.” Hebrews 8:1–2*

There is a **real sanctuary** in heaven where Christ ministers now to complete the work that was begun on the cross.

- *“Unto 2300 days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.” Daniel 8:14*

The cleansing—final phase of the atonement, not a denial of it.

- *“We have an advocate with the Father... the propitiation for our sins.” 1 John 2:1–2*

Christ's role as intercessor shows the atonement continues in **heavenly mediation**.

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 20- E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #40: “Much is made of the antitypical day of atonement beginning in 1844, but that very thing minimizes, if it does not nullify, the value of the blood of Christ.”

Why This Is Wrong: This statement falsely accuses the biblical teaching of the antitypical Day of Atonement (fulfilled by Christ's high priestly ministry beginning in 1844) of undermining or replacing the blood of Jesus. In reality, the 1844 message—based on *Daniel 8:14* and *Hebrews 8–9*—magnifies the blood of Christ by showing its continued application in the heavenly sanctuary. The earthly Day of Atonement was a type; Christ's work in the Most Holy Place is the

antitype—the real thing. Without this ongoing priestly ministry, the full effect of the atonement would be incomplete. **This claim also confuses the sacrifice (the cross) with the application of the blood (the priestly ministry)—both essential parts of the atonement.**

Scriptural Refutation:

- *“We have such an high priest... a minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man.” Hebrews 8:1–2*

Christ’s priestly ministry in the **heavenly sanctuary** is not a denial of the blood—it is the **means by which the blood is applied**. The real sanctuary validates, not nullifies, the cross.

- *“Christ being come an high priest... by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.” Hebrews 9:11–12*

The **blood of Christ is not diminished** by the sanctuary work—it is the **very basis** for His intercession and ministry. The 1844 message teaches that **by His blood**, Christ entered the Most Holy Place in heaven to begin the final atonement.

- *“Then shall he kill the goat of the sin offering... and bring his blood within the veil... and make an atonement for the holy place...” Leviticus 16:15–17*

The Day of Atonement involved **two phases**: (1) **sacrifice** of the victim and (2) **application of blood** in the Most Holy Place. Christ fulfilled both. To stop at the cross and deny His **final ministry in 1844** is to embrace only **half** the atonement.

- *“Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.” Daniel 8:14*

This prophecy points to **1844** as the beginning of the antitypical Day of Atonement (the KJV Bible uses the word figure, type, shadow instead of Antitype See: Romans 5:14- Adam =type—figure of Christ; 1 Peter 3:21- Baptism=antitype of the flood; Hebrews 8:5 -Sanctuary service-Example and shadow of heavenly Sanctuary) —**not as a denial**, but as the **culmination** of Christ’s atoning work.

- *“Who serve unto the **example** and **shadow** of heavenly things, as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle: for, See, saith he, that thou make all things according to the pattern shewed to thee in the mount.” Hebrews 8:5*
- *“If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: and he is the propitiation for our sins...” 1 John 2:1–2*

Jesus’ role as **advocate** applies the benefits of His shed blood. This is precisely the **ongoing work** highlighted in the 1844 judgment doctrine.

The 1844 teaching does not **minimize** the blood of Christ—it **magnifies** it by showing that the atonement is not only a **sacrifice on earth**, but also a **heavenly mediation**. The false statement presents a **partial gospel**, which ends at the cross and rejects the biblical reality of Christ’s present ministry. This is not only doctrinally incorrect—it dangerously **undermines the final**

work of atonement currently taking place in the Most Holy Place of the heavenly sanctuary.

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 20- E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #41: Sanctuary and Atonement Reduced to Mere Ceremonialism. “The Gospel has been turned into ceremonialism...look over the literature from the beginning, and it will be apparent that they have transferred the Jewish sanctuary and its ceremonies into Heaven,, and have made the atonement itself only ceremony”

Why this is Wrong: This is a misrepresentation of the sanctuary message. Adventism does not teach ceremonialism—it teaches the **antitypical fulfillment** of the **shadows (Types)** in the reality of Christ’s work. This accusation undermines the **heavenly ministry of Christ**.

Scriptural Refutation:

- “Which are a **shadow (type)** of things to come; but the body is of Christ.” Colossians 2:16–17

The **reality** is in Christ—not in denying His priestly work.

- “Christ is not entered into holy places made with hands... but into heaven itself...” Hebrews 9:24

This is not ceremonialism but heavenly reality.

- “The Lord... shall suddenly come to his temple... and purify the sons of Levi...” Malachi 3:1–3

Malachi 3:1-3 is a clear reference to a **judgment work** in the sanctuary. “His Temple is the heavenly sanctuary that the Lord pitched and not man. See: Hebrews 8:2.

- “Thy way, O God, is in the sanctuary, who is so great a God as our God!” Psalm 77:13

The **plan of salvation** is understood through the **heavenly sanctuary**, not dismissed as ritual.

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 20-21- E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #42: Feast-Keeping Inference or the teaching that the new covenant has not satisfactorily replaced the first covenant. “Everything must be made to “fit the type,”as though the shadow of a thing were of more importance than the thing itself.”

Why this is Wrong:

This language subtly **attacks the entire system of type and antitype**, which is how God ordained the plan of salvation to be taught. The implication is that types are overemphasized or forced to “fit” prophecy, which is a common **feast-keeping or anti-Sanctuary theology tactic**. The truth is that the types were divinely designed to teach the work of Christ.

Scripture Refutation:

- “Whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning...” Romans 15:4

The Old Testament types were **intended** to teach spiritual realities.

- “The law having a shadow of good things to come...” Hebrews 10:1

Acknowledges the **importance of shadows** in pointing to Christ.

- “Who serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things...” Hebrews 8:5

God **commanded** that the earthly reflect the heavenly.

Also on the tenth *day* of this seventh month *there shall be* a day of atonement: it shall be an holy convocation unto you; and ye shall afflict your souls, and offer an offering made by fire unto the LORD.

- “And ye shall do no work in that same day: for it is a day of atonement, to make an atonement for you before the LORD your God. For whatsoever soul it be that shall not be afflicted in that same day, he shall be cut off from among his people. And whatsoever soul it be that doeth any work in that same day, the same soul will I destroy from among his people. Ye shall do no manner of work: it shall be a statute for ever throughout your generations in all your dwellings. It shall be unto you a sabbath of rest, and ye shall afflict your souls: in the ninth day of the month at even, from even unto even, shall ye celebrate your sabbath.” Leviticus 23:27–32

The Day of Atonement is a **type** of the final atonement—fulfilled in Christ’s heavenly ministry, not replaced by ceremonial feast-keeping. The following two verses clearly show that the sacrificial service has become the type of the final atonement, the antitype if you will.

- “But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come... by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.” Hebrews 9:11–12

This passage shows that **Christ entered the heavenly sanctuary** as our High Priest—**not with the blood of animals**, but with **His own blood**—to perform the real, final **atonement**. The earthly Day of Atonement was a type; Christ’s heavenly work is the **antitype**. This is how the atonement of *Leviticus 23* is fulfilled under the new covenant.

- “He that overcometh, the same shall be clothed in white raiment; and I will not blot out his name out of the book of life...” Revelation 3:5

The **affliction of soul** and **ceasing from personal works** - *Leviticus 23* now take place in the context of the **investigative judgment**, (which E. J. Waggoner has thrown on the trash heap,) where names are examined and decisions are made. This “cutting off” *Lev. 23:29–30* is now fulfilled in the **blotting out** of names during the heavenly judgment. See also: *Daniel 7:10* and *Acts 3:19*.

- “Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years. I am afraid of you...” Galatians 4:10–11

Paul warns against returning to **ritual observances** which disconnect us from Christ.

“But clearer light came with the investigation of the sanctuary question. Now was seen the application of those words of Christ in the Revelation, addressed to the church at this very time: “These things saith he that is holy, he that is true, he that hath the key of David, he that openeth and no man shutteth, and shutteth and no man openeth; I know thy works; behold, I have set before thee an open door, and no man can shut it.” [Revelation 3:7, 8.] Here an open as well as a shut door is brought to view. At the termination of the 2300 prophetic days in 1844, Christ changed his ministration from the holy to the most holy place. When, in the ministration of the

earthly sanctuary, the high priest on the day of atonement entered the most holy place, the door of the holy place was closed, and the door of the most holy was opened. So, when Christ passed from the holy to the most holy of the heavenly sanctuary, the door, or ministration, of the former apartment was closed, and the door, or ministration, of the latter was opened. Christ had ended one part of his work as our intercessor; to enter upon another portion of the work; and he still presented his blood before the Father in behalf of sinners. "Behold," he declares, "I have set before thee an open door, and no man can shut it." 4SP 268.3

Those who by faith follow Jesus in the great work of the atonement, receive the benefits of his mediation in their behalf; but those who reject the light that brings to view this work of ministration, are not benefited thereby. The Jews who rejected the light given at Christ's first advent, and refused to believe in him as the Saviour of the world, could not receive pardon through him. When Jesus at his ascension entered by his own blood into the heavenly sanctuary to shed upon his disciples the blessings of his mediation, the Jews were left in total darkness, to continue their useless sacrifices and offerings. The ministration of types and shadows had ceased. That door by which men had formerly found access to God, was no longer open. The Jews had refused to seek him in the only way whereby he could then be found, through the ministration in the sanctuary in Heaven. Therefore they found no communion with God. To them the door was shut. They had no knowledge of Christ as the true sacrifice and the only mediator before God; hence they could not receive the benefits of his mediation. 4SP 269.1

"Many and determined efforts were made to overthrow the faith of those who would build up the old waste places, and heal the breach which had been made in the law of God. How hard Satan and men tried to close the door which had been opened into the sanctuary where Jesus had entered to make atonement for his people, and where the humble, faithful ones followed him by faith. Christ had opened the door, or ministration, of the most holy place, and light was shining from the open door that all who desired might see the claims of the fourth commandment, and believe. God had established his law, and not one jot or tittle of it was to be annulled." PrT November 3, 1885, par. 5

Spirit of Prophecy clearly shows us that the ministration of Christ in the Most Holy Place above and the 4th commandment of the holy law of God are linked together. E.J. Waggoner's striking against the one brings down the other if his theories are accepted and believed.

"The Confession of Faith" Pg. 21- E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #43: "Why, then, should we spend time studying shadows, when we have the reality? For we have 'come unto Mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the firstborn, which are written in Heaven, and to God, the judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus, the Mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling.'"

Why this is Wrong:

This is a Misapplication of *Hebrews 12:22–24* —Because IF we have already “come to Mount Zion,” there is no need for any sanctuary or judgment doctrine. *Hebrews 12:22–24* is **not** denying the need for understanding the Day of Atonement, sanctuary services, or judgment. It speaks of the **privileges** of the believer in the new covenant, **not the abolition** of the heavenly sanctuary or Christ’s priestly ministry. This is being misused to deny the value of Old Testament types and to attack the Sanctuary and Investigative Judgment doctrines.

E. J. Waggoner begs us to Reject Biblical Typology (“shadows”) Since we have the “reality” in Christ, we should not study the “shadows.” God Himself gave the “shadows” (types and ceremonies) to teach the plan of salvation and point to Christ. **To reject them is to reject a major portion of divine revelation and the foundation of the gospel message, and will lead to a failure to prepare heart, soul and mind for heaven.**

Scriptural Refutation:

- “*Who serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things...*” *Hebrews 8:5*

The types were ordained by God and represent heavenly realities—not useless symbols.

- “*Which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ.*” *Colossians 2:16–17*

Shadows were **prophetic**; the reality (Christ) doesn’t cancel them but **fulfills** them.

- “*For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning...*” *Romans 15:4*

The entire Old Testament—including its types—was preserved for **our instruction today**.

- “*Thy way, O God, is in the sanctuary...*” *Psalms 77:13*

The sanctuary service (full of “shadows”) is **God’s way** of teaching us the full plan of salvation.

- “*By his own blood he entered in once into the holy place...*” *Hebrews 9:11–12*

Christ’s heavenly sanctuary ministry continues even after His resurrection. If this were not so, he would have taken his disciples, raised the righteous dead and gone to heaven at his resurrection. End of story!!!!

- “*Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.*” *Daniel 8:14*

This is the antitypical Day of Atonement, beginning in 1844—after the cross.

- “*The hour of his judgment is come...*” *Revelation 14:6–7*

There is a present, pre-advent judgment, not just future reward.

- “*Seeing then that we have a great high priest... let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace...*” *Hebrews 4:14–16*

This shows ongoing **intercession**—not a completed, static atonement finished at the cross. Waggoner’s Confession of Faith Undermines the Investigative Judgment.

His Claim implies: We are already in heaven by faith, so there’s no need to teach the sanctuary or a final phase of atonement. The verse is used to promote a **mystical, already-in-heaven experience**, which **bypasses the cleansing of the sanctuary**. This is common in pantheistic or spiritualistic interpretations, where Christ’s objective work is internalized into subjective experience.

- “*He shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver...*” *Malachi 3:1–3*

Christ’s work of judgment and cleansing is going on currently in Heaven, not past or

metaphorical.

- *“Repent... that your sins may be blotted out” WHEN? “When the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord” Acts 3:19*

Peter told the people in his day that this was a future event! Blotting out sin is part of that final Atonement before Christ’s second coming. While *Hebrews 12:22–24* is a beautiful description of the believer’s spiritual standing in Christ, this paragraph **misuses the passage to deny biblical typology, rejecting the sanctuary system, and dismissing the investigative judgment**. The shadows (types) given by God are **not abolished**, but fulfilled and deepened in the **antitypical, heavenly ministry of Christ**. To reject the shadows is to lose sight of the blueprint God gave for understanding the **final atonement, judgment, and character perfection** so needful to the faithful in these last days.

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 21- E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #44: “Instead of having the law of the Spirit of life in Christ, the Living Stone, from which they could drink righteousness, they had the law on lifeless stone a “Ministration of death.” The “tabernacle of witness” was continual witness against them.”

Why this is Wrong:

Pantheistic undertones: This line: “Spirit of life in Christ, the Living Stone, from which they could drink righteousness...” comes dangerously close to the mystical “impartation of life” language used by E.J. Waggoner and J. H. Kellogg. This view blends the person of Christ with an abstract life-force or flow of righteousness, rather than a legal, objective righteousness by faith. This wording; **Blurs the distinction** between Christ and His benefits; Substitutes the **objective work of Christ** (His obedience and death) with an **internal experience** that sounds more **New Age** than **Biblical**; Promotes a form of **imparted righteousness divorced from justification and Sanctification**—suggesting that righteousness is a mystical flow from Christ, not a legal standing granted through faithful obedience.

Scriptural Refutation:

- *Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.” Romans 5:18–19*

Righteousness comes by **obedience of one**, not by drinking a substance. This passage **completely refutes** the idea that righteousness is something we “drink” or mystically absorb. Righteousness is a **legal declaration** based on the **obedience of Christ**, not a fluid life-force or inner stream. We are counted righteous by **His obedience**, not by **infusing His Spirit** into our being through mystical means.

- *“Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.” Hebrews 9:12*

Salvation is based on the once-for-all sacrifice of Christ at the cross, but it is applied through His ongoing high priestly ministry in heaven. While the atonement was initiated at Calvary, its

benefits are received through a living connection with Christ—by faith, repentance, and obedience. Righteousness is not mystically absorbed or “drunk” as a spiritual substance from Christ, but is first imputed in justification and then imparted through the work of sanctification. Christ obtained redemption for all, but it is only fully realized in those who, by faith, continue in the path of obedience and surrender.

- *But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ. For if he that cometh preacheth another Jesus, whom we have not preached, or if ye receive another spirit, which ye have not received, or another gospel, which ye have not accepted, ye might well bear^{G430} with him. 2 Corinthians 11:3–4*

“Bear” -“G430 Strong= “To hold oneself up against.” Beware of another Jesus, or another spirit, literally another gospel!

- *“They that forsake the law praise the wicked: but such as keep the law contend with them.” Proverbs 28:4*
- *And it shall be our righteousness, if we observe to do all these commandments before the LORD our God, as he hath commanded us. Deuteronomy 6:25*

These verses make it clear that righteousness is not something mystical or passively absorbed by “connecting” to spiritual life while ignoring obedience. The Law of God is not a ministration of death to those who have surrendered to Christ. Righteousness is defined by doing God’s commandments—carefully following what He says: *“And this is love that ye walk after my commandments.” 1 John 1:6.* It also shows us that **faith is not a passive mental assent to a creed or doctrine**. Biblical faith is an *action verb*—it is trust expressed in obedience. Genuine faith always produces a life of careful obedience to God’s revealed will. In other words, *“faith without works is dead.” James 2:20*, and true righteousness is seen in faithful action.

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 22- E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #45: The Sanctuary System Was a Product of Unbelief. “...we are not to spend precious time studying the minutest details of a system that was only the product of unbelief...”

Why this is Wrong:

The **sanctuary system** was designed by God Himself. See: *Exodus 25:8–9*. To claim it was a “product of unbelief” is a direct **blasphemy against God’s revealed plan** for salvation. It wasn’t man-made or a fallback—it was a ‘divine shadow of heavenly things,’ *Hebrews 8:5*. This statement falsely claims that the **sanctuary system** was created as a result of **human unbelief**, implying that it was not part of God’s original plan. This accusation; **Contradicts** clear scriptural evidence that the sanctuary was **designed by God Himself**. **Undermines** the typological structure that points to Christ’s redemptive work. **Attacks the foundation** of the plan of salvation as revealed from Exodus to Revelation.

In truth, the earthly sanctuary was a **divinely inspired teaching tool**—a “shadow of heavenly things” *Hebrews 8:5*—designed by God to **reveal the gospel** in symbolic form. It was not a

result of rebellion or human failure, but part of the divine plan to teach Israel (and us) about Christ's priestly ministry, substitutionary atonement, and the final judgment.

Scripture Refutation:

- *"Let them make me a sanctuary; that I may dwell among them... according to the pattern." Exodus 25:8–9*

This passage shows that the sanctuary was God's idea, not man's. It was built according to a pattern shown by God to Moses, not a response to unbelief. God Himself initiates the sanctuary as a dwelling place to be among His people, reflecting the divine presence and salvation's plan.

- *"Then verily the first covenant had also ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary. For there was a tabernacle made; the first, ...which is called the sanctuary. And after the second veil, the tabernacle which is called the Holiest of all; ... and the tables of the covenant; And over it the cherubims of glory shadowing the mercyseat;.... Now when these things were thus ordained, the priests went always into the first tabernacle, accomplishing the service of God. But into **the second went the high priest alone once every year, not without blood**, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people: The Holy Ghost this signifying, that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing: Which was a figure for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience; Which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, **imposed on them until the time of reformation**. But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; Neither by the blood of goats and calves, **but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us**. For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh: **How much more shall the blood of Christ**, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God? **And for this cause he is the mediator of the new testament**, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, **they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance**." Hebrews 9:1-15*

The earthly sanctuary was a **shadow of heavenly realities**—designed by God to reflect Christ's future ministry. The claim that it was a product of unbelief directly contradicts the fact that Moses was shown a **heavenly pattern** and **commanded** to replicate it.

- *"Thy way, O God, is in the sanctuary..." Psalm 77:13*

The sanctuary was a "figure" for the time then present, pointing to Christ. God's way of salvation, His character, and His plan of redemption are all symbolized in the sanctuary. To reject the sanctuary as a human invention or an act of unbelief is to reject God's revealed way.

- *"For on that day shall the priest make an atonement for you, to cleanse you, that ye may be clean from all your sins before the Lord." Leviticus 16:30*

This shows that the **Day of Atonement**—the high point of the sanctuary service—was a God-ordained moment of **spiritual cleansing and judgment**. If the sanctuary were merely a product

of unbelief, it could not be the center of such a powerful, divinely sanctioned ceremony.

- “*And the temple of God was opened in heaven, and there was seen in his temple the ark of his testament...*” *Revelation 11:19*

This passage reveals that the heavenly sanctuary still exists—and is real. The earthly sanctuary was patterned after it *Hebrews*. 8:5. Therefore, to call the earthly sanctuary system “unbelieving” is to blaspheme the heavenly original, which Christ Himself ministers in today. See: *Hebrews* 9:24.

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 22- E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #46: Antitypical Day of Atonement Timing Argument (1849 Instead of 1844) “If the type were to be followed exactly, the ‘antitypical day of atonement’ ought to have ended some time in 1849...”

Why this is Wrong: Here Waggoner has totally stepped off of the platform that God set up. This is a deliberate misdirection intended to undermine the prophetic timeline given in *Daniel 8:14*, the foundational text of Adventism. The 2300-day prophecy points to 1844—not 1849. The error here is the insistence on forcing type onto antitype chronologically, when antitype always exceeds and transcends type. Waggoner here abandons the prophetic platform established in *Daniel 8:14*, attempting to undermine the 1844 date by appealing to an exact day-for-year symbolic parallel. This approach; **Misunderstands** the nature of type and antitype; **Disregards** the heavenly origin of the antitypical Day of Atonement; **Detaches the Atonement** from the prophetic 2300-day timeline; and **Destabilizes** the foundation of the Investigative Judgment and Christ’s final work as High Priest.

Scripture Refutation:

- “*Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.*” *Daniel 8:14*
- “*Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most Holy. Know therefore and understand, that **from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem** unto the Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks: the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times.*” *Daniel 9:24-25*

This is the prophetic anchor for the beginning of the antitypical Day of Atonement. The cleansing of the sanctuary began in 1844, not 1849. It is based on a time prophecy that ends with Christ entering the Most Holy Place—not based on human speculation about 360-day types. The start date for the 2300 days (and the 70 weeks) is marked by the command to restore and build Jerusalem. The decree recorded in *Ezra 7:11-26* (given in the seventh year of Artaxerxes) is the specific decree that fulfills this. See: *Ezra 7:11-13* –The text of the decree. *Ezra 7:21-26* – Full scope: temple support, civil authority; and *Ezra 6:14* – Confirms cumulative decrees and their fulfillment.

- *“For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us:” Hebrews 9:24*

The earthly type ends at the cross and is followed by Christ’s priestly ministry in heaven. The heavenly sanctuary is not bound by the time lengths of the earthly shadow. Christ’s real Day of Atonement is ongoing—it began in 1844, according to prophecy, not a human interpretation of Levitical time frames. Christ entered “into heaven itself,” the **true** tabernacle, not merely mimicking the old.

- *“Which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ.” Colossians 2:17*

The shadows (types) are not equal to the realities (antitypes). Waggoner tries to force a literal 360-day calendar year from Leviticus onto the antitypical Day of Atonement, which elevates the shadow over the substance. Christ’s heavenly ministry operates on a higher, prophetic scale, not bound to the calendar of the Levitical system.

- *“Who serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things... See, saith he, that thou make all things according to the pattern shewed to thee in the mount.” Hebrews 8:5*

The earthly sanctuary was built after a pattern—a teaching model—not a time-locked blueprint. The pattern taught spiritual truths, not a prophetic calendar down to the day. The 1844 movement was based on prophecy, not on calculating a literal **one-day service** in symbolic time.

- *“To everything there is a season, and a time to every purpose under the heaven.” Ecclesiastes 3:1*

God determines prophetic events by divine appointment, not by rigidly forcing human timelines onto divine realities. The 1844 start of the judgment was revealed by prophecy—not typology. It is dangerous to ignore God’s declared timing in favor of speculative calculations.

Dr. E.J. Waggoner’s 1849 timing argument reveals a serious departure from the prophetic foundation laid in *Daniel 8:14*. His effort to synchronize the antitypical Day of Atonement with the literal 360-day Jewish year and extend it five years undermines both prophecy and solid foundational Adventist theology, the platform that E.G. White was shown as God wanted it. Antitypes are not bound to their types in duration or scale—they surpass them in meaning and scope. The cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary began in 1844, as declared by God’s Word—not in 1849 as speculated by man.

The Spirit of Prophecy warns us:

“During the past night, I have been shown more distinctly than ever before that these sentiments have been looked upon by some as the grand truths that are to be brought in and made prominent at the present time. I was shown a platform, braced by solid timbers, the truths of the word of God. Some one high in responsibility in the medical work was directing this man and that man to loosen the timbers supporting this platform. Then I heard a voice saying, “Where are the watchmen that ought to be standing on the walls of Zion? Are they asleep? How can they be silent? This foundation was built by the Master Worker; and will stand the storm and tempest. Will they permit this man to present doctrines that deny the past experience of the people of God? The time has come to take decided action” SpTB07 38.1

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 22- E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #47: Atonement Was Completed at the Cross (Denial of 1844 Investigative Judgment) “Teaching that atonement for sins was deferred until 1844... minimizes or even nullifies the value of the blood of Christ.”

Why this is Wrong:

This teaching **confuses the sacrifice** (which was completed at the cross) with the **application** of the blood (which began in heaven and culminates in the Most Holy Place from 1844 onward). It’s a common Evangelical Protestant error that conflates the **death of the Lamb** with the **work of the High Priest**. This accusation distorts the Adventist doctrine, founded by God, by falsely claiming that believers teach the *sacrifice* of Christ was deferred. In reality, the Bible teaches—and Adventism affirms—that Christ’s **sacrifice was completed at the cross**, but the **application** of that sacrifice through His **heavenly priestly ministry** began at His ascension and **entered its final phase in 1844**. This false doctrine; Conflates the sacrifice with the atonement process; Denies Christ’s present priestly work; **Undermines the investigative judgment**, which is the final phase of atonement; and **Limits atonement to a single historical act** instead of understanding it as a **two-phase work**—as seen in the type: sacrifice and high priestly ministry.

Scripture Refutation:

- Christ entered into the holy place “*by His own blood.*” *Hebrews 9:12*

This verse clearly shows that after the cross, Christ entered the heavenly sanctuary with His own blood—not to die again, but to minister the benefits of His completed sacrifice. This means the sacrifice was finished, but the atoning application of that blood continues in heaven. Denying this ongoing ministry nullifies the priesthood of Christ.

- “*And he shall make an atonement for the holy place, because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and because of their transgressions in all their sins: and so shall he do for the tabernacle of the congregation, that remaineth among them in the midst of their uncleanness. And there shall be no man in the tabernacle of the congregation when he goeth in to make an atonement in the holy place, until he come out, and have made an atonement for himself, and for his household, and for all the congregation of Israel.*” *Leviticus 16:16–17*

On the Day of Atonement, the blood is applied **after** the sacrifice. In the type (the Day of Atonement), the **atonement was not completed at the altar**, but in the **Most Holy Place** when the **blood was applied**. This points to Christ’s **post-cross ministry**, which began in 1844 according to *Daniel 8:14*. Without this phase, there is no biblical Day of Atonement fulfillment.

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

“*Sins are blotted out*” in the future, during a specific period (linked to the judgment) not at the cross, and NOT at the time Peter spoke these words to the people. If the atonement were completed at the cross, there would be no future blotting out. This verse affirms the investigative judgment phase as essential to the complete atonement process.

- “*Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them.*” *Hebrews 7:25*

Christ's intercession is **present and ongoing**—NOT finished at the cross. His role as High Priest is essential for our **daily cleansing and final judgment**. If atonement ended at Calvary, there would be **no need for intercession**, and this verse would be meaningless.

- “*Fear God and give glory to Him for the hour of His judgment **IS COME***” Revelation 14:7 **Present—NOT PAST Tense!**

The atonement was **initiated at the cross** through Christ's perfect and complete sacrifice. But the **application of His blood**, the **cleansing of the sanctuary**, and the **blotting out of sins** take place through His **high priestly ministry in the heavenly sanctuary**, which entered its final phase in **1844**.

To deny this is to **confuse type and antitype**, **dismiss the prophetic timeline**, and **strip Christ of His priestly role** in the plan of salvation. It replaces the living gospel with a **dead historic event**, **removing the believer's need for present obedience, intercession, and preparation for judgment**. E.J. Waggoner's teaching throws out the Three Angel's Messages— which are a present judgment message, **post—cross**.

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 23- E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #48: The Atonement is Merely the “Life of God in Christ” (Pantheistic theories subtly presented) “We have received the atonement, namely, the life of God **in** Christ.”

Why this is Wrong:

This teaching subtly replaces the biblical atonement—anchored in the **legal, substitutionary death of Christ** and His **ongoing priestly ministry**—with a **mystical concept of salvation** that **redefines atonement** as merely receiving an inner “life force” or divine essence. Rather than presenting Christ's shed blood as the basis of atonement, it shifts the focus to an internalized experience, echoing **Kellogg's pantheism**, which confused the **indwelling of the Spirit of God** with the **life force of creation**, and **Waggoner's moral influence theory**, which emphasized the effect of Christ's life over the atoning value of His death.

While it is true that “**Christ in you, the hope of glory**” *Colossians 1:27* is a vital part of the gospel, this reality flows from a prior **legal reconciliation** with God based on Christ's blood, not from mystical union alone. The indwelling Christ does not **replace** His heavenly priesthood—it depends upon it. Waggoner redefines the atonement as internal life alone, which is to **deny the cross** as the central saving act and to **strip away the necessity of Christ's ongoing intercession** in the heavenly sanctuary.

Scripture Refutation:

- “*We also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the atonement.*” *Romans 5:11*

The atonement is through Christ's work, not His **essence**. The atonement is something we receive through Christ, not by partaking of His essence or life, but by being legally reconciled to God through His death (v.10). The same passage defines atonement as being reconciled to God by the death of His Son, not by receiving His life as a pantheistic mystical force.

- “*For the life of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls...*” *Leviticus 17:11*

This verse anchors the atonement in the **blood of a substitute sacrifice**, not in a **life-force** or internal experience. The blood represents **life given in exchange for life**. The idea that atonement is “life” apart from the shedding of blood **contradicts the foundation of biblical atonement**.

- *“Without shedding of blood is no remission.” Hebrews 9:22*

This explicitly refutes any theory that replaces **blood-based atonement** with inner-life or spiritual experience. The **objective shedding of Christ’s blood** is what makes remission of sin—and thus atonement—possible. Atonement is **legal and sacrificial**, not mystical, and spiritualistic.

- *“The chastisement of our peace was upon Him, and with his stripes we are healed...” Isaiah 53:5–6*

Christ bore the penalty—not merely shared His life. This passage shows a substitutionary, penal atonement—Christ bore our sins, **was punished in our place**. The atonement is not the impartation of Christ’s divine life, but the transfer of our guilt to Him and His suffering in our place.

- *“By his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.” Hebrews 9:12*

Christ’s atoning work continues in the **heavenly sanctuary**, and it is based on His **blood**, not the distribution of His “life.” The atonement is something **obtained through His blood** and **ministered** in heaven—not mystically infused into believers.

- *“He hath made him to be sin for us...” 2 Corinthians 5:21*

A legal substitution, not a life-sharing experience.

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 23- E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #49: Waggoner states: “And this is the blotting out of sins. How can it be otherwise, when the enmity is destroyed, ‘slain,’ and the enmity is the body of sin! ‘It is the blood that makes atonement for the soul,’ and this blood—life—is not divided.”

Why It’s Wrong:

1. Blotting Out of Sins Is Redefined as Internal Change

- Waggoner equates the blotting out of sins with the **destruction of enmity within the sinner**, i.e., the “body of sin” being slain.
- This shifts the **focus of atonement from heaven to human consciousness**, making the forgiveness of sin dependent on subjective moral transformation.

2. True Statement Misused: “It is the blood that makes atonement...”

- This is a direct quote from **Leviticus 17:11**, and it’s true.
- However, Waggoner immediately **spiritualizes it**, saying “this blood—life—is not divided,” which sounds like an **infused life-force**, rather than an **objective, legal substitutionary act**.
- The blood is interpreted not as a judicial means of forgiveness, but as a spiritual power or inner energy, consistent with pantheistic and moral influence theories.

3. Blending of Legal Atonement with Mystical Experience

- While acknowledging the blood, Waggoner **redefines what that blood does**: it becomes a vehicle for “life” and “slaying enmity,” rather than the **basis of forensic forgiveness and heavenly record-cleansing**.
- The idea that **“this blood—life—is not divided”** points toward Kellogg-style pantheism, where God’s “life” is seen as present in all things, including in the believer—not mediated through the priestly work of Christ.

Waggoner’s error:

The blood is “life” flowing into the believer, blotting out sin **by internal change**, not by legal intercession.

Scripture Refutation:

- *“For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son... by whom we have now received the atonement.” Romans 5:10–11*

This verse defines atonement not as a mystical life imparted, but as a legal reconciliation accomplished by the death of Christ. The result is peace with God, not through inner energy, but through faith in the finished work of the cross. The atonement is based on substitution, not infusion.

- *“But Christ... by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.” Hebrews 9:11–12*

Here, **the application of Christ’s blood in the heavenly sanctuary** is essential for redemption. Atonement is not just what happened at the cross, nor what happens within the believer—it includes **Christ’s priestly intercession**, where **His blood is legally applied** to our case. The idea that atonement is only an internal reception of “life” denies the actual function of the heavenly sanctuary.

- *“Repent... that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come...” Acts 3:19*

The blotting out is **future**, in heaven—not internal moral change alone.

- *“Christ in you, the hope of glory: whom we preach, warning every man... that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus.” Colossians 1:27–28*

Yes, Christ dwells in the believer, but this is not the atonement itself—it is the fruit of atonement. This indwelling is only possible after reconciliation through the blood (v.20). The gospel message Paul preached was not based on subjective mysticism, but on an objective transaction leading to an inward reality.

- *“On that day shall the priest make an atonement for you, to cleanse you...” Leviticus 16:30*

This verse clearly shows us that salvation comes from an **External cleansing** by priestly act, not internal moral cleansing alone.

- *“For the life of the flesh is in the blood... it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul.” Leviticus 17:11*

This verse establishes the **foundation of all atonement theology**: **blood**—representing life surrendered—is required to atone for sin. To substitute this with “life” in the form of a mystical experience is to **reject the very requirement of justice that God established**.

- “The judgment was set, and the books were opened...” Daniel 7:10
Sins are recorded and reviewed in heaven—not just “removed from the heart.”
- “Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost... seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them.” Hebrews 7:25

This refutes the idea that salvation or atonement is complete through internal transformation. Christ is saving His people by continually interceding as High Priest until the Priest stands up and says “it is done.” Rev. 16:17; 21:6. If atonement is reduced to “God’s life in us,” there’s no need for a High Priest at all—this is a dangerous rejection of Christ’s High Priestly ministry.

The teaching that atonement is merely the “life of God in Christ” received internally is a **pantheistic distortion** of the gospel. It **rejects the legal, substitutionary death of Christ, removes the necessity of His heavenly intercession,** and replaces the **objective work of God** with a **subjective, mystical experience.**

While “**Christ in you**” is indeed essential, it must never be **detached from the cross, the blood,** or the **sanctuary with its final Atonement.** The indwelling of Christ is the **result** of atonement—not the atonement itself. Any theology that shifts the focus from the **blood of the Lamb** to an **inner life force** is preaching **another gospel.**

Pantheistic Theories

*“Already there are coming in among our people **spiritualistic teachings that will undermine the faith of those who give heed to them.** The theory that God is an **essence** pervading all nature is one of Satan's most subtle devices. It misrepresents God, and is a dishonor to His greatness and majesty.*

***Pantheistic theories** are not sustained by the Word of God. The light of His truth shows that these theories are soul-destroying agencies. Darkness is their element, **sensuality their sphere.** They gratify the natural heart, and give license to inclination. Separation from God is the result of accepting them.*

*Our condition through sin has become preternatural, and the power that restores us must be supernatural, else it has no value. **There is but one power that can break the hold of evil from the hearts of men, and that is the power of God in Jesus Christ. Only through the blood of the crucified One is there cleansing from sin.** His grace alone can enable us to resist and subdue the tendencies of our fallen nature. This power the **spiritualistic theories** concerning God make of no effect. If God is an **essence** pervading all nature, then He dwells in ALL MEN; and in order to attain to holiness, man has only to develop the power that is within him.*

*These **theories**, followed to their logical conclusion, sweep away the whole Christian economy. They do away with the necessity for the atonement and make man his own saviour. These theories regarding God make His Word of no effect, and those who accept them are in **great danger** of being led finally to look upon the whole Bible as a fiction. They regard virtue as better than vice; but God being removed from His position of sovereignty, they place their dependence upon **human power**, which, without God, is worthless. The unaided human will has no real power to resist and overcome evil. The defenses of the soul are broken down. Man has no barrier against sin. When once the restraints of God's Word and His Spirit are rejected, we know not to what depths one may sink.*

Those who continue to hold these spiritualistic theories will surely spoil their Christian

experience, sever their connection with God, and lose eternal life.

*The sophistries regarding God and nature that are flooding the world with skepticism, are the inspiration of the fallen foe, who is himself a Bible student, who knows the truth that it is essential for the people to receive, and whose **study it is to divert minds from the great truths** given to prepare them for what is coming upon the earth.*

*I have seen the results of these fanciful views of God, in **apostasy, spiritualism, and free-loveism**. The free-love tendency of these teachings was so concealed that at first it was difficult to make plain its real character. Until the Lord presented it to me, I knew not what to call it, but I was instructed to call it **UNHOLY SPIRITUAL LOVE**". AUCR March 1, 1904, par. 6-12 Australasian Union Conference Record March 1, 1904*

"The Confession of Faith" Pg. 24- E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #50: "What I object to is the denominational teaching that this is only a book transaction. That makes the atonement not a personal matter at all... The blotting out of sins is a vital thing in the sinner himself, and not a mere matter of bookkeeping."

Why this is Wrong:

1. A rejection of the legal, book-based investigative judgment
2. A pantheistic and mystical redefinition of atonement
3. An implied preference for experiential or ceremonial understanding over scriptural foundation
4. A false analogy between Adventist sanctuary doctrine and Roman Catholic mass

This is **moral influence theology** mixed with **pantheistic inner-experience doctrine**. It denies the objective, legal aspect of the atonement—particularly the heavenly record of sins and their judicial removal during the investigative judgment. The Bible teaches both; **Objective** removal of sin from the heavenly record (legal transaction); and **Subjective** transformation of the sinner (sanctification). This quote attempts to **replace the objective with the subjective**, collapsing the atonement into an emotional or **internal "release,"** rather than an act of legal mediation by Christ in heaven.

Scripture Refutations:

- *"Then they that feared the Lord spake often one to another: and the Lord hearkened, and heard it, and a book of remembrance was written before him... Then shall ye return, and discern between the righteous and the wicked..." Malachi 3:16-18*

This passage shows that **God keeps an active record**—a "book of remembrance"—to be used in a **future act of discernment or judgment**. The separation of the righteous from the wicked is not arbitrary or mystical; it is based on **evidence recorded and reviewed by God**.

- *"For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil." Ecclesiastes 12:14*

This universal judgment is **comprehensive**—including even **secret actions**—which implies a **record** of deeds beyond what is known to men. This verse proves that judgment involves a divine **review of facts**, not merely a subjective change in a person's feelings or state.

- *"Now Joshua was clothed with filthy garments... And he answered... Take away the filthy garments from him... I will clothe thee with change of raiment." Zechariah 3:3-5*

This scene is a **heavenly legal transaction**—a **recorded accusation** against Joshua (symbolizing God’s people), followed by an **objective removal of guilt** and **replacement** with Christ’s righteousness. The cleansing is performed **by divine declaration**, **NOT** by **inner mystical reform**. It is judicial and representative.

- *“The Lord is longsuffering... forgiving iniquity and transgression, and by no means clearing the guilty; visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children...” Numbers 14:18*

This reveals that God distinguishes between the forgiven and the unrepentant, and does so judicially. He doesn’t arbitrarily erase guilt from His records without meeting the condition of repentance. This supports the idea of investigative judgment—where decisions are rendered based on divine review, not inner emotional states.

- *“But after thy hardness... treasurest up unto thyself wrath... in the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God; Who will render to every man according to his deeds.” Romans 2:5–6*

This passage declares that God will judge each person according to their deeds, which assumes an accurate and reviewed record of those deeds. This is not **abstract or metaphorical**—it is **judicial and evidentiary**, and it directly refutes the idea that the blotting out of sin is merely a **subjective or emotional experience**.

- *“And the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works.” Revelation 20:12*

Again, this confirms that there is a **legal process** based on **heavenly records**. The notion that this is meaningless or unimportant “bookkeeping” contradicts the direct teaching of plain Scripture.

- *“Christ is... entered into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us.” Hebrews 9:24*

This is a judicial intercession—Christ is ministering on our behalf before God, based on His shed blood, and as a result of this legal work, He also transforms our hearts, giving us enmity toward sin through the power of His indwelling life.

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 24- E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #51: “What possible difference can it make to a man what is done with a record of his sins... when he himself has had them removed?”

Why this is Wrong: It’s Pantheistic:

This teaching reduces sin to a **state of consciousness** and salvation to a **mystical change in feeling**, not a legal act of substitution, confession, and cleansing. This statement suggests that the record of sin in heaven is irrelevant as long as a person feels “cleansed” internally. It shifts atonement from an objective legal act—based on Christ’s blood and mediated in the heavenly sanctuary—to a subjective emotional or psychological change. This view is rooted in pantheism, which makes salvation a matter of inner harmony, not heavenly intercession. It also parallels moral influence theory, where salvation is based on how Christ’s life affects us internally, rather than on His death and priestly work being applied for us legally.

Scripture Refutations:

- “I, even I, am he that blotteth out thy transgressions for mine own sake...” Isaiah 43:25
Blotting out is something **God does**—not something the sinner “feels.” It is based on divine justice and mercy, not personal emotion.

- “Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ.” Romans 5:1

Peace comes **after justification**, which is a **legal declaration**—not just an internal awareness or “release.”

- “Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight: that thou mightest be justified when thou speakest, and be clear when thou judgest.” Psalm 51:4

Sin is **not merely personal and internal**—it is first and foremost **against God**, and it requires a **legal judgment**. David acknowledges that sin must be addressed by God **in His courtroom**, not just resolved through personal emotion or inward peace.

- “Also now, behold, my witness is in heaven, and my record is on high.” Job 16:19

Job understood that there is a heavenly record of one’s life. His hope did not rest in how he felt about sin, but in the fact that God Himself held the record—and would judge righteously. This destroys the notion that heavenly records are irrelevant.

- “For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil.” Ecclesiastes 12:14

If every work is judged—even secret ones—there must be a record of those works. The judgment is not based on how the sinner feels, but on what is written and reviewed before God. That’s why the heavenly record matters profoundly.

- “He that overcometh... I will not blot out his name out of the book of life...” Revelation 3:5

This text shows that one’s name can be blotted out of heaven’s books. That has nothing to do with whether the person “feels” forgiven. It is a real decision made in heaven based on the books of record, further proving that inner experience cannot replace judicial atonement.

*“In Vision... I saw the Father rise from the throne and in a flaming chariot go into the **Holy of Holies** within the vail, and did sit. There I saw thrones which I had not seen before. Then Jesus rose up from the throne, and most of those who were bowed down rose up with him. And I did not see one ray of light pass from Jesus to the careless multitude after he rose up, and they were left in perfect darkness. Those who rose up when Jesus did, kept their eyes fixed on him as he left the throne, and led them out a little way, then he raised his right arm and we heard his lovely voice saying, wait ye, I am going to my Father to receive the Kingdom. Keep your garments spotless and in a little while I will return from the wedding, and receive you to myself. And I saw a cloudy chariot with wheels like flaming fire. Angels were all about the chariot as it came where Jesus was; he stepped into it and was borne to the Holiest where the Father sat. Then I beheld Jesus as he was before the Father a great High Priest. ... **Then Jesus shewed me the difference between faith and feeling.** And I saw those who rose up with Jesus send up their faith to Jesus in the Holiest, and praying, Father give us thy spirit. Then Jesus would breathe on them the Holy Ghost. In the breath was light, power and much love, joy and peace. Then I turned to look at the company who were still bowed before the throne. They did not know that Jesus had left it. Satan*

*appeared to be by the throne trying to carry on the work of God. I saw them look up to the throne and pray, My Father give us thy spirit. Then Satan would breathe on them an unholy influence. In it there was light and much power, but no sweet love, joy and peace. Satan's object was to keep them deceived and to draw back and deceive God's children. I saw one after another leave the company who were praying to Jesus in the Holiest, go and join those before the throne and they at **once received the unholy influence of Satan**. DS March 14, 1846, par. 1*

The claim that the heavenly record of sin is irrelevant once the sinner “feels” forgiven is a pantheistic deception. It denies the heavenly sanctuary, the investigative judgment, and the legal basis of salvation. Scripture consistently affirms that sins are recorded, reviewed, and either blotted out or retained—not based on inward sensation, but based on Christ’s intercession and our standing before the throne of God. This false doctrine reduces the gospel to subjective mysticism and dangerously disconnects the sinner from the real High Priest in the real heavenly sanctuary, who alone can remove guilt from the books of heaven.

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 25- E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #52: “I have often gone into a Roman Catholic church during the celebration of the mass, and it seemed to me that it was an exact picture of the S.D.A. idea of Christ’s work as priest...”

Why this is Wrong:

This is Theologically Dangerous: This statement attempts to discredit the **biblical doctrine of Christ’s priestly ministry in the heavenly sanctuary** (as taught in Hebrews and upheld by Protestant Adventism) by falsely comparing it to the **Roman Catholic mass**, which is a **blasphemous counterfeit** of the true atonement. This is False and misleading; Anti-Protestant; Blasphemously undermining the heavenly priesthood of Christ; **A defense (or minimization) of the mass**, which Protestants have rightly condemned as **idolatrous and unscriptural**. In doing this E. J. Waggoner is exonerating the Catholic Mass.

The implication here is that **Seventh-day Adventism’s sanctuary doctrine** is **no better than** the Catholic Mass. This dangerously undermines Protestant teaching by:

- **Suggesting parity** between the true priesthood of Christ and Rome’s counterfeit
- **Mocking the sanctuary message** given by God in *Daniel 8:14* and *Hebrews 8 & 9*
- **Insulting the investigative judgment** and ongoing intercessory work of Christ as “formalism” or empty “mummery.”

This constitutes spiritual treason from a Biblically Protestant standpoint. Yet E. J. Waggoner continues to be defended by many Seventh-day Adventists today—both within the corporate denomination and among independent groups. In light of the overwhelming weight of Biblical evidence, the question remains: Will you take your stand upon the unshakable Word of God and the foundation laid at the beginning of our faith? Or will you continue to follow a man whose teachings reflect pantheistic error, echoing the original lie of the serpent: “Ye shall be as gods”?

Scripture Refutation:

- “We have such an high priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens; a minister of the sanctuary...” *Hebrews 8:1–2*

Christ’s priestly work is **not symbolic** or **remote** like the Roman priesthood—it is a **living reality** in the heavenly sanctuary. The comparison to the mass is false and irreverent.

- “For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands... but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us.” *Hebrews 9:24*

This verse **contradicts the entire analogy** being made. Christ does not minister in shadows, symbols, or rituals like an earthly priest—**He ministers in reality**, in heaven, on our behalf. The Investigative Judgment doctrine is truth; the Mass does not.

- “Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.” *Daniel 8:14*

This verse anchors the entire **investigative judgment doctrine**, which Waggoner is seeking to **mock** by comparing it to a Catholic ritual. The **2300-day prophecy** is God’s prophetic timetable—not a man-made ceremony.

- “...that man of sin be revealed... who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God...” *2 Thessalonians 2:3–4*

This refers to the **papal system**, the very power behind the Mass. Any statement that minimizes or likens God’s heavenly work to the Mass is aligning with the **mystery of iniquity**, NOT THE GOSPEL.

- “Fear God, and give glory to him; for the hour of his judgment **is come**...” *Revelation 14:6–7*

This is the **first angel’s message**, announcing the beginning of the **investigative judgment in 1844**. The true SDA doctrine is based on heaven’s reality, not on rituals of Rome. To equate the two is to reject God’s last-day message.

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 25- E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #53: “The priest’s mummery had no manner of connection with the people... so the denominational teaching separates the work of Christ from the people—making the atonement consist of forms and not of fact.”

Why This Is Wrong:

False Analogy with the Catholic Mass! This falsely equates the **heavenly high priestly work of Christ**—based on Scripture and typology—with the **corrupt rituals of the Catholic mass**. The priest in Catholicism pretends to create Christ’s body through transubstantiation. By contrast, the Scriptures teaches that **Christ is in heaven, ministering His blood** on our behalf. The comparison is dishonest and deeply misleading.

Scripture Refutations:

- “We have such an high priest... a minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man.” *Hebrews 8:1–2*

Christ is not separated from us—He ministers **for us** in the heavenly sanctuary. To equate this

with Catholicism is theological dishonesty. God's true people will obey every aspect of the three angel's messages and by faith in the full atonement of Christ will abide, by faith, in the Most Holy Place of the Heavenly sanctuary as they seek to overcome daily through the blood of the Lamb.

- *"We have a great high priest... let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace..."*
Hebrews 4:14–16

Christ's ministry brings us **direct access** to God's throne. He is not distant; He is actively mediating. To deny this is to **reject the biblical gospel**. Though not overt, the **emphasis on personal cleansing apart from priestly ministration**, and the criticism of "form" and "book transactions," subtly hints at a **return to experiential or symbolic systems**, opening the door to **ceremonialism** or **feast-based atonement**—disconnected from the **antitypical fulfillment** in heaven. This is a **Subtle Ceremonial Law Bias**. These pages promote a dangerous mixture of **pantheistic mysticism**, **moral influence theology**, and **anti-sanctuary rhetoric**. By denying the reality of the **heavenly judgment**, the **legal blotting out of sins**, and Christ's **objective priestly ministry**, the writer replaces the gospel of justice and mercy with a **subjective feeling-based religion**. This teaching mirrors the **errors of Kellogg and Waggoner**, ultimately leading away from the **three angels' messages**, toward **spiritualism** disguised as "**freedom from legalism**."

"The Confession of Faith" Pg. 25- E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #54: "Even so the denominational teaching separates the work of Christ from the people—making the atonement consist of forms and not of fact." The Atonement Is Merely Ritual and Not Reality."

Why This Is Wrong:

This is a **false accusation against the biblical teaching** of Christ's **literal, heavenly priestly ministry**, falsely likening it to **Roman Catholic ceremonialism**. It suggests that teaching the atonement as a real priestly work in heaven somehow **separates Christ from His people** or reduces the atonement to mere ritual "forms." But this denies the biblical model of the heavenly sanctuary, where Christ is both our High Priest and Mediator, ministering the real benefits of His shed blood on behalf of believers. In fact, the very purpose of the sanctuary system—earthly and heavenly—is to **connect the people with Christ**, not to separate them.

Scripture Refutations:

- *"We have such an high priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens; a minister of the sanctuary... which the Lord pitched, and not man."*
Hebrews 8:1–2

This passage **clearly affirms** that Christ is performing a **real ministry** in the **heavenly sanctuary**. To claim that this work is just "ritual" or "form" is to **deny the reality of Christ's current intercession**—which is the very **foundation of the New Covenant**.

- *"Seeing then that we have a great high priest... let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace..."* *Hebrews 4:14–16*

Far from separating Christ from the people, His **priestly ministry** enables believers to **come**

boldly before God. The sanctuary message doesn't distance Christ from us—it's the means by which we are **drawn near to God** through His Son.

- *“Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost... seeing he **ever liveth** to make intercession for them.” Hebrews 7:25*

This refutes the idea that Christ's priesthood is disconnected or ceremonial. He is alive, actively ministering, and that work is the basis of **our continual salvation**—not a dead form, but a **living priesthood** that applies the atonement.

- *“It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again... who also maketh intercession for us.” Romans 8:34*

Christ's atonement did not end at the cross. He rose again to **continue interceding**. This verse exposes the false claim that atonement is a past ritual with no living connection to the believer. The intercession is **real, personal, and ongoing**.

- *“We have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: and he is the propitiation for our sins...” 1 John 2:1–2*

Jesus is both **Advocate** and **Propitiation**. His heavenly work is **not symbolic**—it is the **legal basis for forgiveness** and **reconciliation with God**. The teaching that this is merely “form” denies the gospel itself.

From a true Protestant Adventist view, this statement by E.J. Waggoner represents a dangerous error:

- It equates the biblical doctrine of Christ's heavenly ministry with Catholic ceremonialism, which is dishonest and misleading.
- It denies the **legal and mediatorial function** of the High Priest in heaven.
- It attacks the **investigative judgment**, the cleansing of the sanctuary, and the role of Christ in applying His blood for the remission and final blotting out of sins.

This view reflects the **pantheistic/mystical shift** that denies the objective, forensic basis of salvation and tries to internalize all atonement into personal experience—a **fatal departure from the gospel of Hebrews and the sanctuary model**.

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 26- E.J. Waggoner

False Doctrine #55: “The idea of making a man's salvation depend to any degree whatever upon his belief, or the fact, of whether or not Christ stood for a certain number of years upon one side or the other of a partition wall would be childish.” This is mocking the role of prophetic time and the 1844 judgment in salvation.

Why This Is Wrong:

Waggoner can only say this because he has entirely rejected the sanctuary service, the holy and most holy places, in order to accept “the light within.” This statement rejects the solemn reality of God's appointed time for judgment, as well as the entire sanctuary gospel message. Though salvation is by grace through faith, it must be based on revealed truth. To deny prophetic fulfillment is to reject God's Word and His authority. Waggoner does not merely discard the investigative judgment—he effectively discards the entire heavenly sanctuary, including both the

Holy and Most Holy places. In doing so, he clears the way for **pantheistic error** to take its place. Truly, the glory has departed—**Ichabod**.

1. It undermines Christ's High Priestly Ministry

The 1844 judgment is not an arbitrary date—it marks the **beginning of Christ's final phase of ministry** in the heavenly sanctuary. See: *Daniel 8:14*; *Hebrews 8–9*. Denying or mocking this event is to reject the very work Christ is doing today for the cleansing of His people. *Hebrews 9:23–28*.

2. It disconnects salvation from revealed truth

While salvation is always by grace through faith *Ephesians 2:8–9*, **faith is only valid when it is placed in God's revealed Word** *Romans 10:17*. To reject truth once revealed is to reject God's authority and counsel *Luke 7:30*; *John 12:48*. Jesus warned that those who knowingly reject light are walking in darkness *John 12:35–36*.

3. It falsely separates prophetic truth from salvific relevance

This error promotes the false idea that **doctrine and prophecy are optional**, when in reality they are essential to **understanding Christ's work, discerning the time of judgment**, which is crucial for preparing for the second coming. *Revelation 14:6–7*; *Matthew 25:1–13*.

Scripture Refutations:

- “*Whom shall he teach knowledge?... precept upon precept... line upon line...*” *Isaiah 28:9–10*

Truth is progressive and built through prophetic structure. God's truth is not given all at once but progressively revealed, especially through the prophetic Word. The sanctuary message and the 2300-day prophecy —*Daniel 8:14*— are not isolated doctrines—they are part of the carefully layered structure of present truth that God builds “line upon line.” For Waggoner or anyone else to call this “childish” is to mock God's divine method of instruction.

- “*Surely the Lord God will do nothing, but he revealeth his secret unto his servants the prophets.*” *Amos 3:7*

Prophetic time is part of the salvation plan. God does not act in redemptive history without **prior prophetic warning**. The 1844 judgment is such an event. The rejection of this timeline ignores the very principle that God reveals His purposes through time-specific prophecy. Salvation history—including the judgment—was **not hidden but revealed through Daniel, John, and others**. To reject prophetic timing is to ignore God's advance warning system.

- “*The vision is yet for an appointed time... though it tarry, wait for it...*” *Habakkuk 2:3*

God's timeline is deliberate and must be understood by faith. This refers to a time-prophecy with a future fulfillment, which the people of God were to wait for in faith, even though it seemed delayed. This verse applies directly to the 2300-day prophecy, which terminated in 1844. The faithful were told to trust the timing, even when mocked (as happened in the Millerite movement). To scorn prophetic time is to dismiss God's call to patient faith and obedience.

- “*If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things which belong unto thy peace!*” *Luke 19:42–44*

Jesus wept over Jerusalem because they missed the prophetic time of their visitation, even though it had been clearly foretold See: *Daniel 9:25–26*. This proves that missing or rejecting prophetic time leads to judgment, not blessing. To repeat this mistake in 1844 is to fall under the

same condemnation.

- *“When he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth...” John 16:13*

Rejecting the Spirit’s guidance into present truth—such as Christ’s ministry in the Most Holy Place after 1844—is resisting the Holy Spirit. Truth is not optional. The Spirit’s role is to guide believers into unfolding light, including prophetic understanding.

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 26- E.J. Waggoner

ERROR #56: “Will nothing ever emancipate the denomination from the bondage of the observance of “days and months, and times and years? Will they forever encumber and smother the glorious message of the everlasting Gospel with endless details of ceremonialism? Must the whole Levitical system be transferred to heaven till the end of time, and it be continually taught that God regards even His own followers as mere ticket-of-leave men?” (Men on Parole)

Why This Is Wrong:

Condemning the sanctuary doctrine as legalistic ceremonialism is to reject the entire platform of truth established at the beginning of the way. This equates Christ’s heavenly ministry with bondage, failing to recognize the antitypical fulfillment of the Levitical system in Christ’s ongoing intercession. This statement ridicules the **heavenly sanctuary message**, treating it as a re-imposed form of Old Testament ceremonialism. It portrays God’s investigative judgment and Christ’s priestly intercession as oppressive and legalistic—likening believers to convicts on probation, rather than sons and daughters under grace.

Scripture Refutations:

- *“Thy way, O God, is in the sanctuary...” Psalm 77:13*

God’s redemptive work is understood through the sanctuary model. The **sanctuary reveals God’s character, mercy, justice, and saving plan**. It is the very framework of the gospel. The idea that this “way” is bondage is a blasphemous reversal of divine truth. David exalted the sanctuary as the path of salvation—not a prison of law.

- *“We have such an high priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens; a minister of the sanctuary...” Hebrews 8:1–2*

Christ’s ministry is not a return to Levitical bondage but the fulfillment of what the earthly priests only symbolized. To reject the sanctuary message is to reject Christ’s current role as our mediator and intercessor in heaven. We have NO OTHER way to the Father!

- *“In the year that king Uzziah died I saw also the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple. Above it stood the seraphims: each one had six wings; with twain he covered his face, and with twain he covered his feet, and with twain he did fly. And one cried unto another, and said, Holy, holy, holy, is the LORD of hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory. And the posts of the door moved at the voice of him that cried, and the house was filled with smoke. Then said I, Woe is me! for I am undone; because I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips: for mine eyes have seen the King, the LORD of hosts. Then flew one of the seraphims unto me, having a live coal in his hand, which he had taken with the tongs from off the*

altar:” Isaiah 6:1–6

Isaiah sees the heavenly temple and the cleansing of his sin. This is not bondage, but a living heavenly reality.

- *“Thou son of man, shew the house to the house of Israel, that they may be ashamed of their iniquities: and let them measure the pattern. And if they be ashamed of all that they have done, shew them the form of the house, and the fashion thereof, and the goings out thereof, and the comings in thereof, and all the forms thereof, and all the ordinances thereof, and all the forms thereof, and all the laws thereof: and write it in their sight, that they may keep the whole form thereof, and all the ordinances thereof, and do them.” Ezekiel 43:10–11 See also, Revelation 11:1, 2*

The sanctuary reveals the pattern for God’s people. It is meant to shame iniquities and teach holiness, not to be despised and rejected.

- *“And the temple of God was opened in heaven, and there was seen in his temple the ark of his testament...” Revelation 11:19*

The Most Holy Place in the heavenly sanctuary is opened in the last days, confirming that Christ’s final intercessory work is ongoing. This is the antitype of the Day of Atonement (*Leviticus 16*). To call this bondage is to mock the very presence of God, where the ark, law, and mercy seat dwell.

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 26- E.J. Waggoner

ERROR #57: “I have reference to the teaching that no matter how humbly and contritely a man may confess his sins to God, how heartily he accepts Christ as his sacrifice and Saviour, His sins are only provisionally forgiven; that they are held against him to see how he will “Hold Out.” ... No real man forgives an offender in such a manner, but whole-heartedly, letting the evil of the past be as though it had not been...” “It is at best but a suspended sentence...”

Waggoner is here calling provisional forgiveness unbiblical and unjust. This is a serious charge against the God of Heaven.

Why This Is Wrong:

This scoffs at the biblical idea that continued relationship with God is conditional on ongoing obedience and faith—a truth repeatedly emphasized in both old and new Testaments.

Scripture Refutations:

- *“Jesus to the healed man: “Sin no more, lest a worse thing come unto thee.” John 5:14*
Forgiveness is given, but judgment can still follow if sin returns.
- *“ Now therefore, I pray thee, pardon my sin, and turn again with me, that I may worship the LORD. And Samuel said unto Saul, I will not return with thee: for thou hast rejected the word of the LORD, and the LORD hath rejected thee from being king over Israel.” 1Samuel 15:25, 26*
Saul was once accepted, then rejected—because forgiveness did not grant immunity from disobedience.
- *“Behold therefore the goodness and severity of God: on them which fell, severity; but toward thee, goodness, if thou continue in his goodness: otherwise thou also shalt be cut*

off.” Romans 11:22

Ongoing acceptance is conditional.

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 27- E.J. Waggoner

ERROR #58: “There is no intimation that the blotting out of sins is to be delayed indefinitely after the repentance and conversion, for such a thing is an impossibility.”

Why This Is Wrong:

This statement claims that all sin is immediately and permanently removed from the record at the moment of repentance, and that the idea of a delayed, investigative judgment—such as taught in the antitypical Day of Atonement—is not only unnecessary, but impossible. It effectively denies the Investigative Judgment, the heavenly sanctuary, and promotes a pantheistic mysticism, where forgiveness is an internal feeling rather than a legal, heavenly process. This merges forgiveness (pardon) with blotting out (erasing record), ignoring the biblical teaching that blotting out occurs during the final phase of atonement.

1. It Confuses Pardon with Final Blotting Out

The Bible distinguishes between the **initial forgiveness of sin** (pardon) and its **final blotting out** in the judgment. Forgiveness gives conditional standing before God, but blotting out is a judicial act tied to Christ’s high priestly ministry in the **Most Holy Place** See: *Leviticus 16; Hebrews 9:23–26*.

2. It Denies the Sanctuary’s Final Atonement Phase

This error effectively nullifies the entire purpose of the **antitypical Day of Atonement**—the time when the sanctuary is cleansed and sins are finally removed from the record. By rejecting this, it treats the sanctuary as unnecessary and embraces a **pantheistic view** of salvation—as something mystical and subjective rather than forensic and judicial.

Scripture Refutations:

- *“And the LORD said, I have pardoned according to thy word: But as truly as I live, all the earth shall be filled with the glory of the LORD. Because all those men which have seen my glory, and my miracles, which I did in Egypt and in the wilderness, and have tempted me now these ten times, and have not hearkened to my voice; Surely they shall not see the land which I swore unto their fathers, neither shall any of them that provoked me see it.” Numbers 14:20–23*

The people were forgiven, yet judged and barred from Canaan. Forgiveness is not the end of judgment.

- *“Remember me... and wipe not out my good deeds...” Nehemiah 13:14*

The righteous understood the concept of a record review.

- *“Rejoice... that your names are written in heaven.” Luke 10:20*

The implication is that names can be added or removed, indicating a record-based process.

- *“Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord...” Acts 3:19–21*

This shows that repentance and conversion precede blotting out, which takes place in the future,

during the “times of refreshing” and “restitution of all things.” Blotting out is not immediate but occurs during a defined prophetic period—the antitypical Day of Atonement—which began in 1844 (*Daniel 8:14*). To say this process is “impossible” is to flatly contradict the text.

- *“But when the righteous turneth away from his righteousness... all his righteousness that he hath done shall not be mentioned... for his iniquity... he shall die.” Ezekiel 18:24*

This proves that **sins once forgiven can return** to the record if the person turns away from righteousness. Blotting out cannot be unconditional or immediate, because it is **dependent on continued obedience**. If all sins were instantly and irreversibly blotted out at conversion, this principle would be void.

- *“For on that day shall the priest make an atonement for you, to cleanse you, that ye may be clean from all your sins before the Lord...” Leviticus 16:30 & 33*

This refers to the Day of Atonement, where already-forgiven sins (from the daily sacrifices) are now removed from the record and blotted out of the sanctuary. This teaches a two-phase atonement—daily forgiveness, and final cleansing. This model is fulfilled in Christ’s high priestly ministry in heaven. Rejecting this process is to reject God’s divinely ordained method of salvation.

- *“For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil.” Ecclesiastes 12:14*

This teaches a final, future review of records, where both good and evil deeds are judged. If sins were immediately and permanently blotted out at conversion, there would be no need for judgment. The investigative judgment is how God separates wheat from tares and justifies His decisions before the universe.

- *“... but now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself... so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many...” Hebrews 9:26–28*

This describes Christ’s heavenly priestly ministry as the final phase in the removal of sin. “To put away sin” is the final act of the atonement—not the initial forgiveness. The phrase “in the end of the world” links it to the prophetic time period of *Daniel 8:14* and shows the delayed nature of sin’s full removal.

The instantaneous, unconditional view of forgiveness is consistent with pantheistic universalism, which teaches that God is in all, and that salvation is not dependent on judgment, record books, or obedience. Feast-day theology often redefines the Day of Atonement and spiritualizes it away from its forensic, sanctuary-based meaning. These doctrines deny the objective reality of sin and Christ’s literal, ongoing work in the Most Holy Place, thereby removing the need for a heavenly sanctuary altogether.

To claim that the blotting out of sin must be immediate and cannot be delayed; Contradicts *Acts 3* and *Leviticus 16*, which clearly separate forgiveness from final cleansing, Denies the reality of the Investigative Judgment, central to the everlasting gospel *Revelation 14:7*, Promotes a mystical, pantheistic view of salvation, divorced from Scripture and the sanctuary, Renders God’s final judgment meaningless, since there would be nothing left to review, And destroys the moral accountability required for salvation.

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 27- E.J. Waggoner

ERROR #59: “There is no teaching of a future remission... The remission of sins is as real a thing as the healing of disease, and cannot take part apart from the individual.”

Why This Is Wrong:

E.J. Waggoner is once again fully rejecting the concept of a future, investigative judgment. This collapses the entire judgment process into a mystical present experience. It denies the prophetic unfolding of God’s justice and the necessity of vindicating His people before the universe.

Scripture Refutations:

- *“Rejoice... but know... that for all these things God will bring thee into judgment.” Ecclesiastes 11:9*

Future accountability is clear.

- *“And he shewed me Joshua the high priest standing before the angel of the LORD, and Satan standing at his right hand to resist him. And the LORD said unto Satan, The LORD rebuke thee, O Satan; even the LORD that hath chosen Jerusalem rebuke thee: is not this a brand plucked out of the fire? Now Joshua was clothed with filthy garments, and stood before the angel. And he answered and spake unto those that stood before him, saying, Take away the filthy garments from him. And unto him he said, Behold, I have caused thine iniquity to pass from thee, and I will clothe thee with change of raiment. And I said, Let them set a fair mitre upon his head. So they set a fair mitre upon his head, and clothed him with garments. And the angel of the LORD stood by.”*
- *Zechariah 3:1–5*

Joshua stands before God and Satan in a heavenly judgment scene where filthy garments (sin) are removed after examination. These garments must be removed before a change of raiment.

- *“There is nothing covered, that shall not be revealed...” Luke 12:2–3*

A coming time of full disclosure of all hidden things is here revealed.

These pages reveal a theology of presumption and pantheistic mysticism, rejecting: The heavenly sanctuary, The Investigative Judgment, The conditional nature of salvation, and The prophetic timeline of Daniel and Revelation. They falsely reduce the gospel to an internal, subjective experience—making man a deity—denying God’s objective, forensic work in heaven.

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 27- E.J. Waggoner

ERROR #60: “The objection is raised, that to teach that Christ does make atonement for sins on the cross is to teach the doctrine of indulgence, the forgiveness of sins before they are committed. That objection does not hold, as far as I am concerned, and does not lie against Scripture teaching. Christ does make atonement for sins on the cross; for, ... the cross is an ever-present reality...”

Why This Is Wrong:

The above statement uses “circular reasoning” but ultimately, Waggoner is Teaching that the cross alone is the full atonement—He believed in the doctrine of indulgences—the forgiveness of sins before they are committed—denying Christ’s ongoing priestly ministry in heaven. This reduces atonement to a single event in the past—Calvary—while denying the ongoing intercession and cleansing work that Christ now performs as High Priest in the heavenly sanctuary. This echoes the popular Protestant error of “Jesus did it all at the cross,” and dismisses the two-phase atonement revealed in the sanctuary model.

Scripture Refutations:

- *“We have such an high priest... a minister of the sanctuary...which the Lord pitched...” Hebrews 8:1–2*

Christ’s priestly ministry began after the cross, not ended there.

- *“Now to appear in the presence of God for us... to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself.” Hebrews 9:24–26*

This shows the atonement continues beyond Calvary through Christ’s ministry in the heavenly sanctuary.

- *“To cleanse you, that ye may be clean from all your sins before the Lord...” Leviticus 16:30–34*

The Day of Atonement (antitype = Investigative Judgment) followed the daily sacrifices. Forgiveness came first; cleansing came later.

- *“Unto 2300 days, then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.” Daniel 8:14*

This cleansing is part of Christ’s final work of atonement, begun in 1844—not finished at the cross.

- *“We shall be saved by His life.” Romans 5:10*

We are forgiven by His death, but we are saved by His ongoing priestly life—denying that is incomplete theology.

Summery:

Despite the author’s intent to distance himself from the doctrine of indulgences, the statement logically supports the same theological framework:

- Forgiveness and atonement detached from condition, timing, or judgment;
- **Atonement finished at the cross** with no ongoing priestly phase;
- The “ever-present” cross as a mystical, automatic reality—essentially a spiritual indulgence.

So yes, this statement agrees with the doctrine of indulgences in principle, even while denying the label—which makes it all the more dangerous because it wraps error in Protestant language.

- *“We may disguise poison by mingling it with wholesome food, but we do not thereby change its nature. On the contrary, it is rendered more dangerous, as it is more likely to be taken unawares. It is one of Satan’s devices to combine with falsehood just enough truth to give it plausibility.” 4SP 404.1*

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 29- E.J. Waggoner

ERROR #61: “I contented myself with teaching [essential truths] and holding my peace concerning things I knew were not Biblical... such as the ‘Sanctuary Question.’”

Why This Is Wrong:

Viewing the Sanctuary doctrine as non-essential and privately dissenting without clarity or accountability. This claims the Sanctuary doctrine is non-essential, treating it as an optional, divisive issue rather than the centerpiece of the final gospel warning (Revelation 14:6–7). It reflects an attitude of personal peace over doctrinal integrity, rejecting God’s prophetic warning system under the pretense of non-militancy.

Scripture Refutations:

- *“Thy way, O God, is in the sanctuary...” Psalm 77:13*

God’s plan of salvation is revealed through the sanctuary structure—not optional, but central.

- *“The temple of God was opened in heaven... and the ark of His testament was seen...” Revelation 11:19*

This shows the Most Holy Place opened in the last days—confirming that the sanctuary is prophetically essential.

- *“Fear God... for the hour of His judgment is come...” Revelation 14:7*

The Investigative Judgment message is a pillar of the Three Angels’ Messages, not a side issue.

- *“Preach the word... for the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine...” 2 Timothy 4:2–4*

Ministers must proclaim truth regardless of popularity, not avoid it for convenience or peace.

- *“When I say to the wicked... and thou givest him not warning... his blood will I require at thine hand.” Ezekiel 3:18–20*

Silence in the face of error is deserving the blame in God’s eyes. There is no neutrality in truth.

- *“Indifference and neutrality in a religious crisis is regarded of God as a grievous crime, and equal to the very worst type of hostility against God.” 23T 40.3*

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 29- E.J. Waggoner

ERROR #62: “This letter is only a private expression of my views on one line, and I have no intention of making it public...”

Why This Is Wrong:

Claiming rejection of doctrine is personal, not public, thus evading accountability. Truth and error do not exist in a vacuum. The moment a minister disagrees with foundational truth—especially on Salvation, Judgment, and Christ’s ministry—he is accountable to God and the church. Hiding heresy under “privacy” is **NOT** spiritual—it is deception and moral evasion.

Scripture Refutations:

- *“For nothing is secret, that shall not be made manifest...” Luke 8:17*

Private belief contrary to truth is not safe—it will be judged.

- “Every idle word... shall give account... by thy words thou shalt be justified or condemned.” Matthew 12:36–37

Private statements still matter in judgment. Beliefs held in “private” shape public consequences.

- “But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed. For before that certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles: but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them which were of the circumcision. And the other Jews dissembled likewise with him; insomuch that Barnabas also was carried away with their dissimulation. But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Peter before them all, If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?” Galatians 2:11–14

Paul publicly rebuked Peter when he led others astray—even though Peter didn’t publicly teach error. If a public teacher holds private error, it must be exposed to protect others.

- “I am against the prophets... that cause my people to err by their lies...” Jeremiah 23:30–32

God holds leaders accountable when their teachings—or silence—lead others away from truth.

- “He that doeth truth cometh to the light...” John 3:20–21

The one who avoids public truth is not of the light. Hiding doctrines shows spiritual darkness, not humility. E.J. Waggoner’s false doctrinal beliefs came out through his twisting and turning in every sermon, and writing; and with guile and subtility he led a whole denomination into error. Thus the man who “Was never a belligerent” has a record in heaven of just how many thousands of souls his sermons and writings have led astray in the last 143 years! God have mercy! The judgment day he refused to believe in is coming. And what a massive record he will have to face!

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 29-30- E.J. Waggoner

ERROR #63: “...I do hope to be given the time and opportunity to publish... truths of the atonement, without calling special attention to any denomination.”

Why This Is Wrong:

Promoting a Gospel without Distinctive Doctrinal Identity. This implies that presenting the “simple truths of the atonement” should be **separated from denominational identity**, including the **Seventh-day Adventist sanctuary message**, which forms the core of the **everlasting gospel** (*Revelation 14:6–7*). This is **peacekeeping theology**, avoiding the distinct “present truth” that God has given for this time.

Scripture Refutations:

- “The everlasting gospel... Fear God... the hour of His judgment is come...” *Revelation 14:6–7*

The **judgment-hour message** is not generic. It is **distinct** and **time-specific**—requiring clear identification with God’s remnant message.

- “Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth.” John 17:17

Truth is not merely about the cross—it includes **all Christ's teaching**, especially the **Sanctuary and Sabbath truths** given through the remnant.

- *“Preach the word... for the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine...”*
2 Timothy 4:2–4

This verse refutes attempts to **soften truth for unity's sake**. Doctrinal distinctiveness is part of faithful gospel preaching.

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 30- E.J. Waggoner

ERROR #64: “...Why cannot the denomination be satisfied to teach these things, without a load of ceremonialism, tradition and speculation?”

Why This Is Wrong:

Minimizing the Role of the Sanctuary and Denouncing “Ceremonialism.” This statement labels the **heavenly sanctuary truth** and the **investigative judgment** as “ceremonialism,” aligning with modern evangelical and pantheistic critiques that dismiss the **antitypical Day of Atonement**. This is a dangerous distortion of the foundation of the platform of truth, and of prophetic teaching. The whole evangelical world dismissed this doctrine upon rejection of the first and second angel's messages in 1838-1844 — The doctrine of “Once Saved- Always Saved, No effort needed” is lulling millions to sleep in carnal security, because of their rejecting the whole of the Three Angels Messages.

Scripture Refutations:

- *“It was therefore necessary that the patterns... should be purified... but the heavenly things themselves...”* Hebrews 9:23–26

The sanctuary is not ceremonialism—it's the **living framework** of Christ's final atonement.

- *“Thy way, O God, is in the sanctuary...”* Psalm 77:13

God's **entire plan of salvation** is revealed through the sanctuary. Calling it “speculation” is spiritual blindness.

- *“Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.”*
Daniel 8:14

This is **prophetic time**, not tradition. To disregard this is to dismiss God's appointed time of judgment. This verse is STILL the pivotal verse for the true and faithful Protestant Advent believers.

*““Who will be on the Lord's side?” should be sounded by the faithful, experienced ones in every place. **God requires** them to come out and **cut loose** from the various influences which would separate them from one another and from the **great platform** of truth upon which God is bringing His people.”* 1T 337.1

*“I saw a company who stood well guarded and firm, and would give no countenance to those who would unsettle the established faith of the body. God looked upon them with approbation. **I was shown three steps—one, two and three—the first, second and third angels' messages.** Said the angel, Woe to him who shall move a block, or stir a pin in these messages. The true understanding of these messages is of vital importance. The destiny of souls hangs upon the*

manner in which they are received. I was again brought down through these messages, and saw how dearly the people of God had purchased their experience. It had been obtained through much suffering and severe conflict. Step by step had God brought them along, until he had placed them upon a solid, immovable platform. Then I saw individuals as they approached the platform, before stepping upon it examine the foundation. Some with rejoicing immediately stepped upon it. Others commenced to find fault with the laying of the foundation of the platform. They wished improvements made, and then the platform would be more perfect, and the people much happier. Some stepped off the platform and examined it, then **found fault with it**, declaring it to be laid wrong. I saw that nearly all stood firm upon the platform, and exhorted others who had stepped off to cease their complaints, for God was the master-builder, and they were fighting against him. They recounted the wonderful work of God, which had led them to the firm platform, and in union nearly all raised their eyes to heaven, and with a loud voice glorified God. This affected some of those who had complained, and left the platform, and again they with humble look stepped upon it.” ISG 168.2

“The Confession of Faith” Pg. 30- E.J. Waggoner

ERROR #65: “I acknowledge the zeal of the S.D.A. denomination, which is not diminished... but perhaps increased, by the fact that it is not altogether according to knowledge.”

Why This Is Wrong:

Praising Zeal Without Knowledge This is **Romans 10:2 theology in reverse**—praising zeal even though it is misdirected. The implication is that **fervor is valuable even when it’s not based on truth**, which is deeply dangerous. Truth must never be sacrificed for sincerity.

Scripture Refutations:

- “They have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge.” Romans 10:2

Paul rebukes—not praises—this kind of zeal. It leads to **self-righteousness and rejection of truth**.

- “That the soul be without knowledge, it is not good...” Proverbs 19:2

Zeal without truth is destructive, not noble.

- “My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge...” Hosea 4:6

Zeal doesn’t save if it is disconnected from truth. It brings destruction!

WHAT ABOUT THE “E. G. WHITE LETTER” to Willie and Mary White?

Battle Creek, Michigan

March 9, 1890

This letter is published in entirety in 1888 materials 617-619.

Dear Willie and Mary:

Yesterday E. J. Waggoner gave a most powerful discourse. I have heard from many who were present, and their testimony was unanimous that God spoke through him. Elder Smith was present and they said, listened attentively. 6LtMs, Lt 82, 1890, par. 1

Why this is Wrong:

The Bible defines the true role of a prophet in two distinct ways: to speak the word of the Lord and to rebuke sin, regardless of popular opinion. A genuine prophet never conformed to the voice of the majority, even if their testimony was united. Human consensus and hearsay were never God’s method for revealing truth. Instead, God’s messengers always spoke with divine authority, declaring plainly, *“Thus saith the Lord”*

Scripture Refutations:

Micaiah vs. 400 Prophets

“And Micaiah said, As the Lord liveth, what the Lord saith unto me, that will I speak.”

1 Kings 22:14. There were 400 prophets who were all unanimous in their counsel to the King—and it was flatteringly false advice.

Jeremiah vs. Priests and Prophets

“Then spake the priests and the prophets... This man is worthy to die.” Jeremiah 26:11

The religious leaders were united against him, not one of them had the ability to discern truth from error.

Elijah vs. 450 Prophets of Baal

“I, even I only, remain a prophet of the Lord; but Baal’s prophets are four hundred and fifty men.” 1 Kings 18:22. The Majority of the people were on the side of falsehood and error, and even the “faithful few” answered Elijah “Not a word” their silence threw them on the side of false prophets who were wrong.

Isaiah’s Warning

“The Lord hath poured out... the prophets and your rulers, the seers hath he covered.”

Isaiah 29:10 Leaders were all blind in Isaiah’s day, and this prophecy covers for end times as well.

Jesus Condemned

“Then assembled together the chief priests, and the scribes, and the elders... to take Jesus... and kill him.” Matthew 26:3–4. Unanimous religious rejection of the nation against the very Son of God! What spiritual blindness. Has the majority ever been right?

Stephen vs. Sanhedrin

“When they heard these things, they were cut to the heart, and they gnashed on him with their teeth.” Acts 7:54. One last attempt by God for the whole nation of Israel, but once again a united rejection of the truth.

Paul Abandoned

“At my first answer no man stood with me... notwithstanding the Lord stood with me.”

2 Timothy 4:16–17. “Where did the “Moral Majority” go when things got hard for Paul? His testimony is that they all deserted him.

Summary:

Scripture shows the religious majority, more often than not, reject God’s true message. Truth isn’t proven by votes or a crowds consensus. The Word of God clearly shows that a true prophet of God would never look to the “Moral Majority” to get a consensus on whether a man was speaking truth or error. We believe this to be a letter penned to Willie & Mary by Willie, as this letter holds the ‘group think’ thesis that ruled all that Willie White did.

Remarks by W.C. White at

College View, Nebraska,

Sabbath Morning, Nov.25, 1905

“As a body of Seventh-day Adventists, **WE** BELIEVE that this church will stand until Christ comes.... The Seventh-day Adventist church, **WE** BELIEVE, will stand firm until the end...”

Who, but Willie C White, with the rubber stamp sporting his Mother’s signature would write such letters, trying to make a man, riddled with pantheism from 1882 onward, look like he had a message straight from God?

WHAT HAPPENED TO JONES AND WAGGONER?

“It is with regret that we record that both men lost their way.” Through Crisis to Victory- A. V. Olson. 1966.

A.T. Jones - Walking Away From the Foundation.

In mid-1903, during a period of church crisis, A.T. Jones visited Elmshaven and informed Ellen White of his intent to go to Battle Creek to teach Bible at the American Medical Missionary College, under the invitation of Dr. John Harvey Kellogg. Despite Ellen White’s clear warnings.

- *"In vision I had seen him [A. T. Jones] under the influence of Dr. Kellogg. Fine threads were being woven around him, till he was being bound hand and foot, and his mind and his senses were becoming captivated."*—Letter 116, 1906. 21LtMs, Lt 116, 1906, par. 6
- **On February 26, 1905, she pled with him:** *“Elder A. T. Jones, God calls upon you to go out into the cities, and give the last message of warning... No longer confine your efforts to one place... Proclaim the gospel message in the cities of America.”* —Letter 187, 1905; 20LtMs, Lt

187, 1905, par. 17, 18.

- **July 23, 1904, "Inharmonious Note" at the Berrien Springs Meeting.** *"The words and attitude of Brother E. A. Sutherland and Brother A. T. Jones at the Berrien Springs meeting struck an inharmonious note—a note that was not inspired of God. It created a state of things which resulted in harm that they did not anticipate. It made the work of the meeting very much harder than it would otherwise have been. Had it not been for their injudicious course, the Berrien Springs Conference would have shown very different results."*—Special Testimonies, Series B, No. 2, p. 42.1.
- **December 29, 1905, Lost Spiritual Eyesight and Repudiated God's Warnings.** *"I send no more [testimonies to be read to the Battle Creek church] to A. T. Jones, for I have evidence that a work will have to be done for him before the Lord will accept his service. God has given him warnings which he has repudiated, and I am deeply grieved that he has so little spiritual eyesight."*—Letter 345, 1905 (written to G. W. Amadon, first elder of the Battle Creek church). 20LtMs, Lt 345, 1905, par. 2
- **March 12, 1906, The Wrong Spirit and Demonstrations of Bitterness.** *"You may be surprised to hear the words that you have heard from Elder A. T. Jones; but I am not at all surprised. This is the development of the man when the spirit that is counter to the Spirit of God comes upon him. In him as he is at the present time, you have a representation of a man who is not under the molding influence of the Spirit of God. The Lord accepts no such demonstrations of bitterness. . . . Read in my books, ... the story of the first great apostasy. History is being repeated and will be repeated. Read then, and understand."*—Letter 98, 1906. 21LtMs, Lt 98, 1906, par. 12
- **April 2, 1906, Captivated, Deluded, and Deceived.** *"During the General Conference at Takoma Park [April, 1905], Elder Jones's case was again presented to me. After this, I had a long conversation with him in which I pointed out his danger. But he was self-confident, and declared to me that Dr. Kellogg believed the truth and the testimonies just as firmly as the rest of us believed and advocated them. In this conversation Elder Jones manifested that which had been revealed to me regarding him, that in the place of receiving the warnings he was full of self-confidence; that he had exalted himself, and in the place of being prepared to help Dr. Kellogg, he had united with him to disbelieve and distrust, and falsely to accuse the ministers and others who were trying to save Dr. Kellogg and other physicians who were in peril... "I warned Elder Jones, but he felt that he was not in the least danger. But the fine threads have been woven about him, and **he is now a man deluded and deceived. Though claiming to believe the testimonies, he does not believe them.**"*—Letter 116, 1906 (to Dr. David Paulson). 21LtMs, Lt 116, 1906; 5Bio 414, 416-417, 420
- **May 1, 1906, Chose Darkness Rather Than Light.** *"I am sorry for A. T. Jones, who has been warned over and over again. Notwithstanding these warnings, he has allowed the enemy to fill his mind with thoughts of self-importance. Heed not his words, for he has rejected the*

plainest light and has chosen darkness instead. The Holy One hath given us messages clear and distinct, but some poor souls have been blinded by the falsehoods and the deceptive influences of satanic agencies, and have turned from truth and righteousness to follow these fallacies of satanic origin." Manuscript 39, 1906; 21LtMs, Ms 39, 1906, par. 5; 20MR 14.5

- **June 15, 1906, Voice Controlled by Dr. Kellogg.** "Dr. Kellogg controls the voice of Elder A. T. Jones, and will use him as his mouthpiece. My prayer is, O God, open Thou the blind eyes, that they may see; and the ears of the deaf that they may hear, and become humble." Letter 182, 1906. July 5, 1906; 21LtMs, Lt 182, 1906, par. 6
- **Grieved the Holy Spirit.** "Elder A. T. Jones, *"Dear Brother, Again and again your case has been presented before me. I am now instructed to say to you, You have had a large knowledge of truth, and less, far less, spiritual understanding. When you were called to the important work at Washington, you had need of far more of the humble grace that becometh a Christian. Since the Berrien Springs meeting, your attitude and the attitude of several others has grieved the Spirit of God. You have been weighed in the balance and found wanting... .*"Self-exaltation is your great danger. It causes you to swell to large proportions. You trust in your own wisdom, and that is often foolishness. Do you remember the counsel which I gave you in my letter of April, 1894? This was in answer to your letter expressing deep regret over the part you had taken in an unwise movement." [Anna Phillips, See: Selected Messages, book 2, pp. 85-95] 21LtMs, Lt 121, 1906, par. 1; KC 33.2
- **She wrote: April 9, 1905** "Elder A. T. Jones...*You need to be converted and become as humble as a little child, else you will lose your soul. Had you had clear discernment, you could have helped Dr. Kellogg; but you had not and have not the clear light that cometh from the Light of the world.... you have worked directly opposite to the Spirit of God. You were standing where you liked to be, and you have reasoned away the objections.... Elder Waggoner has been an injury. In the European field he has sown seeds that will bear evil fruit, leading some to depart from the faith and to give heed to seducing spirits, doctrines of satanic origin. Unless he is converted, he is not fitted to act any part in the ministry of the Word. He is a decided transgressor of the seventh commandment....*" 21LtMs, Lt 121, 1906

This is where E. J. Waggoner's mystical teachings have deluded many people today, causing them to think they can break the Holy Law of God, without penalty. The Bible says they will be marrying and giving in marriage, this means separating and divorcing, even to skipping the divorce and just having a spiritual wife, (soul mate), but its all good. WRONG! "It is only when we stop believing right that we stop doing right."

- "Brother Jones, I have a message for you. In many respects you are a weak man. If I were to write out all that has been revealed to me of your weakness, and of the developments of your work that have not been in accordance with the course of a true Christian, the representation would not be pleasing. This may have to be done if you continue to justify yourself in a course of apostasy. Until your mind is cleared of the mist of perplexity, **silence is eloquence on your**

part.” 21LtMs, Lt 242, 1906, par. 18

- **Ultimately, she declared: March 23, 1906** *A. T. Jones, God’s eye is upon you. He is taking the temperature of your religious life, and the deeds are passing in review before God. I am to bear a testimony that all this scheming and planning and devising will decide what would be your character **if you were permitted to enter the heavenly courts. There would be a second rebellion.** All these unjust, cunning workings will not seem to you so pleasant in the near future as now. All who enter the pearly gates of the city of God will give themselves no rest until they purify their souls by obeying the truth, believing the truth with all their hearts. Now, just now, God calls upon all who have had testimonies borne to them to consider that it is not the instrument that the Lord has chosen to communicate His words to the erring that you are resisting and refusing, but the Lord Jesus Christ, who has for the last fifty years been speaking the fundamental truths to His people. Passages of Scripture will be as pure as crystal, polished by no human hand, but reflecting the light of God. And any man who has changed his convictions for sophistries has departed from the faith and given heed to seducing spirits. He has taken a position to falsify and is destroying his power as a leader in the great work before us. It is not the office to which God has appointed A. T. Jones, or any other man, to give the trumpet an uncertain sound.* 21LtMs, Ms 34, 1906, par. 19, 20
- *“In harmony with this instruction, **I must warn our people against laboring in any line in connection with A. T. Jones. He is one who has departed from the faith and has given heed to seducing spirits. He knows not what manner of spirit he is of.**”* 23LtMs, Lt 330, 1908, par. 28.

In 1884 Elders Waggoner and Jones met. On April 26m 1886, as Elder J.H. Waggoner, the father of E. J. Waggoner, was released from his responsibilities as editor of the Signs of the Times, E. J. Waggoner and A. T. Jones were selected to serve jointly, and their names appeared jointly as editors for three years, from may 13, 1886, to May 6, 1889. The issue of May 6, 1889, lists E. J. Waggoner as editor and A. T. Jone as special contributor. Elder Waggoner then carried the work of editor until May 11, 1891, when the name of Elder M. C. Wilcox appeared on the mast head. It will be observed that the two men held editorial responsibilities through the Minneapolis conference and E. J. Waggoner for two and a half years beyond.

In mid 1907, because of his warfare against the church and its leaders, the ministerial credentials of A.T. Jones were withdrawn. In July, 1908 which was not at all satisfactory. Jones was dropped from the membership roll of the Seventh- day Adventist Church of which for yours he had been a member.

Subsequent to working with Dr. Kellogg. A. T. Jones entered non the publication of *The American Sentinel of Religious Liberty*, an monthly journal which he issued over a period of several years.

In November, 1915 he moved to Washington, D.C., and devoted his time to publishing this paper. He began to attend The People’s Church, a colored Seventh- day Adventist Church that had broken away from the conference and was pastored by F. H. Seeney. On the invitation of the officers of this church, A.T. Jones participated in the work of the church, and then joined the

group. He was granted membership in April 15, 1916.

In February, 1923, Jones returned to Battle Creek for rest and treatment, and was making satisfactory progress until in early May, when he suffered a stroke of apoplexy that caused his death a few days later. Funeral service was conducted in battle Creek at a funeral home by Rev. G.E. Fifield. He was buried at Kalamazoo, Michigan. A brief obituary copied from the battle Creek *Enquirer* appeared in the Review and Herald of June 28, 1923.

E.J. Waggoner: Departure Through Delusion

E.J. Waggoner served as editor of the Signs of the Times until 1891, after which he was assigned to England where he worked with W.W. Prescott until 1903. In 1894, Ellen White expressed growing concerns about his speculative views on church organization, writing to A.T. Jones:

- *“Elder Waggoner has entertained ideas,... has agitated strange theories. He has brought before some of the people ideas in regard to organization that ought never to have had expression... Why not keep steadily at work in the lines that God has given us? Why not walk in the clear light He has revealed, and in place of tearing to pieces that which God has built up, work on the side of Jesus Christ?”*—Letter 37, 1894; 9LtMs, Lt 37, 1894, par. 18, 19

Despite urgent warnings, Waggoner persisted. In 1903, she warned him that Satan was using fantasies and fables to seduce his mind, especially by stirring illicit affections for someone other than his wife. Her prophecy proved accurate. In 1906, following a divorce, he married a nurse he had grown attached to while in England, ending his standing with the church. Though he never became as combative as Jones, Waggoner’s choice to remain in Battle Creek with Kellogg and Jones sealed his doom. Ellen White warned:

To brethren Paulson, Sadler, Jones, and Waggoner,— August 1, 1904 *“In the night season I seemed to be in a large company, speaking plainly and decidedly under the inspiration of the Spirit of God.... Our Counsellor then laid His hands on the shoulders of Elders A. T. Jones and E. J. Waggoner, and said, “**You are confused.** You are in the mist and fog. You have need of the heavenly anointing.” To Brother Jones He said, “Why have you permitted your mind to be worked as it has been? I warned you not to permit this.” He said to Brother Waggoner, “Leave the place where you now are, and walk in the path I have pointed out. Living Temple is full of seductive sentiments, which if received, will tear down the foundations of your faith and weaken your perceptions of truth and righteousness.”.... The Speaker was represented to me as standing on a high platform. To this platform He raised both men and placed one at His right hand and the other at His left. Then He said: “The sentiments that you have received in harmony with the special theories presented in the book Living Temple are not pure truth. **There is a commingling of truth and error**, and it will be difficult for you to single out the true from the false, to distinguish between the threads of truth and the threads of error. My Word is spirit and life....”* 19LtMs, Lt 279, 1904, par. 16

- *“Elder Waggoner has been an injury. In the European field he has sown seeds that will bear evil fruit, leading some to depart from the faith and to give heed to seducing spirits, doctrines*

of satanic origin. Unless he is converted, he is not fitted to act any part in the ministry of the Word. He is a decided transgressor of the seventh commandment.” 21LtMs, Lt 121, 1906, par. 8”

CONCLUSION

Doctrinal Betrayal of the Historic Advent Faith

While it is acknowledged that some of A.T. Jones' and E.J. Waggoner's writings—particularly on religious liberty—contain valuable insights, this must not blind us to the dangerous theological errors that permeate their broader works. Anyone who approaches their books and pamphlets expecting to find pure, undiluted truth will be gravely misled. The fact is, their writings—especially after the early 1880s—are saturated with spiritualistic overtones, doctrinal deviations, and outright pantheism.

This document has presented irrefutable, documented evidence that both Jones and Waggoner began promoting serious theological error as early as 1882. Their trajectory moved steadily toward an antinomian gospel—a **“faith alone”** message that denied the necessity of obedience, minimized the law of God, and advanced the notion of being **“saved” without the sanctification process**. Even worse, they dismantled the Sanctuary message, undermined the final atonement, and ultimately rejected the cleansing ministry of Christ in the Most Holy Place.

E.J. Waggoner himself admitted, in his own ‘Confession of Faith’ (pp. 13–14), shortly before his death in 1916, that he had abandoned belief in the Heavenly Sanctuary and its cleansing work **twenty-five years** earlier—that is, back in 1891. Despite this, countless Adventists continue reading his post-1891 writings under the delusion that they are receiving the pure gospel of 1888, when there is nothing further from the truth, all the while claiming it is the true message of the Three Angels. This is a deadly mistake. What they are actually imbibing in is a counterfeit—a mystical gospel stripped of judgment, law, and priestly mediation.

Let it be understood plainly: any theological framework that denies Christ's ongoing ministry in the Heavenly Sanctuary, that removes the Investigative Judgment, or that confuses righteousness by faith with lawless presumption, is not the third angel's message!—it is a deception!! No amount of eloquence or past usefulness can justify the continued promotion of teachings that directly contradict the foundation of our faith.

Ellen G. White gave clear, inspired warnings about the direction Jones and Waggoner were heading. To continue treating their writings as if they were a reliable guide to present truth is to walk straight into the fog of error and spiritual ruin. The evidence in this study leaves no room for doubt—these men stepped off the platform of truth long before 1888, and what followed was not a message of reform, but a departure from the faith once delivered to the saints.

It is time we stop idolizing these men and start testing the spirits, as Scripture commands. Our safety is in the Word of God and in the messages confirmed through the original Spirit of Prophecy writings—not in the writings of men who ultimately denied both.

When examining the writings of Ellen G. White, one can easily find statements that appear, on the surface, to endorse the teachings of A.T. Jones and E. J. Waggoner as if they were pure, unadulterated truth. But this raises a serious and unavoidable question: How could a genuine messenger of the Lord lend unwavering support to two men who were demonstrably teaching major doctrinal errors—including the denial of the Sanctuary with the Investigative Judgment, the promotion of a lawless “faith alone gospel,” and the dissemination of mystical pantheistic theories that blur the line between God and His creation?

If Ellen White had truly affirmed their teachings in full, then by scriptural measure she would be disqualified as a prophet—because their doctrines directly contradict both the Bible and the early Spirit of Prophecy writings. However, we firmly reject the conclusion that she was a false messenger. The far more reasonable explanation is that some of the statements attributed to her—especially those that read like sweeping endorsements of Jones and Waggoner—were not written by her at all. It is entirely plausible that others, seeking to bolster the acceptance of these men and their flawed message, affixed her name to materials she neither wrote nor approved.

In light of the overwhelming evidence of their theological drift—including their early involvement in Kellogg’s pantheism—it is clear that the endorsement of their message required the illusion of prophetic approval to be accepted by the people. Without the apparent backing of “the prophet,” their teachings would have had little chance of influencing the denomination as deeply as they did.

From as early as 1882, Waggoner had begun introducing ideas that subtly but consistently undermined key pillars of the Advent faith. By 1888, they were not messengers of reform within the message—they were reforming the message itself. The so-called “precious message” of righteousness by faith became a platform upon which they mingled evangelical assumptions, pantheistic philosophies, and Protestant errors long rejected by the pioneers. Far from being pure channels of light, Jones and Waggoner were early agents in the development of what Ellen White called the *alpha of deadly heresies*.

One of the clearest deviations was their denial, both explicitly and implicitly, of the **Heavenly Sanctuary doctrine** and the **Investigative Judgment**. Waggoner’s assertion that forgiveness equates to the complete erasure of sins from the record books contradicts the Bible’s teaching that sin remains in the sanctuary until blotted out in judgment (See: *Lev. 16; Heb. 9; Rev. 20:12*). His views align more with mystical, internalized atonement theories than with the legal, substitutionary, and transactional reality of Christ’s high priestly work after 1844. This error mirrors the Roman Catholic doctrine of indulgences, providing a false sense of immediate absolution without the investigative phase foretold in *Daniel 8:14*.

Both men further corrupted Adventist theology through **pantheistic teachings**, long before John Harvey Kellogg’s *Living Temple* controversy exploded in 1903. As documented, Waggoner was publicly teaching pantheism as early as 1888, stating that the life of God resides in bread, water, and air, and that eating food is equivalent to eating God. Kellogg himself traced these teachings to Waggoner’s influence. This spiritualistic nonsense, which blurs the line between Creator and creation, is not merely off-course—it is blasphemous and subversive to the biblical doctrine of God’s transcendence and personal presence. Such teachings erode the distinction between sin and holiness, man and God, and ultimately destroy the gospel itself.

Waggoner also taught that Christ overcame sin through the power of His own divine nature rather than by faith in His Father—an error that destroys the Biblical and Original Spirit of Prophecy teaching that Christ came, “in the likeness of sinful flesh” and was “tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin” (*Romans. 8:3; Hebrews. 4:15*). His version of Christ’s humanity robs us of a true example and makes Christ’s victory inaccessible to fallen man. Ellen White plainly stated that Christ could not use His divine power to escape temptation without breaking the plan of redemption (*Spirit of Prophecy, Vol. 2, p. 92*). Yet Waggoner’s view lays the foundation for a mystical perfectionism where victory is attributed not to faith but to an

indwelling divinity—another strand of pantheism cloaked in evangelical jargon.

Likewise, A.T. Jones repeatedly confused justification with sanctification, taught a dangerously subjective view of salvation (“I know I am saved”), minimized the necessity of obedience, and even claimed that God would raise up many prophets—just months before promoting the false prophet Anna Phillips. His contradictions on whether character is a gift or the result of cooperation with God reveal a confused theology that blurred the line between righteousness by faith and lawless presumption. Such teaching removes the clear, practical instruction God gave through Ellen White, who warned repeatedly that no man is to say, “I am saved” until standing on the sea of glass.

Moreover, both men were inconsistent, careless, and arrogant in their public preaching. Jones claimed that comparing Scripture with Scripture was unnecessary, directly contradicting *Isaiah* 28:9–13 and Ellen White’s repeated counsel to harmonize all inspired testimony. He even cited the infidel Edward Gibbon as a trustworthy authority, despite explicit warnings from the Spirit of Prophecy that Gibbon’s writings were a tool of Satan.

In conclusion, the theology of Jones and Waggoner from 1882 to 1916 was a mixture of half-truths, speculative errors, spiritualistic philosophy, and open rebellion against heaven’s light. They not only stepped off the Advent platform—they worked systematically to dismantle it.

The popular narrative that they were fully endorsed by Ellen White is a historical myth. She endorsed the uplifting of Christ—not every word or doctrine they preached. She warned them repeatedly, rebuked their errors plainly, and withdrew her support when they persisted in dangerous teachings.

To continue promoting their post-1888 writings as authoritative is to perpetuate the very alpha of apostasy Ellen White feared had entered the church. The omega will follow! Let every honest soul return to the Bible and the Original Spirit of Prophecy Writings, (non-copyrighted — as truly inspired writings cannot be copyrighted) and reject the seductive voice of “another gospel;” dressed in the robes of justification by faith, but lacking the holiness, obedience, and heavenly judgment that accompanies the true gospel of Christ.

Let God’s people now stand where they stood before 1888. The old landmarks are still valid. The pillars still stand. And the truth will not shift to accommodate men’s speculations or their fallen reputations.

Appendix "A"

The
"Confession of Faith"
of
Dr. E. J. Waggoner



TO THE READER

The manuscript of the following letter was the last thing written by Dr. E. J. Waggoner, and was found on his desk after his death, which took place suddenly, May 28, 1916. The letter is printed in response to the request of his friends, many of whom desire to possess a copy.

A "Confession of Faith"

My DEAR BROTHER:

Ever since you were here last summer I have had it on my mind to write you a long letter, in which I could express myself as freely as though I were talking to you. I had it in mind before you came, but hesitated, not knowing how it would strike you. I did not want you to get the idea that I was in any sense "on the war path," or desirous of controversy. I didn't really believe that you would misunderstand my motive, because you had already written to me that you would like to talk over some items of denominational belief with me. But there were so many things to discuss then, and I had no idea that we should be together even so long as we were, it didn't seem opportune to introduce any leading topic.

First, I wish I could tell you how much we enjoyed your brief visit. It was really a great blessing to us. You were kind enough to express the hope that I might again be connected with "the work." I remember that both you and Brother —— expressed the same wish when you called on me a few minutes on your way home from General Conference. Your brotherly kindness touched me, although neither then nor at any time since have I for a moment entertained the thought that such a thing could ever take place; nor can I say that I have wished it, under the present conditions, although I cherish the tenderest memories of my association with many former fellow-workers. But I was glad for the kind wish, and for the brotherly spirit that prompted it; and it furnished an additional reason why I should write this letter as a sort

of "confession of faith," that you may know more clearly where I stand, and may see that it is not indifference that keeps me out of "the work."

It is indeed as a confession of faith, and not as an expression of disbelief of old doctrines, that I should like to have you consider this partial statement of my ground for knowing that I should not be accepted into the S. D. A. ministry even if I were ever so willing. I want you as an old and loved friend to know, as nearly as I can make it known, where I stand. I hope that your patience will be sufficient to enable you to read my "confession" through at one sitting; and if at first you are inclined to ask, "Why does he take so much space in repeating what every Christian is supposed to know?" please remember that a confession of faith ought to be very simple, and that I want to be sure to establish common ground between us. You remember Minneapolis. I am making bold to ask you, if you come to some things that you feel inclined to dissent from, to point out to me where there is a break in the logical sequence.

In the beginning, therefore, I will say that I believe the Scriptures to be The Word of God. I know that they are "the inspiration of the Almighty," because they give me understanding. The more I read and meditate in them, the more I am impressed with their infinite depth and breadth, and at the same time with their infinite simplicity. They transcend all philosophy, because they are simple, ultimate truth. My attention was called more sharply than ever to this fact by the remark recently made to me by an educated man, not a professor of religion, that he resented Paul's writings (referring particularly to the epistle to the Romans), because his theology obscured the simple teaching of Christ. I replied that that was because he didn't understand Paul's teach-

ing. Subsequent study—for I am taking a class through the epistle to the Romans—has made me see more clearly than ever before that Paul was not a “theologian,” but that he simply stated self-evident truths—truths really as self-evident as any axiom in mathematics. But the truths are packed closely together, each word often containing a distinct thought, and the hasty reader is likely to imagine that there is a maze of philosophical and theological arguments, while there is only a mass of simple, ultimate truths, each independently true, and convincing when looked at by itself; but it takes a lot of close scrutiny to distinguish the boundaries of each, and then to see them all blending into one harmonious whole.

Christ is primarily the Word of God, the expression of God’s thought; and the Scriptures are the Word of God simply because they reveal Christ. It was with this belief that I began my real study of the Bible, thirty-four years ago. At that time Christ was set forth before my eyes “evidently crucified” before me. I was sitting a little apart from the body of the congregation in the large tent at a camp-meeting in Healdsburg, one gloomy Sabbath afternoon. I have no idea what was the subject of the discourse. Not a text nor a word have I ever known. All that has remained with me was what I saw. Suddenly a light shone round me, and the tent was, for me, far more brilliantly lighted than if the noon-day sun had been shining, and I saw Christ hanging on the cross, crucified for me. In that moment I had my first positive knowledge, which came like an overwhelming flood, that God loved me, and that Christ died for me. God and I were the only beings I was conscious of in the universe. I knew then, by actual sight, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself; I was the whole world with all its sin. I am sure that

Paul's experience on the way to Damascus was no more real than mine.

It was an impersonal, extra-Biblical revelation; for no text and no human being was connected with the experience. But, believing that the Bible is God's revelation to man,—a revelation of Himself,—I knew that it must have been designed for the giving of just such a revelation as I had that day. I knew, and still know, that from the Bible the Gospel teacher is to set forth by the Spirit what no ear has ever heard nor can hear, and what has never entered into the heart of man. I resolved at once that I would study the Bible in the light of that revelation, in order that I might help others to see the same truth. I have always believed that every part of the Bible must set forth, with more or less vividness, that glorious revelation; and when I did not see it, or some direct connection with it, in any portion of Scripture, I have known that I did not understand it, and have refrained from attempting to teach such portions until I could see the light shining from them.

Christ must be the beginning and end of all Scripture, as He is the Author and Perfecter of faith. It was the Spirit of Christ that testified in the ancient prophets; and so the Scriptures are the "testimony of Jesus,"—the "testimonies" to which the Psalmist so frequently refers.

We know God first of all as the Creator in Christ. In that living Word that was God in the beginning everything exists. "For in Him were all things created, in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible; . . . and He is before all things, and in Him all things hold together." Therefore,

"He that spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all, how shall He not with Him also freely give us all things?" God saves

by His creative power. Creation is first and last and all the time. God created everything perfect. Man's disobedience "brought sin into the world, and all our woe, with loss of Eden"; and God, "with whom is no variableness, neither shadow that is cast by turning" redeems all by the continued exercise of the same power that brought all into being. God was not taken by surprise, for "He Himself knew what He would do." No new work was instituted. "The works were finished from the foundation of the world," and the everlasting word that upholds all things still continues to work effectually, as in the beginning. Whoever believes it becomes conscious that it works effectually in him. "If any man be in Christ, there is a new creation." "This is the work of God, that ye believe in Him whom He hath sent."

Jesus Christ is "the same yesterday, and to-day, and forever." He cannot change, because He is the revelation, the out-shining of the unchangeable God. His "goings forth have been from of old, from the days of eternity." Therefore the Gospel, which is the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth, must be always the same, with no shadow of change. It was the same before the foundation of the world, when only angels had been created. At first it was the good news of God's power in creation, and the angels sang together and shouted for joy. Later, it was also the good news of God's power in creating anew, and again the angels sang together and shouted for joy. But no new feature has ever been introduced, because the power of God is necessarily as unchangeable as God Himself. God has not grown greater, stronger, or better as the ages have passed, because He was as great and strong and good in the beginning as He could be—always infinite in everything.

So Christ is the all-sufficient sacrifice from

before the foundation of the world. It was through Him that pardon was offered to Lucifer and his deluded host, before man was created. The offering was rejected, because Satan would acknowledge no greater than himself; and as he knew perfectly what he was doing, his probation ceased; and so Christ, in coming to earth, "took not on Him the nature of angels," but only that of sinful man.

From the simple truth that Christ is "the image of the invisible God,"—the shining forth of His glory, the manifestation of His unchangeable character,—Himself the same yesterday, and all the yesterdays, and today, and forever; we must believe and know that from the days of eternity of old until now Christ has exercised the three-fold office of Prophet, Priest, and King. He was born to the throne, not merely in Bethlehem, but from His "goings forth." From the beginning He was constituted "Heir of all things." "Yet have I set [literally, anointed] my King upon my holy hill of Zion."

Prophet, Christ has certainly ever been, since as the Living Word He has spoken for God. He is the mouthpiece of Divinity. He was the Prophet of God in the beginning, when the heavens and earth were created, since it was by Him that the creative word was uttered; and He was the same Prophet when He came preaching peace to all, both near and far. God was "preaching peace by Jesus Christ" centuries before Christ appeared in Judea. Isa. 57:19.

And how about the Priesthood? A thousand years before Christ appeared in the flesh among men, David wrote by inspiration, "Jehovah said to my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand until I make thy foes thy footstool" (kingship); and, "Jehovah hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a priest forever, after the order of Melchizedek."

Further: It is as true of Christ as of high priests taken from among men, that He is "ordained to offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins." None but a priest can offer a sacrifice acceptable to God. King Uzziah affords a sad proof of this. Therefore Christ's priesthood must necessarily have antedated His offering of Himself. Obviously, then, He was priest before His crucifixion. He "gave Himself for our sins" just as truly when He went about doing good and healing all that were oppressed of the devil, saying to the broken in spirit, "Thy sins be forgiven thee," and giving life to the dead, as when He hung upon the cross. Isaiah declared, "The Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all," and. "Surely He hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows." So His priesthood must date back of Isaiah's time. And since grace was abounding at the fall of man,—for where sin abounds grace much more abounds,—we must believe that Christ was Priest at least from the foundation of the earth; and that is as far back as specially concerns us. Abraham offered up his only begotten son by faith in God's ability to raise him up even from the dead, through the offering, already made, of His only-begotten Son. The works, by faith in which we do enter into rest, were finished from the foundation of the world.

These simple, vital truths do not admit of argument. They "say themselves." They have only to be believed. I am merely stating what comes to me as I read the Bible for personal help and comfort. Now these plain, fundamental truths being recognized, it necessarily follows that there can have been no change in any feature of the Gospel (call it the "Plan of Salvation" if you please) since the fall. Clearer statements of it, to meet man's increasing blindness, there have been; but the thing itself has not changed one iota. "Unto us was the Gospel

preached as well as unto them." "We believe that by the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ we shall be saved even as they." The unchangeable God has but one way of saving men. Any change would make either for perfection or for imperfection. No one will for a moment admit that God would or could make a change tending toward imperfection; but to claim a change toward perfection would be no less to bring a charge of imperfection against God. Believing in God, we must admit that the Gospel was the same and as complete in the beginning as it is now; for it is but the revelation of the life of God to and in men dead in sin.

Man has had but one need since the fall—salvation from sin. "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin." Sin carries death in its bosom, and is essentially death; therefore the need that man suffers can be satisfied only by the gift of a perfect life—a life free from sin, a life victorious over death. So God in Christ gave His life for and to sinful men. That is the sum of the Gospel.

But sin is a condition, not an entity. It exists only in the individual, and can be removed only by a new life in the individual. It is not like grain or wood or stone, that can be removed from a place and deposited somewhere else. It is like a disease; it is, in fact, a mortal disease. It can no more be removed from a person, and carried by another person and deposited in some place at a distance from the sinner, than a fever can be taken away from a sick man by the physician, and stored away in some warehouse provided for the purpose.

I am not unmindful of the statement that Christ does "bear," or "take away" our sins. He bears the sins of the world, and by bearing them He takes them away from those who accept Him as their Saviour. But I remember this,

also, that He bears our sins in us, and not apart from us. He bears them because He "is come in the flesh," fully identified with humanity. The sins of the world are upon Him, because He bears the world. He bore the sins of the world,—of our common humanity,—in His own body on ["up to"] the tree; and by the cross the body of sin is destroyed, that a new life may begin. But let it not be forgotten, that the cross on Calvary profits us nothing unless it is erected in our own hearts, and we are crucified with Him. Paul shows in Romans 10:6-9, that we do not find Christ in heaven or in the grave, but only within, crucified and risen again in our own hearts. And when by faith we know that for a fact, our sin is taken away. Even Christ does not bear it now, because His endless life has swallowed it up. He bears the sin up to the cross, and if we allow Him to take us with Him to the cross, so that we are crucified with him, our sins cease to be, are there blotted out with the old life that there ceases to be.

Sin is not an entity, neither is it a debt, in the ordinary sense of the term, to be cancelled by the payment of something (even of a life) by and to some other person, apart from the sinner. All the illustrations of the atonement for sin, as being the payment of a man's debt by some benevolent person, give a faulty idea of the truth. A debt is something apart from the debtor, but sin is a part of the sinner; it is, indeed, his whole life. It can not be removed, or satisfaction be made for it, by the abstract gift of a life, any more than consumption, leprosy, or the plague can be cured by the payment of money, or even by the gift of a life, unless that new life be given to the sufferer himself. There have been cases in which a patient has been healed by the gift of the physician's or some other person's life blood; and this alone illustrates what Christ does for the sinner, as

demonstrated in the case of the woman with the issue of blood, who by the reception of "virtue" from Christ, was immediately "made whole." But her disease was not carried off and stored up somewhere. It ceased to exist, being "swallowed up of life."

This fountain of living waters, opened for sin and uncleanness, has always been open, always flowing from the throne of God and the Lamb. Men have always been called to take of it freely. Only by taking it constantly, do even the unfallen angels retain their sinlessness. The water from the Rock in Horeb; the water and the blood uniting in one stream from the heart of Christ on the cross; and the pure river of water of life flowing from the throne of God, in the midst of which is the Lamb that was slain;—all these show that "that which was from the beginning,"—the Word of life,—has been and is constantly flowing. The gift of God's life, which, since the fall, comes only by the cross of Christ, is not an event of a day, but the great fact of eternity. No one ever had to look forward or backward, but only upward and within, to find the cross. Its arms span eternity; through all the ages it stands unchanged—the restorer of life to those who have lost life, and the preserver of life to those who have never forfeited it. It has always been the one way of salvation for the sinner, and it will remain "the science and the song" of the saved through eternity.

I know that this is open to a technical objection, on the ground that "the cross" signifies the curse, and is a symbol of shameful death, and that therefore it cannot have existed before the fall, and cannot exist after the restoration. This is easily made plain. Take the original command to the first pair: "Be fruitful and multiply." The birth of children means the gift of life. The mother gives her life to the child.

In the present state, this gift is accompanied by pain and intense anguish. The mother may anticipate the birth of a child with longing; and after it is born she rejoices; but there is no joy, but only sorrow, in the act of giving birth—the bringing of a new life into existence. But we know that if there had been no sin there would have been no sorrow in child birth. The joy of anticipation would have been intensified in the physiological act of bringing forth. Child birth is the same thing that it would have been if there had been no sin; but a change of condition makes it painful.

So with the gift of God's life, that the universe may be peopled. God had a longing for children to surround Him. He brought forth the angels—"sons of God"—by the gift of His life, and the joy of anticipation was not dimmed in the fulfillment. Man, also the son of God, was the product of the gift of God's life, and still His joy was full. But sin came, and death passed upon the whole race of God's children of earth. What shall He do, that His banished be not expelled from Him?—Do just the same as He did in the beginning—give His life freely, that His children may be born again. The mystery of the new birth is identical with that of the first birth; both are acts of creation by the gift of life. But sin causes the gift of life for the new birth to be accompanied by pain, since God must needs bear our sicknesses and take our death. It may be said, therefore, that the cross exists from eternity to eternity, and that sin causes it, during the period of sin's duration, to be connected with pain and shame; or we may say that the one thing which exists from eternity to eternity is the gift of God's life, for the creating and re-creating of men, and that sin makes the cross the only way of entrance for that gift. What words one uses to describe the thing, is a minor matter; the great truth is that

men are re-created by the exercise of the same power by which man was originally created. In both cases it is Christ who is the Mediator—the medium through whom the work is accomplished.

Seeing these simple, fundamental, Gospel truths clearly, made it evident to me fully twenty-five years ago that there could never have been any changes, or differences of dispensation, in God's work of saving men. The river of God is not subject to floods and drouths; its flow is constant and even; its banks are always full. It is, as Whittier expresses it:

“Immortal Love, for ever full,
For ever flowing free,—
For ever shared, for ever whole,
A never-ebbing sea.”

Christ crucified was as much a reality, and as available, in the days of Moses and Isaiah as in the days of Paul. The revelation of Christ as Jesus of Nazareth, from the manger to Calvary and Olivet, is but the removal, as it were, of a fold from the screen that separates the invisible world from us, so that through the opening we may get a view of what is constantly taking place. Neither at the cross, nor before or since, has there been any new feature introduced,—any change in the way for sinners to approach the Throne of Grace. Christ has from the foundation of the world been the Lamb slain; His life has always been the one perfect sacrifice for sin; and His royal priesthood has been unchangeable. He is from first to last the “one mediator between God and men.” He has borne the sins of the world from the beginning of sin; and He has “taken away” the sin from as many of the world as have been willing to have it blotted out of their lives.

Also, twenty-five years ago, these truths, coupled with the self-evident truth that sin is

not an entity but a condition that can exist only in a person, made it clear to me that it is impossible that there could be any such thing as the transferring of sins to the sanctuary in heaven, thus defiling that place; and that there could, consequently, be no such thing, either in 1844, A. D., or at any other time, as the "cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary."

"Then what took place in 1844?"

That question puzzled me for many years; for I had been so thoroughly indoctrinated with the idea of a 2300-year period ending in 1844, that it never occurred to me to doubt it. Indeed, I never did doubt it for a moment; but one day the light dawned upon me, and I saw that that period had no foundation whatever, and then of course I simply dropped it.

How did I learn this? you ask. Well, I suppose I should never have seen it if I had not been for so many years fully convinced that the thing which I, from my boyhood, had been taught took place in 1844 did not occur, then nor at any other time.

But what about the 2300 days? Are we to throw away the prophetic rule of "a day for a year"? By no means; that rule holds, but it has no application in this case, for the simple reason that the eighth chapter of Daniel makes no mention whatever of 2300 days. Not the "King James" version, nor any other version, but the Hebrew text, must settle the question, and that says, "two thousand and three hundred evenings and mornings" (literally "evening-mornings"), as correctly rendered in the revised version.

"But," it is asked, "doesn't an evening and a morning make a day?" Yes; but what reason have we for gratuitously assuming that the term is here used as a periphrasis for "day"? In that case we should have a figure of a figure! We are placed under the necessity of interpreting

a figure of speech, and then taking that interpretation as a prophetic figure. When a prophetic symbol is used, the symbol itself ought to be absolutely clear, needing no explanation. But here we are told to believe that we have for the figurative day a term that is never elsewhere used in the Bible for the word "day." Why should we assume an exception here? There is a Hebrew word that is everywhere rendered "day," and it is the only word for "day" in the Hebrew language. It occurs more than 2000 times in the Hebrew Scriptures. Has it never occurred to you to wonder why an exception should be made here? It certainly rests with those who claim an exception here to show the most clear and convincing proof of the alleged fact, and to give a plain and conclusive reason therefor.

If the translators of the 1611 version had translated the Hebrew words *ereb boker* (evenings mornings), instead of substituting "day" for the proper rendering, I doubt if even the maintaining of a theory would have led anyone to light upon so far-fetched an interpretation. I ask again, what reason can be given for the introduction by inspiration of a new, absolutely unknown, and clumsy expression, instead of the simple and well-known word for "day," if the reader were intended to understand "day"? I say "clumsy expression," meaning only, of course, as a circumlocution for "day." In reality there is nothing clumsy about it when taken in its obvious sense. It seems so obvious as to need no argument, that the term "evening-mornings," when used in connection with the sanctuary, must refer only to evening and morning sacrifices.

Incidentally there comes in here, of course, a consideration of the application of the "little horn." Consistency demands that the horn of a goat should be of the nature of a goat—a process, a continuation of the animal in question. But

this would preclude the application of a Grecian horn to Rome, since Greece and Rome were two distinct, independent powers. Why is there any more ground for saying that Rome came out of Greece, than there is for saying that Greece came out of Medo-Persia, or that Medo-Persia came out of Babylon? It is true that a victory over a Macedonian king gave Rome great prestige, but not so great as the victory over Darius gave Alexander, or the conquest of Babylon gave Cyrus. Rome, like its predecessors in universal dominion, originated in territory to the westward of the kingdom immediately preceding it, and had an origin as distinct from Greece as Greece had from Medo-Persia, or Medo-Persia from Babylon. The facts do not fit the interpretation which Seventh-day Adventists have given the prophecy. Strangely enough, the chart that has always been used by the denomination, and the supposed picture of the goat, which still appears in all the books and articles devoted to this prophecy, plainly show the inconsistency of the interpretation. Look it up, if you do not have the picture in mind, and you will see that the "little horn," marked "Rome," is represented as coming from behind the goat, and that the goat horn marked "Syria" is represented as uniting with that previously-existing little horn, instead of the latter coming out of the Syrian horn. The awkward picture contradicts the words of the prophecy; but if it had been made true to nature and to the text, the little horn could not have been labeled "Rome."

I had thought to devote a little space to a positive consideration of the application of the little horn, but I will not cumber the argument with it. I did not really need to refer to the horn at all, it being sufficient for my purpose, in dealing with the atonement, to show that the eighth chapter of Daniel does not contain any long prophetic period, at the end of which sins

are to be blotted out. My only burden in this writing is that sin is not an entity, a commodity, that can be taken away from a person and deposited intact somewhere else, awaiting its final destruction. Since no earthly sinners have ever been in the sanctuary in heaven, their sins can never have defiled that place, necessitating its cleansing. But the sanctuary at Jerusalem in Judea, which alone was the subject of Daniel's anxiety, had been most horribly defiled by Antiochus, and did need cleansing.

"But what about the Investigative Judgment?" Yes, indeed, what about it? In truth, there is no responsibility resting on me to say anything about it, because in the entire Bible, from Gen. 1:1 to Rev. 22:21, inclusive, there is never once any mention of such a thing. A long time ago I found that the only way to avoid misunderstandings in Bible discussions was to keep clear of theological terms not found in Scripture, and hence not susceptible of Bible explanation. A brief consideration of the Judgment in general will show that there is no place for an "investigative" Judgment before the coming of Christ. You will pardon me for quoting several passages of Scripture in full, instead of merely giving the references. I want the truth that they contain to stand out so boldly that it will be apparent what a libel upon God it is to assume that He is under the necessity of investigating the record of men's lives and characters, in order to ascertain whether or not He can take them to Heaven.

"Known unto God are all His works from the beginning of the world."

"Can any hide himself in secret, that I shall not see him? saith the Lord. Do not I fill heaven and earth? saith the Lord."

"The word of God is living, and active, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even

to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, of both joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart. And there is no creature that is not manifest in His sight; but all things are naked and laid open to the eyes of Him with whom we have to do."

"O Lord, Thou hast searched me, and known me. Thou knowest my downsitting and mine uprising. Thou understandest my thought afar off. Thou searchest out my path and my lying down, and art acquainted with all my ways. For there is not a word in my tongue, but lo, O Lord, Thou knowest it altogether."

"The foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are His."

"Jesus did not commit Himself unto them, because He knew all men, and needed not that any should testify of man; for He knew what was in man."

"Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who should betray Him."

In the face of this truth so often repeated, how can any thoughtful believer of the Bible teach that it is necessary for God to spend years in searching records, to find out who are true followers of Him, and who are not? We are expected to teach as a fundamental article of faith, that it has already taken God, assisted by hosts of angels, almost seventy-two years to go over the records (several times longer, by the way, than it was supposed would be required) and still the work is not done. It brings God down to the level of man.

But is there not to be a Judgment? Most certainly; for the Scriptures teach that "when the Son of man shall come in His glory, and all the holy angels with Him," then He shall sit upon the throne of His glory, and the dead, small

and great, of all nations, shall stand before Him to be judged; but they nowhere say anything about any Judgment before Christ's coming.

The object of the Judgment is not that God may learn all about men, but men may learn the truth about God. They will not learn it through the preaching of his Word, so they must see everything for themselves, just as it was in relation to every other thing, so that every knee, even Satan's, shall involuntarily bow, and every tongue confess to God, acknowledging that Jesus Christ is Lord. Everyone that is cut off must acknowledge that his punishment is just; and even the righteous, who have trusted God and believed in His goodness and justice, without understanding all things, must have all things set before them so clearly that there will be no possibility for any doubt or question ever to arise.

Seventh-day Adventist teaching concerning the sanctuary, with its "Investigative Judgment" to precede the blotting out of sins, is virtually a denial of the atonement. True, much is made of the "antitypical day of atonement" beginning in 1844; but that very thing minimizes, if it does not nullify, the value of the blood of Christ, in that it teaches that a man may receive the blood—the life—and not receive the atonement. The Gospel has been turned into ceremonialism. The eyes of many have so long been fixed upon "the shadows" that it is almost impossible for them to see the light. I am not bringing any charge against their lives, but only against their teaching—making the word of God of none effect that they may maintain their tradition. Look over the literature from the beginning, and it will be apparent that they have transferred the Jewish sanctuary and its ceremonies into Heaven, and have made the atonement itself only ceremony. Everything must be made to "fit the type," as though the shadow

of a thing were of more importance than the thing itself. You do not depend upon photographs to give you exact information as to your wife's features and characteristics. I dare say there was a time, before your marriage, when you paid a good deal of attention to her picture, and you no doubt have some of those pictures still; but I don't believe that you have spent much time studying them in the last thirty-five or forty years. You don't care for her picture, as long as you have her. And I am sure that you don't insist that she can't be your wife if she does not in all respects correspond to those pictures. Why, then, should we spend time studying shadows, when we have the reality? For we have "come unto Mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the first-born, which are written in Heaven, and to God, the judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus, the Mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling."

The ancient sanctuary with its ceremonies was essentially a type by contrast. It was built because the children of Israel would not have God to dwell in them. But for their unbelief they might have come direct to the sanctuary which God's hands had established, and might have talked with God face to face, as Moses did. The promise was, if they kept God's covenant, as Abraham did, that they should be a kingdom of priests; instead, the priesthood was confined to one tribe, and to one family of that tribe, and was utterly useless so far as freeing from sin was concerned. Instead of having the law of the Spirit of life in Christ, the Living Stone, from which they could drink righteousness, they had the law on lifeless stone, a "ministration of death." The "tabernacle of witness" was continual witness against them. Of course they

were not shut up to those weak and unprofitable things, for whoever turned to the Lord in truth had the veil taken away, and could, like Moses, behold the glory of God. What I wish to emphasize is that we are not to spend precious time studying the minutest details of a system that was only the product of unbelief, when with Abraham and Isaiah and Paul we may by faith have boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus. The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, in referring to the tabernacle and its instruments said, "of which we cannot now speak particularly"; and it seems to me that we would do well to follow his example.

Let me note, by the way, an inconsistency on the part of those who insist that everything must "fit the type." In the type, the atonement day was just one day out of 360 days—the last day of the year. According to S. D. A. teaching, Christ was in the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary from his ascension till 1844, or 1810 years, which time corresponded to the yearly service in the tabernacle, leading up to the day of atonement. The 1810 years corresponded to the 359 days in the type. Now 359 days is to one day as 1810 years is to five years and fifteen days. Therefore if the type were to be followed exactly, the "antitypical day of atonement" ought to have ended some time in 1849. Why insist on following the "type" so closely in other respects, and ignore it in the important matter of time?

But to come to the really serious indictment, I have said that the teaching that atonement for sins was deferred until 1844, and that no sins were blotted out till then, the sins of the living not being blotted out even yet, minimizes or even nullifies the value of the blood of Christ. It makes a distinction between things that do not differ, and teaches that the blood—the life—of Christ received by a person exercises only a

portion of its virtue at the time of its reception,—that it is divided in its action. Seventh-day Adventists do believe in the forgiveness of sins. At least it is taught in the denomination, and is believed by many. But forgiveness is obtained only by the reception, consciously, of the life of Christ, which is given freely on the cross for all men. We are “justified [made righteous] freely by His grace, through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus.” This forgiveness is reconciliation to God, for it was our “wicked works” that constituted our enmity to God, and Christ has reconciled us in the body of His flesh, through death. Col. 1: 21, 22. Justified by His blood is the same as reconciled by His death (Rom. 5: 9, 10), and this is the atonement. By Christ “we have now received the atonement.” I know that there is an attempt to evade this truth, by using the word “reconciliation,” which is given in the margin; but the fact remains that reconciliation and atonement are identical. Reconciliation implies previous enmity. In this case the enmity was all on our side; we were enemies of God, who is the Friend of sinners. It is we who are reconciled to God, by the destruction of the enmity that was in us. Once we hated His ways; now we love and yield to them, and are at one with Him. We have received the atonement, namely, the life of God in Christ.

And this is the blotting out of sins. How can it be otherwise, when the enmity is destroyed, “slain,” and the enmity is the body of sin? “It is the blood that makes atonement for the soul,” and this blood—life—is not divided. I am sure that you still sing with as much fervor as when we used to sing it together twenty-eight years ago,

mazing Grace! 'tis heaven below
To feel the blood applied;”

and I hope that sometimes even yet Adventist congregations join in singing from the old hymn book,

“My sin, O the bliss of the glorious thought!
My sin, not in part, but the whole,
Is nailed to His cross, and I bear it no more;
Praise the Lord, praise the Lord, O my
soul!”

and also from “Christ in Song,”

“Christ has for sin atonement made;
What a wonderful Saviour!
I am redeemed, the price is paid;
What a wonderful Saviour!”

I know that hymns do not establish doctrine; but my joy in singing these lines comes from the knowledge that they are Scriptural. “We have received the atonement.” We should not dare come into the presence of God as law-breakers knowing that our sins were charged up against us; but we can come with boldness to the Throne of Grace, when we have this gracious assurance and invitation: “I have blotted out, as a thick cloud, thy transgressions, and, as a cloud, thy sins; return unto me, for I have redeemed thee.”

I think there is no disagreement as to the fact that the blotting out of sins is the atonement. What I object to is the denominational teaching that this is only a book transaction. That makes the atonement not a personal matter at all, but something which can take place without in the least affecting the individual concerned. It is like blotting out extreme hot or cold weather by breaking the thermometer. What possible difference can it make to a man what is done with a record of his sins, written in a book, when he himself has had them re-

moved from him "as far as the east is from the west"! A sick man is taken to a hospital and treated. When he enters his condition is noted, and every day that he is there a careful record of his case is made. Every rise of temperature is set down, together with every unfavorable symptom. By and by he is discharged, cured. That record of the course of his disease will remain on file in the hospital as long as the hospital stands; but the man knows nothing and cares nothing about it. He is freed from the disease, and that is all that he cares about. Just as little can the man who is forgiven and cleansed from sin care for or be affected by any record of his former sins. In saying this I am not implying that there will be retained for ever the record of men's sins. What I do mean is that the blotting out of sins is a vital thing in the sinner himself, and not a mere matter of bookkeeping.

I have often gone into a Roman Catholic church during the celebration of the mass, and it seemed to me that it was an exact picture of the S. D. A. idea of Christ's work as priest. The people were all down in the body of the church, and the priest stood at the altar, far away from them, and with his back to them, going through forms and saying words of which they understood nothing. The priest's mummery had no manner of connection with the people for whom he was supposed to be ministering. Even so the denominational teaching separates the work of Christ from the people—making the atonement consist of forms and not of fact. I believe you will agree with me, that the following lines by Van Dyke are Scriptural:

"Though Christ a thousand times in Bethlehem
be born,
And not within thy heart, thy soul shall dwell
forlorn.

The cross on Golgotha thou lookest to in vain,
Unless within thyself it be set up again."

The idea of making a man's salvation depend to any degree whatever upon his belief, or the fact, of whether or not Christ stood for a certain number of years upon one side or the other of a partition wall would be childish, if the matter were not so serious. Will nothing ever emancipate the denomination from the bondage of the observance of "days, and months, and times, and years"? Will they forever encumber and smother the glorious message of the everlasting Gospel with endless details of ceremonialism? Must the whole Levitical system be transferred to heaven till the end of time, and it be continually taught that God regards even His own followers as mere ticket-of-leave men?

What do I mean by this? I have reference to the teaching that no matter how humbly and contritely a man may confess his sins to God, how heartily he accepts Christ as his sacrifice and Saviour, his sins are only provisionally forgiven; that they are held against him to see how he will "hold out." What is this but to make him a ticket-of-leave man? It is at best but suspended sentence. You don't forgive your children that way. No real man forgives an offender in such a manner, but whole-heartedly, letting the evil of the past be as though it had not been. Why should Christians charge God with doing that which in them would be un-Christian? Why not be content with the teaching that if we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness? and that "as far as the east is from the west, "so far hath he removed our transgressions from us"?

The whole theory of a postponed blotting out of sin seems to be based upon the superficial reading of Acts 3:19. You know, of course, that

the proper reading of that text is found in the Revised Version: "Repent, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, that so seasons of refreshing may come from the presence of the Lord." There is no intimation that the blotting out of sins is to be delayed indefinitely after the repentance and conversion, for such a thing is an impossibility. The blood of Christ cleanses from all sin, when we repent, and then we have "fellowship" with the Father and the Son. We are at one with them. Where are the sins after we have been cleansed from them? Where was the leprosy after Christ touched the leper, and cleansed him from it? Where was Peter's wife's mother's fever after Jesus touched her hand, and it left her? Where did it go? and where was it kept stored up? Where is the pain after the healing balm has been administered? Where is the hunger after the nourishing food has been eaten? Where is the thirst after the refreshing draught? Where was the man's blindness after his eyes were opened? Where was the man's lameness after his feet and ankle bones received strength, and he leaped and walked? Where is the sin, after a man becomes a new creature?

Just the other day I picked up an old volume of "Thoughts on Daniel" and read that the work of Christ since 1844 "consists in the remission of the sins of those who should be found worthy to have them remitted." I pass by the teaching that the remission of sins depends on a man's worthiness. That is too baldly unevangelical to need threshing out again. But we are taught in the Bible that remission of sins is something that is received by whosoever believeth in Jesus. Acts 10:43. Christ, in imparting the Spirit to the apostles, said: "Whose sins soever ye remit, they are remitted." There is no teaching of a future remission. The remission of sins is as real a thing as the healing of disease, and cannot take place apart from the individual.

The objection is raised, that to teach that Christ made atonement for sins on the cross is to teach the doctrine of indulgence, the forgiveness of sins before they are committed. That objection does not hold, so far as I am concerned, and does not lie against Scripture teaching. Christ does make atonement for sins on the cross; for, as I have set forth, the cross is an ever-present reality. How else could Paul say, "I am crucified with Christ"? or how could he reproach the Galatians for their defection, "before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been set forth, evidently crucified among you"? Do not Seventh-day Adventist preachers ever appeal to sinners to "come to the cross"? Where else but at the cross can the bonds be loosed, and the burden of sin be removed?

Well, I might as well stop here, although the temptation is strong to go on with many other lines branching out of this. All that I wanted was to let you know where I stand, and the reason for it. I couldn't stand otherwise, and believe the Gospel. Yet I know that you believe the Gospel and at the same time hold, nominally, at least, to the denominational teaching on the sanctuary. I know that you are very busy; but I wish that for the sake of old times you would point out to me where I am wrong.

How could I honestly hold my place as a preacher and teacher in the denomination so long as I did, if I feel that my views would keep me out of the denominational ministry now?

For one thing, my views were not so sharply defined as they are now, since they were a gradual growth. Moreover, the lines are drawn much more closely now than they were then. You know that men have been retired from the ministry for differing on so uncertain a matter as the interpretation of Daniel 11. What, then, would be the fate of a man in the ministry who should

announce his dissent from the denominational teaching on the "Sanctuary Question," which is considered to be the keystone of the whole arch? Besides, I was never a belligerent, and as I always held, and do still, what I deemed to be the really essential truths of the message, I contented myself with teaching them, and holding my peace concerning things that I knew were not Biblical. Of course, I was often accused of "not preaching the message"; but things would be tolerated in one already long in the work, that would not be in one just entering it, or re-entering it after long absence. You know that in spite of my non-militant attitude, I was in hot water a good deal of the time.

Still further, I was possessed of the spirit of Whittier's lines, which at that time I did not know:

"A bending reed I would not break,
A feeble faith I would not shake,
Nor even rashly pluck away
The error which some truth may stay,
Whose loss might leave the soul without
A shield against the shafts of doubt."

I have seen so many ill-balanced persons throw away all truth, even the Bible itself, simply because they suddenly, and perhaps rudely, were awakened to the consciousness that there was chaff mingled with the wheat that they had received. I have always believed that the best way to uproot error is to sow very thickly the seeds of truth. For that reason I have never undertaken, and never shall undertake, any propaganda against the denomination. This letter is only a private expression of my views on one line, and I have no intention whatever of making it public; although I do hope to be given the time and opportunity to publish the clear,

simple truths of the atonement, without calling special attention to any denomination.

The Sabbath, the sign of God's power, the token of man's rest in the creative word, and thus the sign of the Gospel, is from Eden to Eden. Everything in the world shows the impending end, and that the fulfillment of Christ's promise to come again is the only hope of salvation from utter destruction. The nature of man makes the resurrection of the dead a requisite to the life everlasting; and the earth restored offers a tangible hope for the future, as the taste of its power gives strength for the present. Why cannot the denomination be satisfied to teach these things, without a load of ceremonialism and tradition and speculation? I hoped for it once, but I have learned that denominations never reform. That is left to individuals. I acknowledge the zeal of the S. D. A. denomination, which is not diminished, but perhaps increased, by the fact that it is not altogether according to knowledge. In saying this I do not question, but freely acknowledge, the superior goodness of the brethren in the denomination.

I should be recreant to God if I did not recognize the light that He has given me; I could never understand why it was given to me, except on the ground that His gifts are bestowed, not according to deserts, but according to need.