



*"Watchman,  
what of the night?"*

*The watchman said, The morning cometh, and also the night: if ye will enquire, enquire ye: return, come. Isaiah 21:11-12*

# CONFUSION OVER MEANING OF SANCTUARY SERVICES CONTINUES

One Sacrifice - One  
Atonement?

One Sacrifice - Two  
Atonements?

In recent months, there has been renewed emphasis within Adventist publications regarding the subject of the sanctuary. The Sabbath School Adult Lesson studies for the Fourth Quarter of 1984, were on "Jesus Our Mediator." The author of the "teaching aids" was Dr. A. V. Wallenkampf, who co-edited The Sanctuary and the Atonement, a publication of the Biblical Research Committee of the General Conference. This research publication contained "Biblical, Historical, and Theological Studies" on the subject of the sanctuary. Dr. Wallenkampf also wrote the introduction to this collection of studies.<sup>1</sup>

A parallel situation is to be found in the Adventist Review. The editors of the paper, during 1984, formulated "a statement of purpose" which was endorsed by the Editorial board. This purpose declared the Review would not become "the special province... of any pet theological group."

(Jan. 3, 1985, p. 5) The paper, as to be expected, will stand "solidly behind the 27 Fundamental Beliefs [voted at Dallas]" Through the paper they "will elaborate, explain, and defend them." However, aspects of doctrine not spelled out in these statements "may be discussed in the Review." (p. 6) Coming immediately following a whole quarter's lessons on the mediatorial ministry of Christ, an article in the third issue of the 1985 Adventist Review could hardly be considered accidental. Further, it is authored by the assistant editor of the Ministry magazine, Elder Kenneth Wade. Thus this article reflects the editorial thinking of two concept-forming organs of the church whose readers constitute the laity and the ministry.

The study by Wade contained a very non-controversial title - "Power in the Blood," and contained certain aspects of the sanctuary teaching which needed to be emphasized. He wrote in comment on a ceremonial error which Moses scored heavily:

What seemed an insignificant detail was actually the crux of the ceremony, which made God's sacrificial system different from a hundred heathen systems. When the priest ate the flesh of the sin offering he was to show the folly of the pagan concept that an animal's death could appease God's wrath against sin. He ate the flesh of the offering to teach men and women that they need a human intercessor to bear their sin. (Jan. 17, 1985, pp. 8-9)

This emphasis should direct the attention of any student of the redemption provided by God through Jesus Christ to the work

in the Heavenly sanctuary. It is there the work on behalf of fallen man is made effective because of the intercession of our Great High Priest whether it be forgiveness found in Him, or cleansing through Him. This is Biblically stated in the same experience alluded to in the article, and in the text quoted by Wade - "God hath given you [the priest] to bear the iniquity of the congregation, to make atonement for them before the Lord." (Lev. 10:17)

Then the assistant editor corrected a long standing error in the Crosier "article" which reflected the research of Hiram Edson, Dr. Hahn, and Crosier himself during the winter following the Great Disappointment. This error upon which certain concepts of the investigative judgment rests was carried over into Patriarchs and Prophets. (p. 354 - The White Estate has supplied an appendix note to bring it in line with the Scriptures.) After discussing the first of the two basic types of sin offerings found in Leviticus 4, Wade wrote:

The remainder of Leviticus 4 describes the second type of sin offering, that for the individual members of the congregation. The ceremony in this case was much the same as for the first type of offering, except for two important details: No blood went into the tabernacle, and the priests were to eat the flesh instead of burning it. When they ate it they bore symbolically the iniquity of the sinner. (Ibid., p.9)

This important difference between the categories of sin offerings in Leviticus 4, we have failed to sufficiently note as we have studied the work performed in the second apartment of the Heavenly sanctuary. When the blood was taken in, corporate, or "national" [Crosier's term] sin was involved. Either the whole congregation had sinned, or "the anointed priest" had sinned "so as to bring guilt on the people." (Lev. 4:3 ARV) When the blood was not taken in, the individual was involved as an individual. In the symbolism, the priest ate a part of that animal which stood for the individual sinner. Thus the forgiven sinner would face the ministration done in the second apartment of the sanctuary in the priest. Because of this difference, Crosier - and rightly so - describes the two atonements as "individual" and "national."

The corporate aspect of the work of the

Day of Atonement was alluded to in the lessons for the Fourth Quarter. In the "teaching aides," Wallenkampf asked - "Whose entries are checked in the judgment?" To his own question, he answered: - "Apparently the little horn is one whose record is checked in the judgment. (See Daniel 7: 24-26) The little horn primarily represents papal Rome." (p. 133) This concept was left undeveloped in the lessons.

Within the framework of the ideas presented by Wade, there is also another aspect which is left undeveloped. Wade clearly stated the specific act of the priest in eating of the sin offering was "to teach men and women that they need a human intercessor to bear their sin." But he dropped the concept there; but the Bible does not. This human intercessor, symbolized by the priest, "had to be taken from among men" and one who was himself "compassed with infirmity." (Heb. 5:1-2) Paul declared of Christ - God "hath made Him to be sin for us, who knew no sin." (II Cor. 5:21) The Messiah came into humanity so that He could be taken from among men to appear in the presence of God for us to "make intercession" on our behalf. (Heb. 7:25)

This coming into humanity was a critical point in the 1888 Message. E. J. Waggoner after quoting II Cor. 5:21, commented:

This is much stronger than the statement that He was made "in the likeness of sinful flesh." He was made to be sin. Here is the same mystery as that the Son of God should die. The spotless Lamb of God, who knew no sin, was made to be sin. Sinless, yet not only counted as a sinner, but actually taking upon Himself sinful nature. (Christ and His Righteousness, pp. 27-28, emphasis his.)

This position which was reflected in the 1889 Statement of Beliefs was omitted, and altered in the 1980 formulation at Dallas. Naturally the editors of the Adventist Review, who stand with the 27 Statements formulated at Dallas, would not wish this 1888 concept included in any study on the "Power in the Blood."

In the last few paragraphs of his article, Wade comes to the subject of the significance of "the Day of Atonement" - an area so crucial to Adventism. Here the article

"falls apart." Follow closely what is written:

Once each year the Day of Atonement brought the symbolism of the daily rituals to its climax. On this day of cleansing and judgment the high priest took the blood of the sin offerings into the most holy place and sprinkled it before God's presence, foreshadowing the laying of "the iniquity of us all" (Isa. 53:6) upon Christ.

Then the high priest brought the blood back out to the holy place and cleansed the altar of incense of the sin that had been laid upon it throughout the year as blood was sprinkled there (see Ex. 30:9, 10; Lev. 16:18, 19). . . .

The high priest's entry into the most holy place and the cleansing of the altar of incense carried the beautiful message that God accepts upon Himself all our iniquity. But once the blood that symbolically bore sin into God's throne room has laid those sins on God, it can come again from God's presence and be used to cleanse from sin. (p. 9)

Notice the concepts expressed:

1) The blood taken into the Most Holy Place foreshadowed "the laying of 'the iniquity of us all' upon Christ." It was at the Cross where the iniquity of us all was laid upon Christ. Christ died once for all on Calvary. What is Wade trying to say? Is he suggesting that the services on the Day of Atonement were merely a replay of what Calvary was to be? Is this a way to mitigate the force of the atonement in the Most Holy Place, and indicate that all was completed at the Cross?

2) The entry of the High Priest into the Most Holy Place "carried the beautiful message that God accepts upon Himself all our iniquity." It is true that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself. (II Cor. 5:19) The Day of Atonement, however, was something entirely different from this. God was not accepting; He was presiding over a cleansing. Sin is abhorrent to God. He could not accept it; but made provision that He might ever remain just, yet could justify the one who would have faith in Jesus. The penalty for sin only was accepted by God in the God-man, Christ Jesus - never sin! Even in the incarnation, while Jesus took upon Himself our fallen nature, He did not participate in the sinfulness of man. How much more so God - in whose presence the "four living creatures" continuously proclaim - "Holy,

holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come" (Rev. 4:8), to accept upon Himself our sins? The prophet describes God's attitude toward sin. He wrote - "Thou art of purer eyes than to behold evil, canst not look on iniquity." (Hab. 1:13)

What is needed to clear the air of all the fuzzy and confused thinking being projected in regard to the subject of the sanctuary, and especially the Day of Atonement, is to note carefully certain key symbolic acts connected with the services.

The first mention of the Day of Atonement is in Exodus 30:10, in connection with the Altar of Incense. The atonement was stated as being achieved by "the blood of the sin offering of the atonements." The KJV is expressing the Hebrew very closely in this text. There were two sin offerings presented on the Day of Atonement - a bullock for the high priest and his house (Lev. 16:6); and the Lord's goat (Lev. 16:15-16). The blood of the Lord's goat alone came upon the Altar of Incense to cleanse it from sin. While the Lord's goat is referred to as a "sin offering" no sin was confessed over this goat. The blood of the Lord's goat was a blood symbolically free from all sin. This blood was the blood of the atonement. It did not bring sin into the sanctuary. It cleansed and provided for the removal of sin from the sanctuary.

The word in Exodus 30:10 for atonement is in the plural form as indicated in the KJV. This plural form could indicate one of two things, (or both) - either that there was more than one atonement, or that the services on the tenth day of the seventh month prefigured the supreme atonement, or as our pioneers expressed it in their statement of beliefs - "the great atonement" (1889 Yearbook). It is true that the Levitical outline of the services to be performed in the sanctuary enclosure describes two atonements: - one, resulting from the ministry at the Altar of Burnt Offering for the individual (Lev. 4:31), and the other, taking place on what is called "a day of atonement." (Lev. 23:28)

In considering the antitypical application of these symbolisms, it needs to be kept

in mind that one sacrifice, once for all, provided both the means for the individual atonement, and the blood for the cleansing of the sanctuary on the great antitypical Day of Atonement. In the type, the provision of the animal sacrifices came from two different sources. In the case of the individual, he provided the animal for his sin offering. It stood for him. God permitted "His son" to come and become "us" - God with us (Matt. 1:23) - that by my accepting Him, He would carry the penalty of my sin, and stand for me in the judgment in the presence of God. I am thus complete in Him. (Col. 2:10) The prophet Isaiah broke forth in poetic language and proclaimed - "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given." (Isa. 9:6)

On the other hand, the kids of the goats presented alive before the Lord on the Day of Atonement - one of which was to become the Lord's goat - were taken "of the congregation of the children of Israel." (Lev. 16:5) In the imagery of prophecy, it is the Seed of "the woman" - God's people - who will triumph over Satan (Rev. 12). In the message of Hebrews, the Captain of "the many sons" brought to glory, partakes of their "flesh and blood" so that by dying "He might destroy him that had the power of death." (Heb. 2:10, 14) God took one "of the congregation of the children of Israel" and made Him that Captain. Abraham, when called to sacrifice his only son, perceived the deeper meaning, and told Isaac - "God will provide Himself a lamb for a burnt offering." (Gen. 22:8) And God did! Thus the Lord's goat typified God's provision for the cleansing and complete eradication of sin from the universe.

Why should one atonement, the daily be carried out in the Court representing the earth, and at the Altar of Burning Offering representing the Cross? Here is where the individual is - the "us." We need a Saviour. We need to see the terribleness of sin. That was provided at, and by the Cross. By why should the "great" atonement - the atonement of atonements - be carried out in Heaven, in the Most Holy Place? This is where sin began, with a covering cherub in the presence of God. (There were two live goats presented before the Lord in the type.) And where sin began, the final scenes in the eradication of sin

from the universe are to begin - before the Ancient of days. In the decision of that court trial - pre-Advent judgment, or whatever name one wants to use to place it in the framework of time - judgment is handed down in favor of "the Son of man" (Dan. 7:14) and to "the saints of the most High" (Dan. 7:27), those who have remained loyal to God inspite of the pressures of the corporate entities devised by Satan to bring the whole world under his control.

---

<sup>1</sup>Wallenkampf in his introduction to The Sanctuary and the Atonement stated:

The different facets of the ancient sanctuary service help us understand the different phases of biblical atonement. In the sanctuary service atonement for sin was made by the shedding of the blood of the sacrificial animal, including the disposition of the blood by the officiating priest, but final atonement was made on the day of atonement. All of these facets were a part of atonement. In the same way, theologically speaking, Jesus did make full, complete and perfect atonement for all our sins on the cross, and biblically speaking, in the terminology of the ancient sanctuary service, He continues to make atonement for us today by His present intercession in the heavenly sanctuary. (pp. xiii & xiv; emphasis his)

It is the conviction of this editor that the "facets" of the atonement would have been more accurately expressed had the paragraph been written as follows:

The different facets of the ancient sanctuary service help us understand the different phases of biblical atonement. In the sanctuary service, atonement for sin was made after the shedding of the blood of the sacrificial animal by the disposition of the blood through the officiating priest, but final atonement was made on the day of atonement. All these facets were a part of the atonement, the sacrifice being the condition of the atonement. (See AA, p. 29) In the same way, theologically speaking, Jesus did make a full, complete and perfect sacrifice for all our sins on the cross, and biblically speaking, in the terminology of the ancient sanctuary service, He is making atonement for us today by His present intercession in the heavenly sanctuary.

There is no way that Jesus could "make full, complete, and perfect atonement for all our sins on the cross," and Him to "continue to make atonement for us today by His present intercession in the heavenly sanctuary." That which is perfect cannot

## PATZER EXPLAINS FOR WILSON

In the December, 1984, issue of the Thought Paper, we noted that Elder Neal C. Wilson refused to commit the church to the Federal Court case involving the appointment of an U.S. Ambassador to the Holy See, either as a friend of the court, or as one of the plaintiffs in the suit filed by Americans United for the Separation of Church and State. We suggested that if enough concerned persons wrote, we might obtain an answer as to why Wilson made the decision he did. Some folk did write, and we reproduce in full the answer received from Elder A. J. Patzer, Administrative Assistant to Elder Wilson:

"Dear -----

"It is the wish of Elder Neal C. Wilson for me to acknowledge receiving your letter addressed to him.

"The General Conference Public Affairs and Religious Liberty Department vigorously registered its concern and protest pertaining to the establishment of diplomatic relations with the Vatican which would lead to an exchange of ambassadors. Please note the following:

- A press conference in the Senate Office Building in Washington, D.C., organized by the Public Affairs and Religious Department with about a half-dozen other church organizations joining in the press conference.

- Two half-page ads in the Washington Post newspaper.

- Another half-page ad in the Washington Times newspaper.

- Many television and radio interviews and discussions with national exposure.

- North American Union Public Affairs and Religious Liberty directors visited with the offices of their senators in Washington, D.C.

- Hundreds of telephone calls and telegrams from our conference leaders, pastors and lay people sent to senators and the White House.

- The director of the Public Affairs and Religious Liberty Department testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Appropriations Committee opposing the ambassador to the

Vatican.

- A long article in the Ministry Magazine - which goes to tens of thousands of non-Adventist ministers - explaining our position of a strong opposition.

"As far as we know, this is more than any other denomination did.

"Opposing a matter and going to the public and the Government to persuade is appropriate but going to court is a grave matter for the Seventh-day Adventist Church to name and sue the President and the United States Government, this puts our church in an adversary relationship.

"Only in an extreme and critical crisis which would affect the operation of our church and our institutions in carrying forward our work would such consideration be given and entered into if there was substantial church support.

"The problem with critics who send out material do not give the full story which creates misunderstanding."

### Comments

What was done through the news papers, radio, television, and press conferences, plus visitation to the offices of the senators was commendable. However, it must be clearly understood - and Patzer did not name him - the head of the Public Affairs and Religious Liberty Department of the General Conference is Dr. B. B. Beach. His track record in ecumenical affairs, and in SDA-Catholic contacts hardly coincides with the stand one needed to take in regard to the appointment of an ambassador to the Holy See. It was Dr. Beach, who at Vatican Council II, entered unilaterally into dialogue with representatives of the WCC, which dialogue finally involved the Church. He has been secretary of the Secretaries of the World Confessional Families [Churches] in which the Papacy is also represented. Further, in this capacity, Beach is the one who presented the Seventh-day Adventist Church in symbol to the Antichrist. It makes then a rather hollow sound in press conferences to oppose an ambassador to this same Antichrist. (See So Much in Common, co-authored by Beach, and published initially by the WCC)

Patzer stated that Elder Wilson considered it a grave matter to go to court in which

a suit is being brought against the president of the United States, in this instance, a very popular president. In simple language, Wilson elected not to have a confrontation with the Executive arm of the American government. If I recall the Bible record correctly, there was a popular king - at the zenith of his power and prestige - who had constructed an image all of gold. What was announced as a dedicatory convocation was turned into a worship service. Religion and State combined on the plain of Dura. Three officials in the government of the province of Babylon coming to the dedication refused to enter into the religious aspects of the program. It was a grave thing to confront the popular monarch - and besides there was the furnace of fire. But they did! The issue then was church and state; the issue now is church and state. This time the leadership of the professed people of God flunked the test.

Patzer indicated further, that the only reason that the Church would go to court would be if the issue effected "the operation of the church or [its] institutions" - in other words, the organizational structure. Isn't truth worth going to court for? The bottom line is simply preserve the structure - to the cross with the truth. Isn't this the position which Caiaphas took?

Patzer even suggests in his letter that the Church would not go to court even over its institutions unless "there was substantial church support." This is very interesting. Was there church support to defend the church in a long litigation (EEOC vs PPPA) in which the prophetic position of the Church regarding Romanism was thrown to the trash heap of history? Since we no longer have an aversion to Roman Catholicism, what does all the protest through the press sound like? Could we say, stage acting? Our Bibles transliterate the word.

Patzer scores the critics whom he says do not tell the full story. Really, who is keeping the full story from the laity? We are trying hard to uncover the full story, and Patzer is working equally as hard to keep the cover on. Of course, that is a part of his job description.

## SUMMARY REPORT - 4

We continue from the February issue, the report from the Complaint filed by Americans United in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania at Philadelphia.

### FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

(Continued)

"On February 11, 1929, the Lateran Treaty was entered into between the Holy See and the Italian government. This treaty recognized the State of the City of the Vatican. In the Lateran Treaty the Holy See renounced its claims to the territory of the Papal States.

"The State of the City of the Vatican is composed of just 108 acres or about one-sixth of a square mile of territory in the city of Rome. The Vatican legal system is based upon the Roman Catholic Church's Code of Canon Law and on the statutes promulgated by the Pope. Some of its day-to-day administrative activities are carried out by the College of Cardinals. Its population is slightly in excess of 1,000. The Vatican is the world headquarters of the Roman Catholic Church and exists to serve as the spiritual and administrative headquarters of the church.

"On December 24, 1939, Pope Pius XII and President Franklin D. Roosevelt announced the exchange of a personal representative between the United States and the Vatican. Myron C. Taylor held the position as 'Personal Representative' of the President under President Roosevelt and President Truman. He continued to serve in this capacity until 1949 when he retired. The appointment, however, of Myron C. Taylor was made without the consent of the Senate and carried with it no appropriation by Congress. No congressional act was thus involved.

"In 1951 President Harry Truman nominated General Mark Clark as Ambassador to the Holy See. Plaintiff Americans United for Separation of Church and State opposed such an appointment. Plaintiff National Association of Evangelicals called on its 8,000 pastors to fight the nomination,

To page 7, col. 2

¶  
"Separation of church and state is a minority view for a majority of earth's population" - Johnson and Yost

From p. 4 - Footnote

be added to, nor subtracted from. To do so, produces imperfection. God's work is perfect. Jesus' death was a perfect sacrifice. It provided forgiveness for man now as he accepts it; it looked forward to the complete restoration from the results of sin in the final atonement. One sacrifice - two atonements!

#

### SEMINARS TO SEMINAR

In the January Thought Paper, we announced two Seminars for 1985, one for June and the other in August. There has been only slight response for the June date - not enough to justify the time, effort, and the cost - therefore, we are canceling the Seminar for June.

We sensed that the change of topics from Romans to Galatians might have had some effect on the interest. We need to keep in mind that the book of Galatians was much discussed at the 1888 General Conference Session.

Since the present calls for only one Seminar this year, it means that if you wish to be considered for attendance, we need to know very soon. We cannot wait till one month prior to the time, and then finalize everything. The date for the Fall Seminar remains the same - August 4-10. The date for the final consideration will be July 1. We will appreciate your cooperation if you are interested.

#

"There are two kinds of people: those who say to God, 'Thy will be done,' and those to whom God says, 'All right, then, have it your way.'" - C. S. Lewis

"There is a way that seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death." - Proverbs 14:12 & 16:25 (Twice for emphasis)

"Watchman, What of the Night?" is published monthly by the Adventist Laymen's Foundation of Mississippi, Inc., P. O. Box 178, Lamer, AR 72846, USA. It is sent free upon request. For Canada, write - The Adventist Laymen's Foundation of Ontario, P. O. Box 117, Thorne, ONT P0H 2J0.

From p. 6 - Factual Allegations

and a multitude of other organizations spoke out against the appointment as a violation of church-state separation. Plaintiff National Council of Church, by action of its General Board on January 17, 1951, adopted a policy statement opposing the appointment of an ambassador to the Vatican;. . . A second policy statement was adopted by the General Board of the National Council of Churches on October 31, 1951, . . . This latter policy was reaffirmed by the General Assembly, a body of 750 members, on December 12, 1952, and was reaffirmed by the General Board or March 17, 1954, and remains the present policy of the National Council of Churches. A condition of national religious divisiveness was the outgrowth of the presidential appointment. On January 13, 1952, President Truman withdrew General Clarks' appointment.

\*In 1970 President Richard Nixon named Henry Cabot Lodge as his personal representative to Pope Paul VI. The appointment did not require or receive senatorial approval or congressional funding. At this time there was a substantial amount of opposition from Protestant organizations and again religious discord followed the action of the President. Personal representatives have been appointed by Presidents since that time until the recent appointment

\*In March of 1981, President Reagan appointed William A. Wilson to serve as the President's representative to Pope John Paul II. Mr. Wilson served in this capacity until his appointment while the Holy See maintained Archbishop Pio Laghi, the Apostolic Delegate to the U.S. Catholic Church, as its unofficial diplomatic representative in Washington."

To be Continued

**"Obedience to God is the most infallible evidence of sincere and supreme love to Him." - Nathanael Emmons**