

L.E. Froom

to

Dr. Otto H. Christensen

Jan. 9, 1960.

You speak of voicing the feelings of 'hundreds' of other workers that in the Questions on Doctrine there is a leaning over backward, with a maximum emphasis on one phase of Christ's atonement and a minimum emphasis on the other-- 'for the purpose of placating' our evangelical friends.

I am rather surprised and disillusioned by your strictures. In the first place, I resent the suggestion that there was a compromise, or sell-out, to these evangelical enquirers. Your words simply echo the charges of Andreasen, which were without foundation in fact. If you represent hundreds, then there are many thousands that emphatically do not share your views. We did lean over backward in making the most exhaustive and meticulous study of the Spirit of Prophecy counsels ever made on the atonement, the nature of Christ, and all the related matters, than has ever been attempted in our history. In this we had access to the new complete index to the Spirit of Prophecy, and the help of the chief indexer, Elder R. L. Odom, as well as Elder Arthur White, who probably knows the writings better than any other man. We never work independently.

When it comes to the writers of Questions on Doctrine rushing things through, if ever there was deliberate, wide consultation with groups of men from the Seminary, the Review staff, the General Conference, and from the field before the answers were first submitted to our own headquarters representative committee of fourteen (including such keen men as F. D. Nichol) -- it was in the preparation of this volume. Consultation, consultation, consultation was the invariable procedure. When it comes to the 225 readers and the 'thirty days,' when men asked for more time they were given more time - much more time. You speak of about how we had 'months' to prepare it. As a matter of fact, it consumed over two years.

And you speak about this being rushed into print to placate these friends. That again is pure surmise. There was never one word that was modified to win approval. We said, 'This is what we believe. This is our position. Is it clear?' When an area was unfamiliar to them because of denominational phraseology and cliches, and was not understood, an attempt was made to make it crystal clear. The simple fact is that the charge that has been leveled against some of us is more accurately directed at the

Spirit of Prophecy, for we have simply put into form the counsels of hundreds of statements of the Spirit of Prophecy, which became our basic guide in coming to the conclusions there presented, and I prefer to be on the side of the Spirit of Prophecy, than on Andreasen's - or yours.

While a few Bible teachers still hold to the old Arian position, and the concept that Christ partook of a sinful, fallen nature--the vast majority take their stand with the multiple Spirit of Prophecy statements. While some hold that the atonement had little to do with the cross, the vast majority take the clear stand that, as Mrs. White states in eight different places, the atonement was completed on the cross; while its benefits are now being applied by Christ, our Atoneing Sacrifice who became our Ministering Priest, applying its benefits to all who accept the provision of the cross.

You speak of some of us as being removed from people and the workers. I wonder. Perhaps some of us are much closer to the workers than you. We have wide and constant contacts. We still have an occasional man who says that Christ was a creature, the first being to be created. But that reactionary position is in absolute conflict with the Spirit of Prophecy declarations concerning Christ. In Him was life, 'original, unborrowed, underived.' Andreasen, to fight this book, has gone back to the Arian and Socinian sentiments of a minority of leaders prior to 1888. I am glad that I do not stand with him in this throw-back.

Nor do I understand your talk about high pressure methods. Brother, you are not acquainted with the careful process that was meticulously followed or you would never dub it such. If ever there was wide consultation, and absolute subservience to the counsels of the Spirit of Prophecy in their completeness, not a segment of them; and conformity with the 1931 Statement of Beliefs and uniform Baptismal Certificate which followed -- it is found in this book.

You speak of Uriah Smith. Mrs. White had to tell Uriah Smith that if he didn't change his attitude, and some of his positions, that he would lose his own soul. And she had to rebuke such men as J.H. Waggoner. And those are the two men that some of the critics of today now follow, taking Uriah Smith's book written ten years after 1888, his 'Looking Unto Jesus', with its amazing statements still in absolute conflict with the Spirit of Prophecy. But he never accepted those counsels. We have men today that are just as recalcitrant as were those few men, but the majority did not so relate themselves to the issues of 1888 which was far wider, far broader, far more vital than some might think.

Well, enough of that. Now so far as Elder Anderson's reply to Martin. I am fully acquainted with his reply. Elder Anderson and I work in

closest harmony. He has read every word of my Manuscript, even in its formative stages. I confess that I don't understand your philosophy of your relationship to a manuscript. I have been in editorial and writing work for many, many years. I have written quite a few books that have been widely accepted. In fact, I have never had a book that has been rejected - not because of pressures, but because the majority in competent committees have endorsed the presentations. That doesn't mean that certain individuals have not had divergent views. Denominationally we follow the principle of the majority decision.

As mentioned before, that was true with the Coming of the Comforter. There were some that were fiercely antagonistic to the postulate that the Holy Spirit is a Person, and not an impersonal influence.

[excerpt]