“All Christians engage in confessional synthesis,” wrote theologian Carl R. Trueman. Some religious groups adhere to a public confession subject to public scrutiny whereas others are immune to scrutiny. Early Seventh-day Adventists, with strong ties to the Christian Connexion, feared lest the creation of a statement of beliefs be used to exclude them. From their perspective, Millerite Adventists remembered when statements of belief were used to exclude them.

These fears were aptly expressed during the earliest organizational developments in 1861 of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. According to denominational co-founder, James White: “making a creed is setting the stakes, and barring up the way to all future advancement. . . . The Bible is our creed.” Another Adventist minister, J. N. Loughborough, reiterated their collective fear: “[T]he first step of apostasy is to get up a creed, telling us what we shall believe. The second is to make that creed a test of fellowship. The third is to try members by that creed. The fourth to denounce as heretics those who do not believe that creed. And, fifth, to commence persecution against such.”

It is well known that Seventh-day Adventists were fiercely anti-creedal. Their confessional synthesis morphed from a private statement of beliefs (1872) that gradually became somewhat more visible (1931) until it finally becoming an official and public statement of belief (1980). Like most evangelical Christians, Seventh-day Adventists adhered to the antebellum mantra of “the Bible and the Bible alone.” The theological
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crisis that resulted from the American Civil War (1861-1865) made it especially clear that this dictum was not sufficient because some of the brightest religious minds on both sides of the conflict claimed “the Bible and the Bible alone” both for and against slavery. Thus within Seventh-day Adventism there was internal as well as external factors that contributed to the milieu within which Seventh-day Adventists birthed their statements of belief.\(^7\)

The fact that each of the Seventh-day Adventist statements of belief (1872, 1931, 1980) affirmed the “Bible and the Bible alone” as their only “creed” demonstrates a commitment to progressive revelation. They recognized their need to have a flexible confession of faith. At the same time, all of these statements of belief, as they morphed from private to public, indicate some form of exclusion. Who were they meant to exclude? Why was each written? How did each contribute to the development of Seventh-day Adventist theology? And finally, how does this process in itself inform our understanding of unity within the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

**The 1872 Fundamental Principles**

According to Uriah Smith, the author of the 1872 *Fundamental Principles Taught and Practiced by Seventh-day Adventists*,\(^8\) early Seventh-day Adventists needed to explain their beliefs to others, especially in light of recent criticisms:

Our only object is to meet this necessity [criticisms]. As Seventh-day Adventists we desire simply that our position shall be understood; and we are the more solicitous for this because there are many who call themselves Adventists who hold views with which we can have no sympathy, some of which, we think, are subversive of the plainest and most important principles set forth in the word of God. As compared with other Adventists, Seventh-day Adventists differ from one class in believing in the unconscious state of the dead, and the final destruction of the unrepentant wicked; from another, in believing in the perpetuity of the law of
God as summarily contained in the ten commandments, in the operation of the Holy Spirit in the church, and in setting no times for the advent to occur; from all, in the observance of the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath of the Lord, and in many applications of the prophetic scriptures.  

For Uriah Smith, who commented regularly on publications received from various other Adventists entities, he recognized that Seventh-day Adventists were all too often confused with these other Adventist groups. Smith regularly used his editorial pen to try to set the record straight. Thus this statement was intended to provide greater clarity to distinguish themselves from other Adventist denominations, and in turn, provide additional clarity for outsiders.  

This statement furthermore implies tension between early Seventh-day Adventists and other Adventist groups. This is not surprising since other Adventist groups developed their own statements of belief. The Albany Conference, on May 1, 1845, developed a statement for the majority of Millerite Adventists after the Millerite disappointment. This statement was afterward affirmed at least twice. A second major statement, adopted by the Evangelical Adventists in 1869, indicates their own theological and organizational maturity. Denis Fortin has analyzed these two statements with the first Seventh-day Adventist statement of belief in 1872. He argues that together they demonstrate “similar religious roots and theological heritage, and some divergent theological frames of reference.” These two latter statements of beliefs (1869, 1872) show both an evangelical heritage with “a different understanding of anthropology. Seventh-day Adventists were the most theologically removed from evangelicalism in emphasizing their doctrine of the sanctuary as the center of their theological articulation.”  

Seventh-day Adventist minister J. N. Andrews acknowledged the 1869 Evangelical Adventists Statement of Beliefs. Any apparent warmth belies increased
tensions with these other affiliated Adventist traditions.⁠¹³ James and Ellen G. White met, Miles Grant, the leader of the Advent Christian Church on a train in 1868.⁠¹⁴ In the conversation Grant stated: “I can worship with you, but your views will not let you [to] worship with me.” James White mistook this as a gesture of good will and followed it up the next year by bringing a small delegation to attend one of their camp meetings in Illinois. They were kicked off the campground.⁠¹⁵ Joshua V. Himes tried to intervene, but Grant and Himes were already in a power struggle that culminated with the expulsion of Himes in 1876. This humiliation on the part of the Whites was met with an additional “testimony” by Ellen G. White titled “Opposing Adventists” (3T 36-39) in which she described “our most bitter opponents are found among the first-day Adventists.” Seventh-day Adventists, she admonished, should never engage with them in such “unjust warfare.” Instead “silent contempt” was the “best approach.”⁠¹⁶ For his part Miles Grant held a personal vendetta against the Whites as well as Seventh-day Adventists in general going out of his way to attack both Ellen G. White and the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

Early exchanges between Seventh-day Adventists and other Adventist traditions contributed to the formulation of early statements of beliefs from 1869 to 1872. Each sought to define their own identity and to exclude others. James White desired to develop a warm relationship between Seventh-day Adventists and what they broadly described as “first-day Adventists” that could be similar to the cordial relationship they had with the Seventh Day Baptist Church. His plans backfired. In the process it culminated with a confession of faith written by Review and Herald editor Uriah Smith that defined the boundaries of belief between the two denominations. At the heart of the 1872
Fundamental Principles was the doctrine of the sanctuary. This more than anything else defined the unique theology of the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

The 1931 Statement of Beliefs

The General Conference Executive Committee noted on Dec. 29, 1930, a request from missionaries in Africa for a Statement of Beliefs. The 1920s was the “golden age” of Adventist missions as new mission stations, schools, and clinics blossomed around the globe. The growth of missions appears to have been a catalyst but not necessarily the primary motivation for the 1931 Statement of Beliefs. The official request came through H. Edson Rogers who desired to place a statement of beliefs in the Seventh-day Adventist Yearbook. General Conference president Charles H. Watson noted that he along with three others (M. E. Kern, F. M. Wilcox, and E. R. Palmer) formed a committee of four to review this statement of Fundamental Beliefs. According to Watson, the real impetus for this “Statement of Beliefs” was the aggressive charges made by dissident E. S. Ballenger in The Gathering Call, which prompted church leaders for a “true statement of essential points of faith.” He additionally noted that no formal approval was given to the statement so that it would not be considered a “fixed creed.” Adventist authors R. F. Cottrell and Lowell Tarling both document the strain that Ballenger’s challenges to the sanctuary doctrine had on this time period. If this was not enough, two other rather prominent Adventists, W. W. Fletcher and L. R. Conradi, both defected and cited the sanctuary doctrine shortly before the 1931 “Statement of Beliefs.”

F. M. Wilcox, editor of the Review and Herald, wrote the primary draft of the document that was published in the 1931 Seventh-day Adventist Yearbook and the 1932
Church Manual. Although the initial purpose was to avoid a “fixed creed,” the 1946 General Conference session voted “that no revision of this Statement of Fundamental Beliefs, as it now appears in the Manual, shall be made at any time except at a General Conference.”

Of the 25 Beliefs listed in 1872, the list was condensed down to 22 beliefs (1931).

A comparison of the two:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit 1: Comparison of 1872 and 1931 Statements of Beliefs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“That there is one God, a personal, spiritual being, the creator of all things.” (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“That there is one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the Eternal Father, the one by whom God created all things.” (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Holy Scriptures. (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptism is an ordinance. (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prophecy is a part of God’s revelation to man. (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World history fulfills Bible prophecy. (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Millennium. (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 2300 day prophecy of Daniel 8:14. (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctuary of the New Covenant is the Tabernacle of God in Heaven. (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ten Commandments. (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The seventh-day Sabbath. (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Papacy Changed the Sabbath. (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repentance and Conversion. (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace to Keep God’s Law. (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perpetuity of Spiritual Gifts. (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleansing of the Sanctuary coincides with the Investigative Judgment. (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A comparison of the two statements (1871, 1931) demonstrates a shifting emphasis within Adventist theology. Clearly the 1931 “Statement of Beliefs” was informed by the earlier 1872 “Statement of Beliefs.” At the same time theological priorities had definitely changed by 1931.

The 1931 list of beliefs was less concerned than the earlier 1872 focus on Bible prophecy (note the exclusion of 1872 beliefs #6, 7, 8). The 1931 statement also demonstrates an increased interest in defining the sanctuary doctrine and confirmed Watson’s recollection of challenges to the sanctuary doctrine by Ballenger (and others) as the primary cause for the new statement of beliefs. The renewed interest and affirmation of the sanctuary doctrine is showcases by how much attention was given to it. The earlier
statement (belief #18 in 1872) was expanded into two separate beliefs (#14 & 16). These
two beliefs formed the largest portion of the 1931 “Statement of Beliefs.”

Other notable theological observations include a trend toward consolidation. The
beliefs of repentance and conversion (#14) and keeping God’s law (#15) in 1872 were
combined into a single belief (#8). Furthermore, the “bodily resurrection” (#21) at the
Second Coming (#22) in 1872 were combined in 1931 into a single belief (#11). These
helped to shorten the overall list.

Also of note were new doctrinal additions in 1931 that included the doctrine of
the “Trinity, or Godhead” (#2), the body as the temple of God as the basis for healthful
living (#17), and tithes and offerings (#18). While the Second Coming was listed
separately, it was largely implied collectively in the other beliefs in the 1872 “Statement
of Beliefs. Merlin D. Burt, director of the Center for Adventist Research, has done a
careful analysis of the development of the Adventist understanding of the Trinity
document, which he argues was largely confirmed with the 1931 *Fundamental Beliefs* even
if some dissonance occurred afterward.21 And finally, the new focus on Adventist
lifestyle along with tithes and offerings (a focus on outward behaviors) corresponded
somewhat with the rise of the historical Fundamentalist movement and a new
preoccupation with Adventist lifestyle in the 1920s and 1930s.

Early efforts to distinguish theological beliefs between Adventist denominations
from 1869 to 1872 gave way eventually to a new set of challenges from within the
Seventh-day Adventist Church in the late 1920s and early 1930s. This led to the adoption
of a new belief (the Trinity), and more significantly, greater clarification about the
sanctuary doctrine. Clearly Seventh-day Adventists were concerned about Ballenger and
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others when they wrote the 1931 “Statement of Beliefs.” The new confession was composed by four people instead of just one. While the editor of the Review and Herald, as in 1872, wrote the primary draft, the process indicates a subtle shift from a private to a more visible and therefore public confession. Now, not only the margins, but the theological center of Adventist beliefs was clearly the sanctuary doctrine, which was clarified and affirmed.

The 1980 Fundamental Beliefs of Seventh-day Adventists

A significant change from the previous two statements of belief (1872, 1931) was the public adoption of the 1980 “Fundamental Beliefs of Seventh-day Adventists” during the 1980 General Conference session in Dallas, Texas. The 1946 resolution by the General Conference in session that no changes to the “Statement of Fundamental Beliefs” as published in the Church Manual created this more public venue. Just like both previous statements of beliefs, the preamble affirmed that “Seventh-day Adventists accept the Bible as their only creed, and hold certain fundamental beliefs to be the teaching of the Holy Scriptures.” The way was left open for possible future revisions.

New challenges arose from an Australian Bible teacher at Pacific Union College, Desmond Ford. In October 1979, during a Friday evening vespers, he questioned whether Hebrews 9 represented a literal sanctuary, and therefore he questioned the Adventist understanding of the sanctuary including the investigative judgment. Ford produced over the next year a 991-page manuscript, Daniel 8:14, the Day of Atonement, and the Investigative Judgment. Church leaders gathered 114 individuals in August 1980 at Glacier View Ranch. Ford was ultimately dismissed as a minister and religion professor.
It was during the tension leading up to this pivotal meeting that the 1980 “Fundamental Beliefs” was voted on April 25, 1980.25 Other challenges centered on the nature of revelation and inspiration, especially as it pertained to the prophetic life and ministry of Ellen G. White. A series of criticisms, most notably by Ronald L. Numbers in his 1976 Prophetess of Health alleged that since divine revelation was not possible, therefore, Ellen G. White must have plagiarized her writings from other health reformers. Others, such as Walter Rea, were especially vociferous in their response as they discovered that Ellen G. White borrowed other authors. For Rea this deconstructed his inerrant understanding of the inspiration of Ellen G. White’s writings. This also contributed much to the dialogue from delegates who were concerned about the implications that the 1980 “Fundamental Beliefs” had for an Adventist understanding of revelation/inspiration.

A contrast of the 1931 and 1980 confessions furthermore showcases Adventist theological priorities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit 2. Comparison of 1931 and 1980 Statements of Beliefs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Holy Scriptures. (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The Godhead, or Trinity” (2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“That Jesus Christ is very God, being of the same nature and essence as the Eternal Father.” (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God the Holy Spirit. (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation. (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The New Birth. (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptism is an ordinance. (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ten Commandments. (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The seventh-day Sabbath. (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ten commandments points out sin, the penalty of which is death, which can only be kept through the “enabling power of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humans are mortal. Only God is immortal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Condition of man in death is one of unconsciousness.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Resurrection both of the just and of the unjust” at Second Coming of Christ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Impenitent . . . reduced to a state of nonexistence”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prophetic period of Daniel 8:14 terminated in 1844.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True sanctuary in heaven was a type and corresponds with judgment phase of Christ’s ministry in heaven.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work of threefold message of Revelation 14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The time of the threefold message corresponds with the investigative judgment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Body is the temple of God and therefore should “abstain from all intoxicating drinks, tobacco, and other narcotics, and to avoid every body and soul-defiling habit and practice.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Divine principle of tithes and offerings for the support of the gospel.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perpetuity of spiritual gifts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Spirit of Prophecy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The Second Coming of Christ is the great hope of the church”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennial reign of Christ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoration of earth at end of Millennium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Great Controversy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Death of Christ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Church.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unity in the Body of Christ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission of the Remnant Church.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ministries of the Church.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage and the Family.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The 1980 “Fundamental Beliefs of Seventh-day Adventists” was an affirmation of much
2 of the 1931, and by extension 1872, statements of beliefs. Similar to the 1931 “Statement

- The Nature of Man. (7)
- Death and Resurrection. (23)
- The Heavenly Sanctuary and the Judgment. (24)
- (included in 16)
- (included in 24)
- Style of Life. (21)
- Stewardship. (20) [Broadening of belief]
- Spiritual Gifts. (14)
- The Second Advent of Christ. (25)
- The Millennium and the End of Sin. (26)
- The New Earth. (27)
of Beliefs” the 1980 “Statement of Fundamental Beliefs” strongly affirmed the doctrine
of the sanctuary. It fact, it synthesized points 13, 14, and 16 into a single doctrinal belief
(#24). The mission of the “threefold message” of Revelation 14 (#20 in 1931) was
broadened to use “Remnant Church” language (1980 belief #16). Other changes include
nuances such as the expansion of the doctrine on baptism (#5) in 1931 to couple it with
the addition of the Lord’s Supper in 1980 (#13). Adventist eschatology was re-
emphasized, similar to the 1872 Statement, by providing a new doctrinal statement on
The Great Controversy (#8). Similarly, Adventist lifestyle concerns were expanded to
include a new and separate doctrine on “Marriage and the Family” (#22).

A significant change in the 1980 statement has largely been observed by Rolf J.
Pöhler in his Continuity and Change in Adventist Teaching (2000) about the development
of a distinctive Adventist ecclesiology. This corresponded, as Malcolm Bull and Keith
Lockhart have astutely noted, with an emphasis on ecclesiology within other religious
traditions. “Adventists were not entirely alone in this since there was a late-twentieth-
century rediscovery of the doctrine of the church on the part of other evangelicals.” For
the 1980 “Fundamental Beliefs” this development corresponded with beliefs in “The
Church” (#11) that defined Christ as the head, “Unity in the Body of Christ” (#12), and
“The Ministries of the Church” (#17). Clearly a new theological priority for Seventh-day
Adventists was ecclesiology. Each of the statements was furthermore written in a much
more relational way as drafters worked to become more intentional to relate doctrines to
actual practice. At the same time the boundaries of orthodoxy were being spelled out.

Soon afterward, Bull and Lockhart observed, this took on tangible form when church
leaders trademarked the name “Seventh-day Adventist” (1981). Denominational leaders
clarified who could or could not use, and therefore benefit, from the official identity of
the church.

Another significant addition to the 1980 statement was a doctrinal statement on
“Creation” (#6) that highlighted new interest into defining origins. The earliest statement
(1872) this was largely assumed as evolution was promptly rejected. The 1931 statement,
following the heyday of the Fundamentalist movement during the 1920s, this was again
simply assumed. Yet by 1980 there were new challenges as thought leaders wrestled
between issues related to science and religion, and questions about the origins of the
earth.

These additions should be juxtaposed against one significant deletion: the anti-
creedal statement that Seventh-day Adventists believed in the “Bible and the Bible alone”
was modified to state that they believed in the “Bible.” The Bible remained the only
creed for Seventh-day Adventists, but Adventists recognized that there different
hermeneutical approaches based upon different presuppositions. This resulted in
differences of beliefs despite being anchored epistemologically in Scripture.

Taken together the 1980 “Fundamental Beliefs” was a strong affirmation of the
1931 “Statement of Beliefs.” Both strongly emphasized the sanctuary doctrine in
response to theological challenges. Both strongly emphasized the Trinity doctrine. And
while not as explicit at first, the 1980 “Fundamental Beliefs” appeared to answer
challenges at the time toward revelation/inspiration. Theological priorities had both
remained the same as well as shifted. Now, not only were the margins more clearly
defined, but the new emphasis on ecclesiology gave more substance to what was within
the boundaries of Adventist theology. Earlier private confessions now received full public scrutiny.

Finally, what are some of the larger patterns in the development of Adventist theology? How do these contribute to unity?

Theological Development and Unity

Seventh-day Adventists have consistently affirmed the Bible as their only creed. This openness toward change, in large part a response to the theological milieu in which Sabbatarian Adventism was born, created a fear of a public creed. The 1872 statement of beliefs by Uriah Smith morphed into a subtly more visible statement of beliefs by a small committee instead of a single individual. This changed after 1946 when the General Conference voted that any future changes must be done in General Conference session, which forced a private declaration to undergo full public scrutiny in 1980. “Perhaps the most astounding and important thing about the 1980 statement of fundamental beliefs is the preamble,” observes Adventist historian George R. Knight, “The preamble not only begins with the historic Adventist statement that ‘Seventh-day Adventists accept the Bible as their only creed and hold certain fundamental beliefs to be the teaching of the Holy Scriptures,’ but also leaves the way open for further revision.”28 One thing that did not change between the three Seventh-day Adventist confessions was a commitment to progressive truth even if the “alone” part was dropped in 1980. Seventh-day Adventists recognized that there were different approaches to the sacred Scriptures, and even recognized that there was more than one way to interpret Scripture, yet at the very heart of Adventist theology was a commitment to the Bible and progressive truth.
All three statements furthermore appear to have been generated in response to theological challenges to the Seventh-day Adventist Church. The first was in response to other Adventist groups, in particular, Miles Grant. The 1931 and 1980 Statements of Beliefs were strong affirmations of the sanctuary doctrine. In a sense the sanctuary doctrine played a unifying role by being the theological focus of these statements of beliefs. Similarly, new challenges from science brought up questions about the origins of the earth. This was resolved by restricting the 1980 statement to biblical language. Both literal Creationists, who adhered to a short time chronology, as well as those who adhered to a much longer time span, discovered that they could live with this language. Thus, these challenges, that began at first from without, later came much more forcefully from within the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

One notable reversal in Adventist theology between 1872 and 1980, as Bull and Lockhart have observed, is the atonement. In 1872 Smith argued that the atonement began on October 22, 1844, but by 1980, there was a strong emphasis on the centrality of the atonement on the cross. This was at least due in large part to the evangelical conferences and publication of *Questions on Doctrine* in 1957. Another notable departure from 1872 to 1980 was the reversal of the Adventist understanding of the Trinity doctrine, especially as it pertained to the full Divinity of Christ and the personhood of the Holy Spirit.

The transition from a private to a public confession demonstrates a need to define the boundaries of Seventh-day Adventist theology. Although denominational pioneers were excluded during the Millerite revival, as the Sabbatarian Adventist movement matured, they were through their interactions with other Adventist groups forced to
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1 exclude others. The exchange between Miles Grant and James White demonstrates a
2 reluctant embrace of confessionalism. Such a statement “inevitably excludes those who
3 disagree with its content.”

4 Later boundaries were defined not from without, but from within. The genesis of
5 the 1931 and 1980 confessions furthermore demonstrates that later confessions were in
6 large part due to internal theological challenges. While Seventh-day Adventists clung to
7 the notion of progressive truth, they increasingly defined the boundaries of orthodoxy.
8 This orthodoxy centered in an affirmation of the core doctrine of the sanctuary. This did
9 not change even as the articulation of beliefs grew from a private declaration (1872) to a
10 full public and voted statement of Fundamental Beliefs (1980). Unity did not require
11 complete uniformity as each statement showcases various theological priorities, but the
12 sanctuary doctrine was a non-negotiable that defined orthodoxy versus heresy.

---
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