

The Desolations of Jerusalem 06

From a Presentation by Duane Dewey 11, 2011

Transcription by Sister Grace

Minor editing for readability by P G Temple

Study on the role of Biblical hermeneutics and inspiration in the Seventh-day Adventist church but before we begin, I will ask, can we please kneel for prayer.

Loving Father in heaven, again we are grateful to be able to come and study these things. Lord we are grateful that You love us, that You have extended to us Your right hand of fellowship. That there is for us One in heaven today who is interceding in our behalf in the Most Holy Place of the Heavenly Sanctuary and that through His mediation today the church is being called to repentance and reform and through His love for us we are able yet to embrace the messages of the First, Second and Third Angels in their order. That through His outpouring of the Latter Rain at the time now that we are in, He is opening up the Little Book and that he is granting to us a view of things that had not yet been able to be seen not only in the history of the Bible itself, but in our own past and in our present. I believe dear Lord that You are guiding the church, and so dear Lord we request this morning that Your guidance will be with us, for those who are hearing and for those that are talking this morning, and that dear Lord that we will submit our will and ourselves to Thee. We pray and ask these blessings in Jesus name, Amen.

Now, this is not a witch hunt. There as a development in the church early on. Let me just read from this article from the Adventist Theological Society, the spring edition of 1994, volume 5, number 1. The writer of this article is Alberto Timm. Brother Timm points out:

“By 1883, Seventh-day Adventists had for about four decades been mainly concerned with defending the divine inspiration of the Bible from *outside* infidel challenges (*This article is about inspiration*). However, some *internal* crises regarding the nature and authority of Ellen White’s writings pushed Seventh-day Adventists in the 1800s into a more thoughtful discussion of the doctrine. During that period two major questions were raised: (1) Are there *degrees* of inspiration? and (2) did the Holy Spirit dictate the actual *words* of the inspired writings?” {Adventist Theological Society Volume 5, Number 1, Spring, 1994}

“*Are There Degrees of Inspiration?* Administrative problems and conflicts of personality at Battle Creek College led Ellen White to send a few testimonies to Uriah Smith, editor of the *Review* and president of the college board, reproving him for some unwise decisions.

“Resentment against such reproofs was one factor that led (*Uriah*) Smith to the assumption that not all Ellen White writings were equally inspired. By the Spring of 1883 Smith was convinced that while Mrs. White’s visions were truly inspired, her testimonies were not.” Ibid

Now that’s a problem; a serious development. This is at the time he was the editor of the *Review* and head of the Battle Creek College. That was 1883/4. Now it says:

“It seems that to harmonize such quarrels about the trustworthiness of Ellen White’s testimonies, George I. Butler, General Conference president (*now I don’t think that you can get any higher than a General Conference president and the Editor of the Review and the head of Battle Creek College in those years. You were at the top of the list of leadership in the church*), wrote for the *Review* a series of ten articles on Inspiration, in which he sought to provide a biblical rationale for the theory of degrees of inspiration. According to E. K. Vande Vere, if Butler could show that the Bible contained human elements, then by implication, the Testimonies contained many more human elements (*this argument for Prescott would make him suspect the*

writing of Ellen White because she was a human) and could not be regarded as absolutely perfect.” Ibid

In other words, the Bible writers themselves, because they were human, that meant that you had to look at the Bible and be suspicious that it was not all divinely inspired, and many people look at the writings of Ellen White that way to this day, and they also view the Bible the same way. This was the beginning of the trouble in the church, well there was some other trouble ahead of that, but the earlier trouble led to this. It says:

“Assuming that inspiration varies according to the various forms of revelation, Butler argued that the Scriptures are inspired just in the degree that the person is inspired who writes them”
Ibid.

Later on, he would declare which books of the Bible were inspired. He gave them categories of inspiration; which was the most inspired, then the second most inspired, and then the final list that were not inspired at all. So Butler had the audacity to tell the church that, in the Review, in ten articles. Not one or two articles, but ten, that certain portions in the Bible could not be trusted to be divinely inspired. That’s from the journal of Adventist Theological Society Volume 5, Number 1, spring of 1994; ‘History and Inspiration in the Adventist Church’.

Now in the same volume, there is another article by P Gerard Damsteegt and it’s entitled ‘The Inspiration of Scripture and the Writings of Ellen G White’. He reflects on the same history that Timm does, and both men bring together the fact that this is the atmosphere that was set just prior to the General Conference in Minneapolis in 1888. So going in to the General Conference in Minneapolis in 1888, the brethren had been prepared to reject the testimony of Ellen White, and they had been prepared to reject the testimony of the Bible as given through the studies of Waggoner and Jones. That’s the reality.

The fruition of all this would later appear in the early 1919 Bible Conference that was headed by W.W. Prescott, and from it, this book, ‘The Doctrine of Christ’, would be produced.

This is from ‘Movement of Destiny’ by Leroy Froom, and is a discussion on the book, ‘The Doctrine of Christ’. “In reality this book is an echo or an extension of the 1888 Minneapolis Conference.” He feels that this is the result of the answer to the message of Waggoner and Jones that was delivered in Minneapolis in 1888. Let me just read something here leading up to the 1919 Bible Conference.

But before I do that, I wanted to show you something in Author White’s letter. Now this is a little disturbing when I read this the first time but nevertheless, here we go. He says...

“Just what place the views on inspiration held by Prescott at one time or another may have had, as related to his 1915 letter cannot be clearly determined (*I believe it can be, but Author White is giving him the benefit of the doubt*). It is a fact that at the 1919 Bible and history teachers meeting, Elder Prescott disavowed holding a rigid verbal inspiration concept when it comes to E. G. White writings, but he did not disclose his position as a whole and there may have been another factor, his relationship to the 1911 edition of the Great Controversy. In early 1910 C. H. Jones and Pacific press called the attention of W.C White and the staff working at Elmshaven to the fact that the printing plates of the Great Controversy were worn out and the type for the book had to be reset. Workers began in a routine way. Ellen White would write Letter 56, 1911. ‘When I learned that the Great Controversy must be reset, I determined that we would have everything closely examined to see if the truths it contained were stated in the very best

manner, to convince those not of our faith, that the Lord had guided and sustained me in the writing of its pages” {Letter by Author White}

I thought that was quite interesting; she wanted the truth and she wanted it also to be clear, and one of the reasons why, is that they would be guided to learn, so that they would be sustained in that the Lord had guided her in the writing of its pages. It wasn't to correct the book of errors for any kind. It was not to correct history mistakes or anything of that sort.

As W. W. Prescott was editor of the Protestant Magazine, page 254 of Gilbert Valentine's book on Prescott, entitled 'W. W. Prescott, A Giant in Adventism'. I want to read to you something about Protestant Magazine about circulation problems and untimely end, eventually the Protestant Magazine met its end for various reasons, but he says here:

“The saga of the 'Daily' continued to dog his step (meaning Prescott), although Prescott had been careful not to specially raise the 'Daily' issue or even exegete Dan 8:11-13 in the Protestant Magazine, the whole underlined theological rationale of the journal, nevertheless derived from the new view. Prescott's basic approach involved contrasting the Catholic mass which took away the need for Christ's high priestly work with the true gospel, the continual mediation of Christ. The Advent church with its emphasis on the priesthood of Christ he asserted had been raised up prophetically, Dan 8:13 to restore this essential truth” {W.W Prescott, A giant in Adventism' page 254}

Now this is not true, what this writer is saying is that we were raised up and we have learned that Christ went into the Most Holy Place and part of this is true. But his assertion about the 'Daily' and his connection with it, to the raising up of these truths, is not true, concerning the 'Daily'. It says:

“The thrust of the magazine rested on this premise and this premise alone (*meaning, Christ's high priestly ministration in the sanctuary is the 'Daily', being replaced by the mass*) and the professor's opponents understood it clearly, there were some that were not ignorant of this ploy. J.S. Washburn for example was particularly antagonistic and conducted a bitter personal campaign against the magazine and its editors throughout the Columbia Union Conference (*Amen*)” {W.W Prescott, A giant in Adventism' page 254}

So now we are going to look at some details. Author White knows about this in some detail because he is mentioning it now in this paper.

“As W.W. Prescott was editor of the Protestant Magazine, it was logical that he, with others, should be asked to participate in such an examination of this book which had a good deal to say about the Catholic Church.”

You can read in this book all about it. It tells you how Prescott designed the magazine, what it was for and so forth.

“W. C. White presented the matter to Prescott in early April of 1910.”

We need to recognize this date. This is the date that Ellen White would write to these men and tell them to leave the 'Daily' alone.

“In a personal visit when he was Washington on April 26th Prescott sent in his report”
{Unknown reference}

What that means is she was telling them in her testimony to those men, they were not to be changing the books, and so their efforts to get contact with him to help them in this revision of the Great Controversy, was not to change its contents, but to ask him about some historical statements that were

made to see if they were accurate, that is all it was for. It was not meant to place him as the arbitrator of what should, and should not be, put in the Spirit of Prophecy; but nevertheless:

“On April the 26th Prescott sent in his report (it says here that you can receive a copy of this for \$2 by contacting the White estate) about half of his suggestions might be classified as minor, such as having to do with a precision of wording or calling for a supporting reference. The other half were more significant, some challenging prophetic dates.” {Unknown reference}

I want you to notice this. There were some minor things but now he says the other half were more significant, more challenging, for instance challenging the prophetic dates. Prescott did not believe that the 2300 days began in 457 BC. Prescott did not believe that 538 was the beginning of the reign of the papacy. He believed that it happened two centuries later and this was in his report that he sent. The other half, such as the dating of the 1260 years, that's the 538 date, and calling into the question the autumn termination of the 2300 day prophecy.

You have to ask yourself a serious question here, if you are Willy White and the gang at Elmshaven and your going to redo the Great Controversy and you get the best Bible scholar we have in the denomination sending in reports like that, you might as yourself the question, what is wrong with this man? But they didn't ask that question. So it goes on:

“His suggestions which called for a change of the teachings in the book were not accepted (Amen) the relation of Revelation 9 to Josiah Litch's prediction of August 11th 1840 and Revelation 11 having to do with the two witnesses and the French Revolution were also not excepted (he wanted to change all of that—pull it out—not accurate—get rid of it.). These were carefully reviewed for soundness of position and buttressed with reliable documentation, (He had presented his history that he thought was correct) all presented with reliable documentation” {Unknown reference}

What he means by reliable doesn't mean that its true, it means that you can go and find the source which he was quoting, that is what they mean by reliable. It doesn't mean that it had anything to do with the truth at all. He had his primary source documentation.

“One point that Prescott considered particularly significant, had to do with statement on page 382-383 concerning the apostate Protestant churches, in which case the word “alone” was added to bring the immediate E.G. White statement into harmony with the chapter and the book as a whole, so they was a little minor change there. Ellen White and the staff at Elmshaven saw that the insertion of that word “alone” as a very natural step and one of not so great significance. Prescott saw it as a major change in Ellen White's teaching, and in later years used this incident to indicate the teachings of the Great Controversy were changed under his suggestion and guidance.” {Unknown reference}

He did that at the 1919 Bible Conference. The way that took place was, they held the conference for a two week time period, and after the Bible Conference was held, then they did an ad hoc Bible teachers' conference on the tail end of that. At the ad hoc Bible teachers conference after the Bible Conference, there was a little bit of a surprise added to their Bible teachers' conference, because Prescott would teach on his ideas of the corrections that needed to be made in the Spirit of Prophecy and that's when the fur hit the fan. (stirred up trouble) That's when Washburn and others that where present, those men who stood on the validity of the Spirit of Prophecy, they protested in a very serious manner. A. G. Daniells had to come to the defence of W.W. Prescott and quite the thing down. It was rough going for Prescott that morning. For Prescott it was all a big misunderstanding, because he thought that they didn't understand him. Those men understood quite well where he was going.

You know they began early on making compilations of Ellen White's books and to my surprise the first person that did so was W. W. Prescott; and would you like to know which book that might be? It is the book on Christian Education published in 1892, that is all compiled by W. W. Prescott. It is the first edition of Christian Education; there are two. There was a later one produced but this is the first one.

"He was in Australia for 10 months in the mid 1890's and was at Cooranbong, where Ellen White resided, much of that time. Perhaps it was here where he learned more of the procedures practised in making her books."

Now this is in relationship to his statement in the letter that "for many years we know that there are corrections that need to be made that we withheld from the people". Remember we read it in the letter that he wrote to Willy White? "You know I have discussed this with you many times now Willy but it is too late now, you never respond, you are cooperating with me and your not doing anything about the errors that you know exist." Those errors that Prescott is referring to are errors both within the denominational books and the errors that he perceived which was in the confines of the writings of Ellen White.

That's the thing that was really disturbing Prescott, that these questions were not being answered. This was 1915. Now it can't be lost on us for those who studying these things to recognise that he had got counsel to leave these things alone in 1910 but by 1915 it is still irritating him, and according to the letter that we read, he is highly discouraged from it. He is complaining that he served the church faithfully for all these years and this is what he gets for all his trouble. Well, some of this I can't quite fathom, in dealing with what I've been reading; how some of us can figure this guy is a hero, I can never understand. And then how can the people in history on the day that this was taking place? I don't understand some of this, but nevertheless this is what I have been reading. It says:

"While his counsel may have been sought in the arrangement in some of the material in the *Desire of Ages* (*did you know that?*) he did none of the writing (*One of the best book I have ever read, and I now find out that he also helped in the arrangement of the material of the Desire of Ages while he was in Australia. What this is allowing you to see, is why he thinks he has the right or the authority to recommend changes in the writings of Ellen White. So he believes he is qualified.*) While his counsel was sought in identifying some of the royal characters brought to the front in articles prepared in 1907 on Ezra and the return of the Jews, this was no different from her usual procedure as set forth in her introduction the Great Controversy, and referred to by W.C White in his statements that Ellen White did not claim to be an authority on the details of history and that she valued highly the work of careful historians" {Unknown reference}

W. C White in writing this explanatory letter about the two letters that we read earlier, one from Willy White to Prescott and then from Prescott back to Willy. notice the link here; He says:

"In 1936, that W.C White addresses the advanced Bible school..." {Unknown reference}

Now this is one of the controversies that came out of the 1919 Bible Conference, and the ad hoc Bible workers' meeting afterwards, was a question of the inspiration of Ellen White, which is still with us today. By 1936 the thing is still raging within the denomination, and in 1936, a year before Willy White's death, after the poor brother White has gone through the trauma of having Elmshaven taken out from underneath him by the General Conference, they ask him to go and do an address to the advanced Bible school at PUC. Now if you remember from our earlier talks, the advanced Bible school was the first step towards eventually making a new theological seminary.

It's at the advanced Bible school where we first introduce into the church this system of historical method of Biblical interpretation. And it's now here at this place in 1936 that Willy White goes to

explain to these men at PUC at the new Advanced Bible school on how to understand the inspiration of the writings of Ellen White. Now, there is a connecting link here and I haven't read it yet but I am sure that Raymond Cottrell knew this link but it says:

"In 1936, that W.C White he addressed the advanced Bible school, the forerunner of the Seventh-day Adventist Seminary contained a great deal of helpful information on how the books were made" {Unknown reference}

So by 1936 they were still questioning Ellen White's authority as being inspired and they sent him up here to this new advanced Bible school at PUC which would eventually become the Adventist Theological seminary to explain to these gentlemen various clarifications in no uncertain terms in regards to his mother's work

"Then from time to time, his correspondence with leading men was informative. One such letter in 1928 to L. E. Froom (*meaning from Willy*) associate secretary of ministerial association clothed with words which he indicated he had rather expected a general use would be made of the information set forth. He wrote, "Please read this statement to Elder Daniels and if you observe that in my haste I have left matters so that it can be easily misunderstood, please point this out to me and give me an opportunity to strengthen the matter before it is placed by you before others of your brethren" {Unknown reference}

In other words if Willy White had made a statement that was unclear, he wanted to be notified before anything got out to the brethren, especially in regards to the subject of inspiration. He had send a letter to Froom requesting saying, "Look if I send you something that you cannot understand or it's a bit vague, let me know right away so that I can strengthen it" – especially on the subject of inspiration. The matter was to be given from Froom to Daniells.

Now it's interesting to note W.C White in the 1919 Bible Conference:

"W.C. White and the 1919 Bible Conference: It was during this time that the 1919 Bible Conference was held across the continent. July 1st -22nd followed by an informal meeting by Bible and history teachers. W.C White received an invitation to attend the Bible conference but not the meeting of the Bible history teachers (*now this is important, he was invited to the conference but not the teachers' meeting*) W. E. Howell secretary of the department of education, not A.G Daniells President of the General Conference or W.A Spicer, Secretary of the General Conference sent out an invitation to attend (*so the man who sent out the invitation was W. E. Howell*). That White should receive an invitation was somewhat of a formality as he was a member of the General Conference Committee. The authorising action which Howell enclosed with his mimeographed invitation presented the authorisation for the meeting taking at the spring counsel. We recommend that a Bible conference of representative workers be held for a period of three weeks from July 1st -22nd of the year 1919." {Unknown reference}

This is what the invitation would state. These are the subjects that they would take up, the person of Christ, the mediatorial work of Christ, the nature and the work of the Holy Spirit, the two covenants, the principles of prophetic interpretation (and I have read those, they are interesting). Eastern question, beast power of revelation, 1260 days, United States in prophecy, seven trumpets and Matthew 24. These were some of the subjects that they would take up at the 1919 Bible Conference, there were more but this was what was on the invitational list.

"Then at the conclusion of this conference the Bible and history teachers remained together another three weeks to work on constructive teaching plans. Action on Bible conference adapted by spring counsel attached E. W Howell, letter to brother so and so."

“Now we repeat, Elder W.C White working on the west coast and not a Bible teacher was, as a member of the General Conference Committee, authorised to attend the Bible conference, but not the informal meeting which followed, and at which meeting the two day’s discussion of Ellen White and her work was spontaneously introduced as reported in the minutes that have now been published.” {Unknown reference}

When I read that, I didn’t know that, that got me really looking in some books. So I looked in these books I had and sure enough.

Briefly what happened was, sometime around 1981 Ron Graybil was doing research at the Review and Herald at the archives. I don’t know what Ron was looking for. He is a Seventh-day Adventist historian, he is still in the denomination, I don’t know where he’s at today. this was back in the 70’s and some time in that history, in his rummaging through the archives, this man found the complete intact transcripts of the 1919 Bible Conference. That is why this man says here that they are now published. You can find all that documentation at www.adventistdirectory.org

When I said a minute ago that I read this subject here on the principles of prophetic interpretation, that is where I read them. I got them off the net. The 1919 Bible Conference, you can just download it all, its 1300 pages. So in that 1300 pages, you have a concise view of what has happened to Adventism. There you can be with Nehemiah on the mule and you can go out at night and you can view the desolation of Jerusalem. That is where you can see what is really taking place in Adventism. That is where you can really hear the voice of Jeremiah pleading with Zedekiah before the city is taken by the King of the North.

“As W.C White read the agenda and the arrangements for the Bible conference, he felt that he would like to attend the meeting, even though he saw no compelling reason to go.” {Unknown reference}

In other words, he found an excuse not to go, even though he got invited, it goes on to say that from the year 1915 when his mother died to 1919, he was virtually left alone at Elmshaven without even a secretary to help him. He was completely isolated from the brethren, left to dangle on the end of the string. Now Brother White says that this is due to circumstances and not related to decisions that people made but when I read it, it broke my heart. Nevertheless, my wife read it too and she said that it was one of the saddest things she has ever read. So, poor Brother White was finding reasons not to go and one of the reasons probably deep down inside was that they had forgotten about him. He only got the letter because it had went out to everybody, no body called him on the phone, A. G Daniells, nobody got a hold of him for this press meeting

“He was being pressed by men bearing heavy burdens in the medical work who were asking him that a book be compiled from his mother’s writings containing counsels on medical work (*So this is why he didn’t attend, he was home doing this work*). D.E Robinson who was sometimes assisting Brother White (*he did have a little assistance, later they did give him some secretarial assistance and Brother D.E Robinson was also helping him but earlier on he was doing all the work by himself after his mother died*) A member of the editorial staff of the southern publishing association did attend the Bible conference as authorised but not the informal meeting of Bible and history teachers which followed.” {Unknown reference}

D. E Robinson was probably as much an authority on Ellen White writings as was Willy White but neither one of them made it to the Bible workers’ meeting.

“Had either Robinson or Brother White or both been present, they would have made a valuable contribution to the discussion of Ellen White’s work.”

Had they been present, they could have brought forth a good deal of useful information and countered a number of misleading and in some cases, ridiculous statement made in an informal discussion. It is certain that Daniells had anticipated the two day discussion on Ellen White and her work, he would have insisted that they be there. During the 1920's there were some improvements in understating and relationships, conditions were bettered only little. Elmhaven was still isolated and W.C White was largely forgotten. Under these circumstances, how could he of the White Estate make a meaningful contribution and impart useful information on inspiration and the work of Ellen White? The situation probably would have been quite different had the office been in Washington DC with Willy White rubbing shoulders with leading men engaged in various lines of administrative work. Circumstances are blame for all of this and not men. We will leave to him the benefit of the doubt.

"While the men attending the bible and history teachers meeting in 1919 raised certain questions and there were some interesting discussions, it is doubtful that W.C White in his isolation was ever even made aware of what took place. So far I have failed to find any such evidence that he was. I was called with my Father W.C. White (*he is telling himself that he worked alone too after his father died*) D.E Robinson was called to Washington to assist in the work with the White Estate but it was not until three or four years ago (*this is really important*) While the men attending the Bible and history teachers meeting in 1919 raised certain questions and there were some interesting discussions, it is doubtful that W.C White in his isolation was even made aware of what took place. So far I have failed to find any such evidence. I was called to work with my father W.C White in Elmhaven in 1929 – following his death in 1937 I was asked to take his place on the board of trustees, I was asked to move the files and work in Washington. I worked alone at first but was given secretarial help and then in order to help carry certain tasks to completion, Elder D.E Robinson was called to Washington to assist in the work of the White Estate. But it was not until three or four years ago (*he wrote this in 1981*) when the minutes of the meeting of the Bible history teachers in 1919 were uncovered and made public that I was aware of the 1919 meeting, neither my Father or D.E Robinson ever mentioned it. So while W.W. Prescott expressed his concerns in 1915 and laid the responsibility for what he spoke of as misconceptions on the shoulders of W.C White (*that's that letter*) there was some history related to it." {Unknown reference}

"In 1915 Prescott was known to see some things from a different way from the understating of his brethren but the atmosphere was not then favourable for W.C White concerned with the approach death of his mother and the closing up of the major operations of work at Elmhaven and then soon working alone to launch out on a crusade to help better the understanding of the inspiration and work of his mother. While certain seeming problems were aired at the 1919 meeting, the one who could have made the most constructive contribution was not in on the discussion and nothing was done following the meeting. The brethren were soon deeply involved in other tasks and did nothing. In the late 1920's the ministerial association was formed and then L. E. Froom the associate secretary began to probe W.C White on some with questions as is evidence by White's letters to him. Some of these are now published in the appendix of Selected Messages book three. As men studied, materials which were unknown of virtually so began to come to the front at Pacific Union College. An excellent course on the Spirit of Prophecy were introduced by Doctor Mary McReynolds but it was years before other colleges provided such courses. In the early 1930's elder A.G Daniells chairman of the board of the trustees of the White Estate was moved to the west coast where he could easily chair the board of the college of medical evangelists at the Pacific Press" {Unknown reference}

This is mentioned in this book here, this is 'The struggle for the prophetic heritage' Willy White and Elder Watson the president of the general conference on the cover. This man was president in these years and it was when Daniells was moved to the west coast he was the liaison also for the General Conference in relationship to Willy White to begin the work these two men would do to remove the controlling factor from Willy White's hand of the White Estate and take it into the General Conference. These histories are all tied together. It becomes a little complex but if you read this stuff, it's not so complex.

"The assistant secretary of Author White was asked by the editor of ministry to furnish articles of Ellen White work and the work of the White Estate what appeared in the ministry was eventually republished in a permanent book form 'Ellen G White: messenger of the remnant'."
{Unknown reference}

How many of you have ever seen the book 'Ellen G White: messenger of the remnant'? That was done over these issues, that is why that book is in existence and it is in relationship to this letter that Willy White wrote to Prescott and Prescott wrote back. In the letter Prescott is telling about his disapproval of White not responding to his fact that there is errors in our books and especially the errors in his mother's books. So this was an issue for Prescott. This is a W.C White response on May 7th of 1915.

"Though pressed hard with the many things calling for attention during Ellen White's last few weeks of life, W.C White took time on May 7th to write the kind letter to W.W Prescott, after an opening paragraph on Ellen White's state of health and welfare, White addressed himself first to Prescott opening paragraphs to which he expressed some despondent feeling over the difficulty of warning the whole world of the impended second advent, he wrote:

"Referring to your letter, I have often in past years been perplexed over the questions as to how our message is to reach the people of heathen lands but I see the marvellous things that God is doing in Oriental countries (*he had been there by the way*) it seems to me that the evidence of his power is as great as in the past years. We never have been able to figure out how the work could be closed up but I continue to believe that with God it is possible in ways in which I do not understand." {W.C White to W.W. Prescott May 7th 1915}

Then coming to the point which formed the core of the Prescott letter of April 15th W.C White writes...

The core of that letter of Prescott was to sadness over the errors in our publications and the errors in what he perceived in Ellen White's writings, that was the core of the letter and he was telling Willy that it does me no good to discuss it with you anymore because you are not responding in a positive way. He is telling Willy that you are not doing anything about these errors. Willy says:

"I sincerely wish Brother Prescott that I were an educated man (*this reminds me of Isaiah*), a student and that my time can be used to studying with you those historical matter to what you have given such diligent attention in which in your estimation call for decided changes in our books (*that means both non-Ellen White books and in Sister White's books, he is covering all of Prescott's concerns*). My work is of a different character and it is of no use to me to under into different arguments regarding historical dates which I am not familiar. I am praying that God will bless those who have opportunity to conduct this study and that they may see light in His light (*God's light*). As you know my experience has been such as to lead me to have great confidence in the great Advent movement of 1844 and to have great confidence that God has led His people in the development of the Seventh-day Adventist denomination and I am hoping and expecting that a further study of history will develop confidence in the work which God has done through revelation given to my mother and correcting those extravagant and fanatical views regarding her work which are injurious to Christian experience and to the advancement. I have felt that it was my duty to be cautious in the matter of making statements that are liable to

be misrepresented and misunderstood. My feelings regarding this were considerably confirmed by the experience of the counsel meeting in Washington in the autumn of 1913." {W.C White to W.W. Prescott May 7th 1915}

And then referring to Prescott's experience White wrote understandingly:

"I have no sympathy with those harsh and misguided men who are plowing up and down on your back because you are not doing what they would like to see you do or saying what they would like to hear you say. Not until the judgment will be known how earnestly I have endeavoured to persuade these men to drop their burden" {W.C White to W.W. Prescott May 7th 1915}

"W.C White's closing paragraph indicated clearly his longing for unity among the brethren:

"Praying that God may save us from error, from misunderstanding and that He will hasten the time when those who are bearing burdens in the work will see eye to eye" {W.C White to W.W. Prescott May 7th 1915}

That is the hope of the ministry here at 'Future for America' too, but I believe that a correct understanding of history will aid all of us in the understanding of these issues. But it says here:

"We have found no record of Prescott answered this sympathetic letter." {W.C White to W.W. Prescott May 7th 1915}

Prescott did not return a response to that letter.

"Before leaving W.W Prescott, it should be said that some time in 1915 the General Conference appointed him a General Field Secretary a position he held until 1937. During this time he called to serve in 1922 to briefly as the President of the Australian Missionary College, next he became President of the Union College and later head of the Bible department."

Later that is what he would be removed from under the experience of Elder Branson.

"Serving from 1924 to 1928 after a world tour in 1930 he became the head of the Bible department of Emmanuel Missionary College until 1934, he died in 1944. Elder W.C White wrote kindly and well in 1931 Prescott in his divergent views in a letter to one who had studied under him and was now raising question as to his orthodoxy. W.C White wrote:

"I too have been greatly blessed by Elder Prescott's teachings and ministry and I always loved to hear him speak. I am truly sorry that anyone should say that Elder Prescott teaches heresy. I think there are some things which he teaches regarding the prophetic dates that many of our other ministers, teachers to not accept (*I could agree with that*). And many others that I highly regard, question very seriously that part of his teaching which seems to unsettle a few of the historical dates that our minister have used heretofore in their expositions of the prophecies. And so Elder Prescott is not he only one who is respected loved and listened to that teaches differently than his bother and son matters of not the greatest importance. I do not think that we should accuse such men of teaching heresy (*that is Willy White's opinion*). Sister White highly regarded her ministering brethren and it was her wish that their influence should be carefully guarded by us all" {W.C White to Miss Hilda Gunther, February 20th 1931}

I don't know who Hilda was but W.C. White wrote that to her. Now this is now some more on Prescott and his relation to the book 'The doctrine of Christ'. This says:

"The idea appealed to Prescott ever since his days as Education Secretary of the General Conference, he had wanted to do something possible to educate the ministry. His South American trip in 1916 had sharpened his interest, it had made him accurately aware that while

ministers and other he met could ably present and defend church doctrines, they were not able to do so in a way that pointed people to Christ. They might change the thinking of those already Christian but there were not able to convert the unsaved. It concerned Prescott greatly that Adventists preaching still lacked at Christio-centric salvic focus.” {Unknown reference}

Now we mentioned earlier that some of this material is from a very liberal slant. Now there is no way that if you give these messages that the pioneers gave, that they are not salvational, they are salvational and they present Christ as a living Savior, because he is preparing a people to meet Him when He comes. But the writer of this book and Prescott didn't believe that that was so. They thought that there was no Christ in these messages, they thought Christ is not here, and that is what this writer here is reflecting.

“He felt strongly enough to write out some positive suggestions on the question of Fredrick Griggs, the General Conference education secretary. Griggs in turn, circulated the professor's letters around Bible departments and various colleges. At the same time, Prescott had begun a work on a college text book, 'The doctrine of Christ'. The book would serve as a basis for educating ministers to have a Christio-centric understanding of church doctrine.:

This is the foundation by which they would pull Christ out of the Third Angel's Message and they would put Christ in an evangelical gospel and spoon feed it to Adventism. That is what this does.

“Now as he thought about it, the opportunity of presenting the material at ministerial institutes throughout the Asiatic division would give him the chance to refine and field test it (*so what he does now, he takes this idea that is in this book, and he take it to Asia and he field tests it*). On December 27th 1917 after an impressive public farewell by his colleagues, Prescott and his wife sailed to China” {Unknown reference}

While there, some of the Chinese brethren said to him, “It's too complicated Brother Prescott, we don't understand”. Now in other places he got better reports, but nevertheless he got good and bad reports on his approach.

“He travelled to Manchurian, Korea Japan Shang Hai - and Singapore and the schedule set aside six weeks for him to give special instruction to the ministerial students at the Chinese mission training school and three months of developing publications. The time he completed his duty, every evangelist and instructor in the division had sat at his feet.” {Unknown reference}

Now we are talking about, between this man's influence and the influence of Bother Cottrell on heels of it. This man died in 1946 and from 1942 to 1952. The year 1946 was the prime time when the BRF was really getting going full steam, and from the influence of both these pieces of history, this is what you are previewing today as you look over the landscape of Adventism and what you are looking at is the desolation of Jerusalem in no uncertain terms. That is why people don't know the Third Angel's Message today in Adventism.

Now I am the first to admit that Ellen White says in the 1888 time frame, she makes the statement that we have preached the law until we are as dry as the hills of Gilboah, I stand on the testimony of the prophet. But that does not mean that we are to take a Christio-centric doctrine and throw everything else to the history of the Adventist ash can and dispose of it. That is not what she is saying. But what she is saying is that the righteousness of Christ is in this message, has been in this message, and has always been in the message, and what we need to preach is the righteousness of Christ in the Third Angel's Message. And she says that the righteousness of Christ is the Third Angel's Message in verity. But that is not how Brother Prescott saw it. He saw it as a bunch of mathematical calculations devoid of anything to do with Christio-centric religion, and he was determined to put Christ in it. And in the long run, what he

has done is taken Christ out of the Third Angel's Message because they (think they) have Christ, but they don't have the Third Angel's Message.

"Prescott did not complete the two full years in Asia as originally planned, with a cessation of hostilities and late 1918 at the end of the war, the church needed to make major administrative decisions delayed by the war. In addition, the General Conference had planned a series of important meetings, the war had also postponed. After conducting his last institute in Singapore on March, he headed home. Prescott was eager to be back at head quarters.

"The year 1919 in fact turned out to be a year of conferences, six in all the most notable and most significant retrospect was the Bible Conference. Prescott missed the first set of meetings, a bookman's convention in early April (*not the Bible conference but he was talking about other things that went on that year*) but he participated prominently in all the rest. The education convention in late April two days after he arrived home, the evangelist convocation in May, the editor's convocation in June and the bible and history teachers counsel in July.

"Prescott led the convention for editors, a first for the church. He had a long cherished dream to bring denominational editors together to deal with the kind of issues that had risen during his Protestant Magazine years. He also played a prominent part in the Bible conference (*so when you went to these conference, you were listening to Prescott, no matter which one you attended, it was W.W. Prescott*) which as noted was undoubtedly the most significant meeting of the year, (*the Bible Conference.*) Full verbatim transcripts, more than 1300 pages of typed script of the meeting, offer valuable insight both into Prescott's preaching and into an important stage of the theological development of the Seventh-day Adventist church." {Unknown reference}

From these manuscripts that you can read on that website, you can do just like Nehemiah did, get on your mule at night and you can go out and view the damage that the enemy has done and you can take a good look at Adventism. Ellen White describes it as the desolation of Jerusalem in Prophets and Kings Page 636. Let me read that and we will close with that.

Now let me emphasize that the most important thing as Seventh-day Adventists today is to – if anybody knows the vision of the little green cords in the Testimonies, if you know the story of Ellen White's vision of the midnight cry, our job is to stay on the path, and not get off, but certain things are going to have to go on our way. Well the things that are going to go, and more than that; the path is going to get very narrow, if you read the vision of the green cord very closely, before we are out of this world, it is going to become close. But for Nehemiah as he knew that his work needed to be done. It was a serious work, this is what she says:

"On the third night after his arrival Nehemiah rose at midnight (*I thought that was apropos, there is a midnight in this history, it's called the midnight cry*) and with a few trusted companions went out to view for himself the desolation of Jerusalem. Mounted on his mule, he passed from one part of the city to another, surveying the broken-down walls and gates of the city of his fathers. Painful reflections filled the mind of the Jewish patriot as with sorrow-stricken heart he gazed upon the ruined defenses of his beloved Jerusalem." {PK 636.3}

And I would submit to you that we can view for ourselves the ruined defenses of our beloved Jerusalem. When you toss these in the ash can of history, you have no defense, you're done. You can preach Christ until the cows come home, but if you don't have the Third Angel's Message and Christ together, you're finished. Shall we pray?

Loving Father in heaven, Lord there is only One who knows the end from the beginning, and Lord, You also know us all by name, You know more about us than we do ourselves, and surely You were with

Nehemiah as he viewed the desolation of Jerusalem. You had sent him and You gave him wisdom to know what to do.

And dear Lord there is no doubt that we need wisdom, no doubt at all. So dear Lord we pray that You will give wisdom to those who are studying these things. Daniel says that the wise shall understand, and so dear Lord, You will help us to recognise our Laodicean condition and that You will give us, dear Lord, Your Spirit in abundance, that we can see clearly for ourselves, and give us the desire to know these things for ourselves, and not take the word of anyone.

They can't take my word, but they can surely reply upon You, the Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy. And so dear Lord, we ask that those who are listening to these talks, can consider how close it must be between Christ and the individual. Very soon, not too far distant, there will be an experience faced by those who remain loyal to the First, Second and Third Angels' Messages that will test very fibre of their being, and unless we are prepared, we are going to capitulate as did Zedekiah when he was offered that one last chance before the king of the north swept down over Jerusalem. Please help us dear Lord to understand these great truths and the impact it means on our own lives and the lives of our families. We ask for these blessings in Jesus name. Amen.