

The Desolations of Jerusalem 07

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, we thank You so much for Your love and Your care, thank You for being with us throughout the week. In America today, we are celebrating Thanksgiving Day. In America we have all these freedoms, because of the Glorious Land. It is here that You brought forth the Third Angel's Message in all its power and glory. We pray dear Lord this morning, that the same One that has given this land of freedom to the church that it might grow and prosper, will still be with her here in these last few moments of earth's history and that You will bless us mightily as we look into the history of these events and the history of Adventism, that we will see for ourselves that Your hand is under the wheels that Ezekiel saw, and that You will be with us this morning as we lean upon Your mighty arms and that Lord, You will be our instructor this morning. Bless us we pray, bless those who are listening, bless those who are here, and bless me the speaker, that we might surrender ourselves to Thee. I pray and ask Thee for these blessings this morning in Jesus name, Amen.

This morning we are going to start with a Bible text in Daniel chapter nine, it's appropriate, verses one through nine. Daniel prayed in his dilemma, in his captivity in Babylon, Daniel saw the invading armies of Nebuchadnezzar up close, as a very young man he was taken, he was castrated, taken as a slave into the service of king Nebuchadnezzar. But in the end of his experience there after going through many things, in his desire to know the truth concerning the people of God and their return from the Babylonian captivity, Daniel prayed this prayer and we are going to go over it this morning briefly.

Daniel 9:1-9. "In the first year of Darius the son of Ahasuerus, of the seed of the Medes, which was made king over the realm of the Chaldeans; 2. In the first year of his reign I Daniel understood by books the number of the years, whereof the word of the LORD came to Jeremiah the prophet, that he would accomplish seventy years in the desolations of Jerusalem. 3. And I set my face unto the Lord God, to seek by prayer and supplications, with fasting, and sackcloth, and ashes: 4. And I prayed unto the LORD my God, and made my confession, and said, O Lord, the great and dreadful God, keeping the covenant and mercy to them that love him, and to them that keep his commandments;"

This is reminiscent of the third angel's message and Revelation chapter fourteen; the same phrase is used 'keep his commandments'.

Daniel 9:5. "We have sinned, and have committed iniquity, and have done wickedly, and have rebelled, even by departing from thy precepts and from thy judgments: 6. Neither have we hearkened unto thy servants the prophets, which spake in thy name to our kings, our princes, and our fathers, and to all the people of the land. 7. O Lord, righteousness *belongeth* unto thee, but unto us confusion of faces, as at this day; to the men of Judah, and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and unto all Israel, *that are* near, and *that are* far off, through all the countries whither thou hast driven them, because of their trespass that they have trespassed against thee. 8. O Lord, to us *belongeth* confusion of face, to our kings, to our princes, and to our fathers, because we have sinned against thee. 9. To the Lord our God *belong* mercies and

forgivenesses, though we have rebelled against him; “

Now this is a history that I believe has been repeated many times in the history of the church. The 1260 year of papal persecution—the Dark Ages—before we came out of the wilderness leading on the arms of our Beloved, according to the Song of Solomon. The church would come out under the blazing light of the First Angel’s Message, it would be the righteousness of Christ displayed in this history which is recorded in the events on these two charts (1843 & 1850). Eventually the first angel’s message would be empowered; the Second Angel’s Message would be rejected by the Protestant churches in the United States, and then on October 22nd 1844 the Third Angel’s Message would arrive in history. This history Sister White describes as a glorious manifestation of the power of God. Daniel would witness such an event, he and his companions, they came out of Babylonian captivity.

Now in light of the prayer we read of Daniel this morning, I believe that it rightly fits the church today that we have sinned against God, and that we are no longer following His commandments.

We might be Sabbath keepers and coming to church Sabbath mornings, but really we don’t understand what it means to be a Seventh-day Adventist anymore. The church is not Babylon yet we conduct ourselves as Babylonians nevertheless. Daniel was captive in Babylon, but his conduct was not that of a Babylonian, but what he did was that he conducted himself as the son of the Most High. His love and his care was for the people of God and for the city that he loved, which was the literal Jerusalem. The city that we should have our eyes fixed on is not today’s literal Jerusalem but that Jerusalem that John reveals in the book of Revelation, which will be presented to the saints at the end of the millennium. John saw the holy city coming down from God out of heaven, this is where we should have our faith today, where Christ is ministering in our behalf in the Most Holy Place in the Heavenly Sanctuary. Today Seventh-day Adventism has not got their sight fixed on that place that Daniel had his eyes fixed on, God’s Most Holy Place in the Heavenly Sanctuary.

Now with that briefly introduction, we are going to continue our discussion this morning on some relevant events in the history of the church with respect to the 1919 Bible Conference, and some other interesting pieces of history. I am going to use this book called ‘W.W. Prescott: Forgotten Giant of Adventism’s Second generation’.

Before I read that, you see at the bottom of the white board, a number of dates you may be wondering about. Let me go through those very quickly so that you can be abreast at what we are looking at.

Darkness 1798 1816 1831 1840 1842 1843 1844 1856 1863 1883/4

1888 1901 1908-10 1919 1935 1942-1952 1955-57 1969 1975 1979 1980

1798, this is the time of the end of Daniel 11 verse 40, when the papacy receives his deadly wound and here the light of the first angel begins to dawn on Protestantism in America.

1816, William Miller begins to study the Bible and to discover the truths that are on the 1843 chart and later to be embraced by the Sabbatarian Adventists on the 1850 chart.

1831 (William Miller) preaches his first sermon,

1840 when the first angels’ message is empowered, when the Ottoman Turks surrendered themselves to the four European powers on August 11th 1840.

1842 where we had the rejection of the Second Angel’s Message.

1843 was the *termination of the 1335 time prophecy.*

1844 included the Midnight Cry and also Christ going into the Most Holy Place, the fulfillment of the parable of the Ten Virgins on October 22nd 1844.

1856 James and Ellen White both tell us that this is where the Sabbatarian Adventists, those who had embraced the Third Angel's Message entered into their Laodicean experience. Here also in that same year, Hiram Edson wrote the articles which I find rather convincing as a voice to those who had become Laodicea; 'The Times of the Gentiles'. Back in 2005 these led us to the correct understating of the history of the 2520 which is displayed on the two charts.

1863 would be a time when the church—and unfortunately it begins with James White—in a leadership position, nevertheless, I think it's ironic that we need to point this out, he also would begin to reject the 2520 that was on the 1843 & 1850 charts. Both charts have the 2520 and Leviticus 26:28-34.

Then by 1883/4—these events that I am describing from 1856 onwards most of us know nothing about—in 83/4 we have Uriah Smith rejecting the written testimonies of Sister White; we have the rejection of George I Butler of the inspiration of the Bible. He wrote ten articles in the Review and Herald that said that some portions of the Bible were not inspired, and he gave a list of what was more inspired, and the secondarily inspired, and then he had a final list that he considered were not inspired at all. From the rejection of inspiration both in the Spirit of Prophecy and in the Bible—again at the leadership positions of the church; Brother Butler was the General Conference President and Brother Uriah Smith was the editor of the Review and Herald after the death of James White.

1888 1901 1908-10 1919 1935 1942-1952 1955-57 1969 1975 1979 1980

In 1888, this spiritual backslidden state that the leadership had bought into the church was carried forward into the General Conference of Minneapolis in 1888. Here is where the Holy Spirit had poured out the Latter Rain in the message of Christ our Righteousness, which was brought out of the history of the Millerites and the Sabbatarian Adventists and was once again being proclaimed by the Lion of the tribe of Judah, and that message was rejected. Once again, Christ is rejected and He is pleading with the church to give the Loud Cry of the Third Angel.

Ellen White, in this time period from 1888-1890, writes heavily on the subject of the Righteousness of Christ in connection with the Third Angel's Message and in so doing she says that the Righteousness of Christ is the Third Angel's Message in verity (The Review and Herald, April 1, 1890). The stream of events led to the reorganisation of the church in 1901.

In 1908-10 we begin to have the controversy over the 'Daily' with Conradi, Prescott and Daniels. It begins with Conradi in Europe, and the other two men bring it home to the United States after their meetings with Conradi, and they begin to turn upside down the understanding of the 'Daily' in Daniel 8, 11 and 12.

1919 finally we come to the famous Bible Conference, that would begin to teach the doctrines of Christ that would be hammered out by W.W Prescott in his efforts to take the doctrine of Christ—according to him, there was no righteousness in the old messages. On the two charts, Prescott believed that they were just mathematical equations and old dried, dead bones history. He believed that what we needed was to preach the Righteousness of Christ. I believe that Elder Prescott did not understand the real issues; he considered himself an expert on history but where he missed the mark was he was not an expert as he should have been on the history of the Great Advent Movement. Had he been so, he would have recognised that this *was* the glorious manifestation of the Righteousness of Christ, and he

would have not had these ideas that we needed to replace this history with his new version of the Righteousness of Christ.

Then 1935-52 we would bring in a new form of Biblical Hermeneutics called the 'Historical Method' which was really the 'Historical Critical Method'. The architects of that within the denomination were Elder Caviness and Elder Cottrell. Leadership had our ministerial theologians retrained in this 'Historical Method'. In this same history in the 1930's, leadership would take away from Willy White his leadership role and the Estate of Ellen White and place it in the hands of the General Conference, because the General Conference men believed that at that time they were two powers within the church, one was in the east coast and the other in the west coast. Elder Watson, who was at that time the General Conference President, was determined to have all the power consolidated in the General Conference so that they would be no power at Elmshaven coming from the Estate of Ellen White. He could not abide with that.

In 1955-57, Raymond Cottrell and the group that would later be formed out of this 1942-52 history, the Bible Research Fellowship along with F.D Nichol, would make the decision to implement and bring into the history of the church the Seventh-day Adventist Commentary based upon the hermeneutics of the 'Historical Critical Method' and they would begin to inculcate and bring into the church these new ideas. All of this is on the heels of a mistaken understanding that Prescott brought in of the Righteousness of Christ. When you mix these two things together, this is how the church is today when you see it. That is why so many winds of doctrine now are able to be blown through the church and no Seventh-day Adventist can agree in anyone given church on the major doctrines that were established in this (Millerite) history.

Then by 1969, Elder Pierson comes in, he was trained in the old method and he begins to put a stop to this heresy that had come into the church, this new form of historical criticism and Biblical interpretation. He returned to the heritage of our fathers. In 1952, the Biblical Research Fellowship became the Biblical Research Committee and in 1969, he would remove all the Bible Research Fellowship men that were running the Bible Research Committee and he would replace them with men that were not using the 'Historical Critical Method' for their understanding of our doctrines. That was really the moment I believe that the Lord stepped in and began to bring about an atmosphere of change that would lead us back to the foundations. That takes places in 1969.

In 1975, the work that Elder Pierson did would finally culminate in replacing the Biblical Research Committee within the General Conference and it would be called then the Bible Research Institute.

According to Raymond Cottrell, the men that were placed in the Bible Research Institute by that year, had taken the 'Historical Method' that was brought into the church back in the 1930's through 1952 and they would combine that method with the old proof text method that brought us out of the churches in the Millerite history and they would call it the 'Historical Grammatical Method. So that is where we're at in Adventism. That is a brief overview.

In 1979 is when Desmond Ford, who had earlier come to his conclusions on the denial of the Investigative Judgment and the Sanctuary Doctrine in 1945, by using the 'Historical Critical Method', he would air his views at PUC, and then the fur would fly and by 1980 at Glacier View, they would remove him from the church, remove his credentials and to this day, we are still dealing with these controversies.

This all began by the church entering into a Laodicean condition. Turn to the book of Revelation. We

want to read the testimony of the True Witness on this account:

Revelation 3:14-20 And unto the angel of the church of the Laodiceans write; These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God; 15. I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot: I would thou wert cold or hot. 16. So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth. 17. Because thou sayest, I am rich, and increased with goods, and have need of nothing; and knowest not that thou art wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked: 18. I counsel thee to buy of me gold tried in the fire, that thou mayest be rich; and white raiment, that thou mayest be clothed, and *that* the shame of thy nakedness do not appear; and anoint thine eyes with eyesalve, that thou mayest see. 19. As many as I love, I rebuke and chasten: be zealous therefore, and repent. 20. Behold, I stand at the door, and knock: if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me.”

The Lord has impressed me this morning that I should share with you a Bible study that I can't go into in detail, but this history of Laodicea also took place in ancient Israel. In the story of king Ahaz, the same thing was encountered, there was a spitting out process that the Bible describes in the time of king Ahaz, which would eventually lead to the destruction of Jerusalem and the King of the North would destroy the city. Then there would be seventy years in Babylonian exile, in the captivity. So there is some Bible evidence to support the fact that in the Laodicean condition, the people of God are being judged, and Christ is calling us and He is having us return to the foundations.

In the history of the Millerites, He is established as the Lion of the tribe of Judah, He is established here as the Lord our Righteousness, and this is where the church has gone off her mark. In the Millerite history, leading down to Sabbatarian Adventism, Christ is displayed in all His glory but the church today had no recognition of that. The church today in our pulpits declare that they don't need the sacred history that is depicted on the two charts, instead, they are willing to throw them in the ash can of Adventist history, and in so doing, they are rejecting the Lord our Righteousness.

Now in the book that I was going to start with 'W.W. Prescott: Forgotten giant of Adventism's Second Generation', we are going to look at some things that he was involved in on page 214-228 of this book, we are going to look at this history briefly and bring you up to speed on the history of 1919.

“THEOLOGICAL CONTROVERSY AND A CHANGE OF JOB.

“Compared to the Kellogg conflict, the theological controversy in Adventism over “the Daily” was a mere storm in a tea cup. For Review editor Prescott, however it was a serious and costly business. Without doubt, he had correctly followed the right denominational procedures required for dealing with matters of dispute...” {W.W. Prescott: Forgotten Giant of Adventism's Second Generation, pg. 214}

I should make a footnote here that this writer here is in sympathy with Brother Prescott, but we are not in sympathy with what Brother Prescott was responsible for doing in the church. We believe this history that is revealed here tells a story of a man that was not following the counsels of Sister White, but the writer of this book is not in that frame of mind as he writes. So just let it be known that some of the stuff that you will hear here, some of it we are not in agreement with, but the historical points that we are going to point to in the life of W.W. Prescott and where he influenced this history, we are in agreement with.

“To his dismay he found that educating the church and attempting to broaden its thinking even

on a minor doctrinal point could produce extreme hostility. Before the conflict ended, Prescott found himself out of office. Was the point in dispute, then, such a minor one after all? Had the denomination dealt with him fairly?

“Prescott had returned relaxed and refreshed to Washington from his 1907 trip through Eastern Asia and Europe. He had hardly had time to settle properly at his editorial desk again, however, when he had found himself press-ganged into leading the forces on one side a rapidly escalating controversy. Marshalling the opposition was Stephen Haskell, who had initiated the conflict with some saber rattling several months before. (*I would like to correct that, Brother Haskell was responding to what had been initiated by W.W Prescott*) He had found “errors” here and there and some were “very dangerous”, he had warned Ellen White in June 1907, “Leading brethren” had adopted positions that “undermine present truth” (*I would agree with that*). Then casting caution aside, he openly declared, “There are many who know that Prescott and myself differ and are really waiting to see how that will yet come out.” {Ibid}

This writer is trying to make you believe that this argument was between men, but it was not between men. It was between what is Present Truth and what is not.

“The point over which Haskell and Prescott differed was the interpretation of tamid (*notice how this write describes this*), a cryptic expression in Daniel 8:11:13, and translated “the Daily” in chapters 11 and 12 (*also in chapter 8*). The term is a key word crucial to the interpretation to the prophetic passages (*now that I would agree with*). To many twenty-first century Adventists (*he is correct about this*), the term and the convoluted technical arguments that swirled around seem either quaint in an eccentric way, almost like a bizarre sideshow or esoteric in the sense that it concerned highly technical details that only those involved in the discussion could possibly understand” {Ibid pg. 214-215}

“Some have occasionally argued that it was, and is, of no current relevance – quite removed, in fact from the more important central business of Adventist Christian living. {Ibid pg.215}

I am going to point out here that this truth that they are discussing that was brought out in the Millerite history and in the days of the Sabbatarian Adventists, would give them the foundation to correctly understand Daniel 8:14, unto two thousand three hundred days then shall the sanctuary be cleansed. It is from that basis that we need to constitute Adventist Christian living, and not separate these issues from it, like this writer does. Adventist Christian living is portrayed on these two charts, it may not be recognisable to some but, that is because we have been under this influence for so long that we don't understand adequately what it means to understand Adventist Christian living.

“But in truth, the dispute for the chief protagonist (*meaning Haskell*) focused on a vital undergirding theological issue (*I will agree with that*) that the church needed to come to grips with. The relationship of Ellen White to the interpretation of the scriptures. (*notice this now, for Haskell the ‘Daily’ was more than just an issue of how to translate the word tamid but for Haskell it meant the relationship of Ellen White to the interpretation of the scriptures.*) Though largely resolved by the 1940's (*I disagree with that*) when debate over the meaning of “the Daily” eventually died out (which it did not), the methodological issue still has relevance because even today it (*the writer agrees with me here*) continues to raise its head in various places in the Adventist community.” {Ibid pg.215} (*so it did not go away*)

“In addition, the history of the conflict has importance in its own right as a significant episode in Prescott's life. It culminated in a great deal of personal trauma and a major change in his career

(Sister White would tell him to drop the issue and Sister White also removed him from the editorship of the desk at the Review and Herald and told him to go into city evangelism and him and his colleague, brother Daniells should stop trying to redo the books). But the incident also reshaped and redeveloped Seventh-day Adventist doctrinal understanding for the second generation of believers. And it is interesting for the intriguing insights it offers into both the strengths and weaknesses of Prescott and his protagonists” {Ibid}

This book is very revealing if you are on the right side of these issues. If you want to go along with your head in the sand and believe that the ‘Daily’ is Christ’s high priestly ministration in the sanctuary, and you don’t want to investigate it for yourself, to see what the pioneers laid in their history, which Sister White calls the glorious manifestation of the power of God, then you can suit your selves but for me and my money, I believe that what these people hammered out was right. The writer here now is going to go to the roots of the controversy.

“William Miller, in the 1840’s, using a complicated series of biblical proof-text parallels...” {Ibid}

I disagree with that, its not complicated. William Miller was known to say that the children can understand this. This is not complicated, it’s very simple, very easy. You match history with scripture, one of Miller’s rules that Sister White says we should be following. When scripture and history match, you have what you are looking for. My colleague here says that the historical critical method is the one that complicates the issue. I would make a point here, what he is going to discuss for you here is the **historicist** method of biblical interpretation which was the ground work of the Seventh-day Adventist church. Its where the foundations where laid, and on the foundations where built the pillars which would come into view in the introduction of the Third Angel, on October 22nd 1844. The Sabbath, the sanctuary doctrine, are the pillars build on the foundation which the Millerites had laid. One of the foundational points of the Millerites is the ‘Daily’ which is in the 1843 charts which is 508 which is the daily which is on the 1850 chart which is also 508. On the 1850 chart it plainly says, “Pagan dominion or the ‘Daily’ taken away.”

“William Miller in the 1840’s using a complicated series of biblical proof-text parallels based on his English text *(they mean the King James Version of the Bible)*, had asserted that the expression tamid in Daniel 8 referred to Roman *paganism (which it does)*. The papacy had “taken away” this paganism in the year 508 *(which is on the chart)*, when England had supposedly been converted to Christianity *(Now he gets this reference form a lecture that William Miller did in his book ‘Evidence from Scripture and History’ about the year 1843 on the Second Coming of Christ, published in several different editions, 1836, 1838, 1842 but nevertheless, in one of the lectures Miller goes through this history. I would behove those who would care to look it up, for themselves, and read Miller’s lecture on this. I think its lecture number four or five)*. Joseph Bates, J.N. Andrews and James White had all followed Miller in adopting the view *(now these men are nobodies in Adventism today but let me read their names one more time)* and Uriah Smith had set the interpretation in concrete through an extended development of it in his book ‘Daniel and Revelation’. Several things made the disputed expression exceedingly important to Haskell. For a start it was integral part of the most important biblical passage used *(notice this)* to substantiate the denominations sanctuary doctrine.” {Ibid}

That might be a clue that we might find this to be a little more serious than some have believed. There are some in the church today that quote Ellen White and say that we should not discuss the ‘Daily’. But

this writer recognises that Haskell's concern was this, let me read it again.

“For a start it was integral part of the most important biblical passage used to substantiate the denomination's sanctuary doctrine. It also concerned what Haskell considered to be an important prophetic date. Further, the pioneers had taught the position (*a few things stacking up now against this new view*). But, most important of all was the fact that Ellen White had, in his view, stated clearly that the “old view” was correct (*we agree with that*). She had written in 1850 “Then I saw in relation to the "Daily," Daniel 8:12 that the word "sacrifice" was supplied by man's wisdom, and does not belong to the text; and that the Lord gave the correct view of it to those who gave the judgment hour cry. When union existed, before 1844, nearly all were united on the correct view of the "Daily;" but in the confusion since 1844, other views have been embraced, and darkness and confusion have followed. {RH, November 1, 1850 par. 11}”

I want you to notice something: what this history begins to do, leading down to the 1919 Bible Conference, in 1908 through to 1910 when they begin to change their views on the daily with Prescott, Conradi and Daniels and Haskell and Loughborough are the champions in this history to defend the faith once delivered to the saints, eventually this all leads to the 1919 Bible Conference. One of the attendees of the 1919 Bible Conference had this to say about what these men eventually would do four years after the death of Ellen White. The men who were told to leave the daily alone and don't change the books four years after her death went ahead with their project and changed the daily, they changed the books and they changed the face of Adventism. This is the description of one of the men who attended the 1919 Bible Conference and I find that it is kind of ironic, the terms that he uses. Notice what he says:

“Reactions to the conference varied widely; on the one hand, F.M. Wilcox spoke for those who thought that a good brotherly feeling had prevailed even though most delegates probably remained just as persuaded of their own views afterwards as before the conference (*This is the 1919 Bible Conference*) on the other hand J.N Waldrof, a conservative Pastor...” {W.W. Prescott: *Forgotten Giant of Adventism's Second Generation*, pg. 214}

In these days, they didn't use the word 'liberals', they used the word 'progressives'; there were the conservatives and the progressives. Prescott, Conradi, Daniells and those on that side of the issue of all these controversial changes in Adventism were the progressives in the 1919 Bible Conference. The conservatives that were holding the ground based on the history on these two charts, were the ones that we not in agreement with what they did at the 1919 Bible Conference.

“... Waldrof, a conservative Pastor, thought that session had conceded too much to the progressives in spite of the fact that the new views had largely prevailed. He for one was resolved (*notice this*) to stand by the old land marks (*Amen*). Sink or swim, he would gladly be known as a dissenter from the Prescott-Lacey legacy. J.N Washburn, whose information about what was said in the discussions of the conflict was only second hand...” {Ibid}

Brother Washburn was a defender of the faith once delivered to the saints and he fought Prescott to the bitter end on this issue, regardless of the fact that he wasn't an attendee. This writer would like you to believe that Washburn, because he didn't attend his testimony has no value, but contrary, it does have value. Notice what he says:

“J.N Washburn whose information about what was said in the discussions of the conflict was only second hand, had choice descriptions of the event of the 1919 Bible Conference, he

labelled it a counsel of darkness and a diet of doubts. The crowning act in the programme of doubt and darkness and criticism, enveloping Washington, it was the omega of apostasy that Ellen White had been talking about. Washburn determined to stamp out the new theology” {Ibid}

You can't get it any clearer than that. But today the new theology is defended by those who are now in the Biblical Research Institute established in 1975, and I believe if we understand this correctly, if the Lion of the tribe of Judah was in this (Millerite) history, you can count on it, He's still in our history. This thing is not over until the 'fat lady sings' and the Lion of the tribe of Judah is going to re-establish these foundations before the Sunday Law. We believe in this ministry here, that that is what the Lion of the tribe of Judah is accomplishing. Not trying to accomplish but accomplishing. It behooves every Seventh-day Adventist to know this history for themselves and not take the words of the men who are in this backslidden, Laodicean condition. I am a little passionate about this; it has affected my own life. All of us have been under this influence. It says here:

“For Haskell the statement was clear cut, further discussion was quite illegitimate. Ellen White had spoken and that should settle it (*Amen*). “The actual interpretation itself and the arguments for and against it was not that critical”, Haskell explained, “Personally it does not matter a hill of beans to me.” (*he is talking about the definition of the word tamid*) What did matter was the authority of Ellen White. To adopt any other interpretation other than what she had indicated was to undermine her authority.” {Ibid}

Haskell saw no way around it. To accept the new vies that Prescott and Daniells were bringing in was to deny the central theme of the authority of Ellen White of her role as a messenger to the church.

“Prescott on the other hand understood the term 'daily' to refer to not to paganism but to refer to Christ's mediatorial ministry...” {Ibid}

Now this becomes very, very subtle. It is such a subtle argument, and it's the foundations of Adventism that are at stake, that these men actually believed, in this 1919 Bible Conference, and earlier on in 1908 and 1910, that they were improving Adventism. They believed that this doctrine being changed was going to bring Christ into the doctrines. In all actuality, it destroyed the doctrines, it destroyed the church. Today because of this, there is hardly a real Seventh-day Adventist among us. Elder White and Elder Haskell and Elder Loughborough if they were alive today, they would not recognise the Seventh-day Adventist church. They would walk in at Loam Linda University church and they would wonder where they were at; and a few other ones.

“Prescott on the other hand understood the term 'daily' to refer to not to paganism but to refer to Christ's mediatorial ministry. It was an expression drawn from the tabernacle service that clearly pointed to Christ (*This writer of this book is on the side of the new view, that is what this is telling us*). Through its doctrine of the mass and its corollary emphasis on mediation through a human priesthood, the Roman Catholic Church had obscured or taken away the mediatorial role of Christ.” {Ibid}

This is an absurdity, this is an untruth, it all sounds good, but let me explain to you that Christ is the Lion of the tribe of Judah and no one takes away His authority, or His ministry, No one! Especially the man of sin and all of his minions. The Bible explicitly says that all power has been given to Christ, which would exclude the papacy.

“Such a new view according to him harmonised better with the Biblical context and with the

facts of history (*he is correctly describing this because it appeared that way to Prescott, and Prescott then began to convince others, and unfortunately, he had a listening audience*). Much more important than even that however, it made the interpretation of the whole prophecy of Daniel 8 thoroughly Christio-centric.” {Ibid}

What they are saying here is that what was done in the Millerite history was not Christio-centric. Now if you believe that then I have some property in Florida that I will sell you for a good price and I have a bridge in Brooklyn that is really reasonably priced. [In other words, if you believe that, you are very gullible.] To buy into this, you are sliding deeper into the Laodicean condition and the devil has been pretty slick. Earlier this week I mentioned that this is not a witch hunt about men, Jesus has told us that an enemy has sown these tares, but unfortunately in this history, names have to be made because they are participants in a history that wont come up good in the thousand years that’s ahead.

“They focused on the gospel rather than on dates, forgotten nations...” {Ibid}

Notice this now, these men think that these are just dates and forgotten nations, they don’t see Jesus in any of it, it is just dates and forgotten nations. Do you know these forgotten nations that God used to chastise his people in the days of Daniel? And because of that chastisement they came out and restored and rebuilt the temple in Jerusalem? So these are not just nations that are old and dead but God was in this thing, the Lion of the tribe of Judah and he revealed this to William Miller in the Millerite history and when he did, William Miller understood things that the Protestant World hadn’t understood. This is what Daniel didn’t understand.

We know that from our studies and these talks throughout the years that when a prophet become a part of the prophecy, he is a representative man. In the Millerite history, Miller and the Millerites represent the prophet Daniel and here the prophet Daniel has the lights turned on and now he understands the end of the discussion of the ‘daily’ in Daniel 8, 11 and 12, and what they understand is that the sanctuary has to be cleansed, and that its going to be cleansed at the end of the 2300 days. This theology down here, Raymond Cottrell would eventually place the 2300 days somewhere else, not in this history. Raymond Cottrell would deny the 2300 days as being prophetic and he would place it as literal and he would remove the papacy from Daniel 8 and 9 and he would replace the papacy with the old Protestant position that it is Antiochus Epiphanies.

“They focused on the gospel rather than on dates, forgotten nations and questionable events in the past. Daniells concurred with the professor.” {Ibid}

I want you to know that there is a foot print here that you need to notice. Over here, the leadership faltered, denying the inspiration of the Bible and Ellen White, down here the same leadership, the General Conference president and one of the major Bible theologians do the same identical thing, they deny the inspiration of the Bible and Ellen White. Elder Daniells was in agreement with Prescott just like Smith was in agreement with Elder Butler. So this is an on going event that keeps repeating itself in our history.

“Prescott recognised the difficulty presented by Ellen White’s endorsement of the old view (*this is Daniells, he says...*) the matter of the correctness of a doubtful date in history (*meaning 508, although the pioneers got it on both charts, it was pretty clear to them, but to Daniells now it’s a doubtful date in history*) pales before the importance of the glorious truth regarding the ministry of Christ. He would later write in defence of the new view” {Ibid}

“Prescott recognised the difficulty represented by Ellen White’s endorsement of the old view

but he argued that the larger context of her 1850 article provided a way out (*I like the way this author writes this*) Clearly she was primarily concerned with correcting a problem of time setting among a small group of early Sabbatarian Adventists." {Ibid}

So they are trying to marginalise this. They are going to try and turn the Spirit of Prophecy upside down, stand it on its head, and they are going to try and make the Spirit of Prophecy say what they want it to say, so that they can deny this glorious manifestation of the power of God in this (Millerite) history. The only reason that I can imagine that they would do this is for their own glory, because they are the historians and the great theologians in the 1900's. Jeremiah says it best, "The heart is deceitful and desperately wicked, who can know it?" I am not able to ask these men why they did this but I can only surmise that it was something on their mind other than the truth, because they are stepping back from something that was laid, according to Ellen White, she says God's hand was in this, God's hand provided all this light leading us on, she says, step by step. She calls this a firm foundation. Now that word was used by one of these men who sided with this history. He was Elder Froom and he would write 'Our Firm Foundation', the book, but nevertheless.

"One must consider the context and the intent of the original Early Writings statement." {Ibid}

What they are doing here now is the same thing that Cottrell does with his historical criticism, "one must consider the context and the history of events," before you can really understand the words of Ellen White, you have to go back and dissect her word and code it into your view of history and then your going to get a correct view of what the prophet is really telling the church. Well if you believe that, then I have that bridge for sale still.

"Adventist now need to re-interpret the imperfect statement on the 'daily'." {Ibid}

There is it friends, they claim that Ellen White's statement is imperfect; they would continue this process till this very day that we are living in. This is 1980 and we are now in 2011 and things haven't changed, it has gotten worse. The man who wrote this book has written another book recently on Ellen White called 'Ellen White and the presidents' dealing with the last three presidents of the General Conference that she dealt with before her death and this man is under the consideration in the book that he has written on Ellen White, that Ellen White was just a very wonderful charismatic person, full of charisma. Now I have read half of that book...

"It a great injustice to your mother (*Now notice how they couch this, notice how they bring Willy White into this thing*) for men to place an interpretation on her words that arrays her against all history (*I am surprised that Willy White did not see right through this*). Another interpretation equally as well founded can be given according to Prescott" {Ibid, pg. 216}

So Prescott here is wiser than the prophet, wiser than God, wiser than the rest based on some mouldy history book that he has got on his shelf. This does not constitute him a hero in Adventism either.

"Such an approach he was such would save the church and Ellen White from great humiliation..." {Ibid}

Now as we began this talk this week we described the desolation of Jerusalem, and I don't think the outlook for brother Prescott has turned out too good in that respect, because the storm he has unleashed is still with us today and there is hardly a single Adventist that knows the truth.

"Although probably the most prominent American exponent of the new view, Prescott by no mean originated it (*now here is the real truth*). Louis. R. Conradi President of the Union

Conference in Europe, had been the first to publish the new interpretation in his widely circulated book on the prophecies of Daniel, but the book was printed only in German. The great irony was that its publication caused not a ripple either in Europe or in the United States, a perhaps unanticipated advantage of foreign languages (*this guy really is naïve if he wasn't to believe that*) before publication, he had asked Ellen White to advise him if she saw a problem in his interpretation. Receiving no response, Conradi assumed she had no objection and he had gone ahead with the printing.” {Ibid}

Now if this was the court of law and you had all this superficial, circumstantial evidence that these men have used to turn Adventism upside down, if it was in the court of law and if it would have meant the life of Elder Prescott on the discussion of the jury, I don't think he would have depended too much on this testimony. But nevertheless, in the circumstances that are penned here, they depended on this type of testimony to say that Ellen White was wrong and they were right.

“Prescott had tentatively raised the new interpretation with his fellow workers in England in 1899, apparently following some conversations with Conradi (*Mark that down*) and found that the position troubled some of them. It disturbed E.E. Andross for example that he informed Haskell, Prescott also later on discussed the idea with Daniells and Uriah Smith. Like Haskell and Andross, the interpretation did not impress Elder Smith, apart from a veiled reference, the professor made to the topic in his 1902 Sabbath School Lesson series however, he had avoided discussing the matter in public.

“After 1902, Prescott and Daniells were too pre-occupied with the Kellogg crisis to give the subject much attention (*we also have to have on the chart time line, 1902, the Kellogg crisis after the re-organisation of the General Conference*) But whenever Prescott's mind turned to the 'daily', he became enthusiastic. His rare discussions with Daniells and Spicer on the topic (*I was really sad to hear that Spicer was in agreement with these men*) convinced him more and more that the new interpretation provided a vital prophetic mandate for the new Christio-centric focus that he had been trying to encourage in Adventism. It would give the church a new impetus.” {Ibid}

It did alright and we are living in the day of that impetus. The Sunday law is about to appear in the United States of America, and I should dare say that most Seventh-day Adventists will not be prepared for that event and it goes back to the work that we are describing here in this history. You can deny this if you want but when the Sunday law comes, if you have heard this testimony this week from the internet or here in person, you will remember that you heard it here first. The Sunday Law is coming. In the face of all those who want to deny it, nevertheless, the Sunday law is on its way.

“But Daniells urged constraint and Prescott waited. He hoped however, that at its proper time and in the proper way then church would deal with this issue. Spicer would later on comment in the professor's defence that Prescott had been very conservative and responsible in not agitating the question.” {Ibid}

You know they would like you to believe that these men were all on the right side of these issues, but when these two men are discussing this in this fashion; Sister White had already written to them and told them to knock this off. [Stop doing this] But they weren't following the counsel and the church is still not following the counsel. Today, people are so deceived by this influence that they will take some of the comments that Ellen White made at the time that this controversy was being started, when she was writing and mentioning to people that they shouldn't be bringing into discussion the 'daily'. The

reason she was doing so was because the [new] 'daily' was going to confuse the minds of those who had been in the church for so long, and even new people coming into the church would be under a confusion, and that's why she was telling these brethren not to discuss the 'daily'. Not that it should never be discussed, but that but because of this controversy that was being done by the leadership of the church, Daniells and Prescott, she said that silence was golden. But in the light of that history, looking back from our day, the time is that we need to understand this history and in its clarity and to put our heads in the sand like ostriches and faintly say that 'Oh, Ellen White says that you shouldn't discuss the daily', means that you do not understand the history.

"Spicer would later on comment in the professor's defence that Prescott had been very conservative and responsible in not agitating the question. During all these years, he has let the other side shout away (*this man is telling you that Haskell is the problem, this man is telling you that all these men who defended the faith once delivered to the saints are the problem*) and he held it in. But by October 1907, Prescott was convinced that the proper time had arrived, in that month, two former publishing house editors published a volume challenging the Adventist interpretation of Daniel eight. In the process they heavily scorned Smith's interpretation of the 'daily'. When the General Conference committee asked Prescott to write a rebuttal to the book in the review affirming the traditional view, without of course naming the volume, he declined. Frankly but in good conscience the professor stated that he found it impossible for him to interpret the chapter as Smith had done, in fact the venerable editor's position was indefensible.

"The committee off course apparently unaware of the Conradi volume, was immediately interested in hearing Prescott's views. The next question was how Ellen White would react to such a re-interpretation of her Early Writings statement. The committee requested the professor to write and ask. If Prescott could not defend Smith, others felt that they could. Pioneer Adventist, John Loughborough for example submitted in an article, of rebuttal for the review. Prescott felt obliged to reject it. 'We are being attacked from various sides now', Review editor explained, 'I desire to use all care to give anyone ground on which to successfully make warfare on our teachings.'" {Ibid}

Shall we pray?

Loving Father in heaven, these views are clear enough, and for those who want to deny them, there is not much we can do except pray, but there is going to come a point in this history, God, where prayer will do no good, there is going to come a point into this history that men will receive the Mark of the Beast and their decisions will be final. We pray dear Lord, that our decisions now, before the decree goes forth, will apply to our hearts and lives the Righteousness of Christ, that was the means that brought the people out of the churches in the time of the Millerites according to Sister White, and that we will realise and react and be responsible to what she has told us and that is that we have no new message.

Please bless us dear Lord to be among the wise according to Daniel and not be among those foolish virgins Lord that don't have what it means to have an experience with Christ behind all these issues. It is such a subtle deception that has been portrayed on the church for so long, claiming that they are teaching the righteousness of Christ while all the while denying Him. Please bless us dear Lord to receive Christ in all His righteousness, that we will have faith in the One who brought us out of the churches, and that we will go forward and be conquerors in His name and that we will be part of the church victorious. Bless us to these ends we pray and we ask for these blessings in Jesus name, Amen.