

The Desolations of Jerusalem 11

From a Presentation by Duane Dewey 11, 2011

Transcription by Sister Grace

Minor editing for readability by P G Temple

Loving Father in heaven, we are so grateful dear Lord for Your wonderful care, I want to thank You personally for helping me to present the first portion of this; help me to bring these things out that You have helped me to study and learn. Dear Lord, it's my burden that people understand that the Seventh-day Adventist church, Lord, is Yours, it doesn't not belong to anyone else; it is the apple of Your eye. It is the very means that you are going to accomplish the last warning message the world will ever hear, and I know dear Lord that it is because You do not want any to perish, and I know in my own life what You have done for me and I haven't treated You the way that You have treated me, but still You keep coming to me with Your love, Your care, Your long suffering, patience and Your mercy. I know that there are many today in Adventism that are in the same shape. They are not sure Lord, they don't know what is coming, but help them to understand that today, even now, as the same invitation that you gave to your children long ago is being given today, that we can turn around and we can lay all of our burdens at Your feet.

Especially in the subject of being faithful Seventh-day Adventists, we need to make surrenders Lord that we haven't done. So dear Lord we would pray that You would do whatever it takes in our individual experience to bring us to these places where we can learn to trust You with everything; and that we will not dear Lord look at the past and all of our failings, but that we would push towards the mark of Christ as Paul did, and that dear Lord though these things we will have an abundant entrance into Your kingdom. Lord the kingdom of God is at hand, and we want to be apart of it, and so dear Lord, we want to give You permission to do whatever it takes. Bless me dear Lord, as I give this talk; bless those who are hearing, so bless us this morning we pray, and we ask Thee for these things in Jesus name, Amen.

Where we left off was the understanding that in the days of the Millerites, Dowling and others, put a literal local fulfillment on Daniel 8:14, and they began to teach that the 2300 days would end literally from the history of Daniel 8:14, in the time of the prophet Daniel, literally take place with Antiochus Epiphanies in 1150 days. They would teach that the Maccabeus would cleanse the sanctuary and make it right, and that is how they interpreted the teaching of Daniel 8.

One of the things it also does is leave open the question of Daniel 9. With that understanding of Daniel 8, you can misinterpret and reinterpret Daniel 9 in any fashion that you so choose. But the way the Millerites did it, they tied the two together, and in tying the two together, they came to the right conclusion, in which unto two thousand day then shall the sanctuary be cleansed, based on the prophetic interpretation that the year day principle is authentic, and they began to count it from 457 BC, the third commandment to restore and rebuild Jerusalem under Artaxerxes Longimanus in the year 457 BC.

Now, today the evangelicals are teaching that there's going to be a thousand years of peace, and they are teaching about the antichrist based on this same logic that Dowling and these other people did in the times of the Millerites, they are teaching that the antichrist will come sometime after the thousand years, sometime down into the future.

They don't understand, and neither do they teach, that the papacy is antichrist. The papacy received his deadly wound in 1798, and we are just about at the end of the world's history when the papacy once again will be exalted to the throne of the earth. This is the great time of trouble because of the papacy; there is not going to be a thousand years of peace, and a millennium, like they believe. The evangelicals are teaching the same errors that Dowling taught during the time of the Millerites.

Miller himself when he came to the conclusion, after the long Bible study he did, he said to himself he could not believe the conclusion that he had come to, that Christ was about to come in just 25 short years in 1843. The world doesn't believe that Christ is coming.

Today, because of the hermeneutics in our own denomination, we are putting off many important things. Our spiritual attention has been distracted to such a point, that we as Seventh-day Adventists, we really don't think a Sunday Law is eminent. The Jews in crucifying Christ didn't see the Roman's coming in 70 AD. But when Titus for the final time surrounded that city, they estimated 2-3 million people perished in the siege of Jerusalem; and they didn't see it coming, when they had all the prophetic evidence that it was coming at them like a locomotive full steam ahead. And when it arrived, it treated them that way too. Locomotives have no feeling; if they hit you going full speed, you're a mess and the locomotive doesn't even look back.

This article is by Dennis Hokama; Adventist Currents, March 1987. Now it says here:

“The Pioneer SDA (Old View) Interpretation: The Millerite movement was crucified on October 22, 1844, by none other than Jesus Himself (by His nonappearance). Most of the Millerites subsequently sought atonement with the Christian world that they had denounced as Babylon during the months just preceding the Great Disappointment.

In that history during the time of the Millerites, more than 90% of all the Millerites went back to the denominations that they had come from, and they went back to their old ways. What makes you think Seventh-day Adventists won't do the same thing when the Sunday law hits?

“A few Millerites, however (*Praise the Lord*), having invoked the blessing of the Holy Spirit upon their interpretations, now felt obligated to defend the Spirit's honor by salvaging something from the wreckage of the Millerite 1844 interpretation.” {Does 1844 Have a “Pagan” Foundation? Pg 22}

Ellen White puts it another way; “They knew that the Lord had led them”; they were not trying to salvage anything, but they were disappointed, and they were heart broken that they had not seen their Saviour come in the clouds of glory. They were still in this world and they wept like children. Elder White says he went outside the meeting when he went to hear one of the Millerite leaders, and he went outside and he wept like a child. Elder Edson said that they wept all night and prayed in the barn. It says here:

“The great question that obsessed them was how to defend any kind of a “cleansing of the sanctuary” on October 22, 1844, when nothing whatsoever had been observed to happen on earth—unless it was the merciless heckling of the non-believers. (*They had a rough time*) According to Adventist tradition (recently corrected by J. B. Goodner in *Adventist Currents* vol. 1, no. 5, pp. 4, 5, 6, & 56) a possible solution came to Hiram Edson in a flash of inspiration while he was taking a walk on the morning following the Great Disappointment. O.R.L. Crosier, a

protégé of Edson's, articulated this solution in the *Day-Dawn*, and then expanded upon it in an article entitled "The Sanctuary" in the *Day Star Extra* of February 7, 1846.

"The Sanctuary to be cleansed at the end of the 2300 days is also the Sanctuary of the new covenant, for the vision of the treading down and cleansing, is after the crucifixion."

So down here where you see the crucifixion, in the time of Christ, these men are recognizing that the cleansing of the sanctuary is after the crucifixion.

"We see that the Sanctuary of the new covenant is not on earth, but in heaven. The true tabernacle which forms a part of the new covenant Sanctuary, was made and pitched by the Lord, in contradistinction to that of the first covenant which was made and pitched by man, in obedience to the commandment of God; Exodus 25:8. (*This is also the teaching of the apostle Paul in the book of Hebrews*). (The *Day-Star Extra*, Feb. 7, 1846)" {Ibid}

"Ellen White endorsed Crosier's translation of the sanctuary into the heavens in a letter to Eli Curtis dated April 21, 1847. This, she said, was not merely her opinion, but something that "the Lord showed me in vision." An additional benefit of this solution was that it gave its adherents an effective comeback to their merciless hecklers, who were lost souls because Jesus had ceased to work for sinners after October 22, 1844, when "the door was shut" to the heavenly sanctuary (*That is a study all in itself but this man is making reference to it*). With regard to the "daily" question, the forerunners of Adventism continued to endorse Miller's "paganism" view." {Ibid}

Now this is very important; the same one that led William Miller was leading the Sabbatarian Adventists who were going to follow Jesus by faith into the Most Holy Place of the heavenly sanctuary. Some of them retained Miller's understanding of paganism; and I have already named the list of those who did, James and Ellen White, Loughborough, Edson, J.N Andrews, Uriah Smith, even the great Uncle of Raymond Cottrell, Roswell Cottrell also clung to the idea of paganism. So in the history of Adventism, the Cottrell family goes back, and Roswell was a man who believed in the 'Daily' being paganism and not Christ's high priestly ministrations in the Sanctuary.

"When the Sabbatarian Adventists moved on, after 1844, to develop their new doctrine of the heavenly sanctuary, they left behind William Miller's identification of the sanctuary of Daniel 8:14 (*meaning the earth*), of the two beasts of Rev. 13, and of the number 666 as pertaining to the "daily", but they retained, in the main, Miller's idea that the "daily" and the "transgression of desolation" were two successive phases of the Roman power, pagan and papal. (*SDA Encyclopedia*, p. 321)" {Ibid}

"It is true that Crosier without actually saying it in so many words, logically repudiated the notion of a pagan sanctuary in the article that Ellen White endorsed in God's name. It was not the first or the last time that the pioneers would show themselves quite oblivious to theological "tensions."" {Ibid}

This guy is recognizing the ambiguities between Ellen White endorsing Crosier's article, and that letter to Eli Curtis, but later on James White takes portions of the article by Crosier, and he extracts the portion which Crosier believes that the sanctuary spoken about in Daniel 8:11 is Christ's sanctuary. So there is some ambiguity amongst historians as to whether or not what Ellen White endorsed in that letter, and what she didn't endorse, but nevertheless, they point to this letter as their reasoning to believe that their new view of the 'Daily' is correct. But when you look at the history for yourself, you

will find that Crosier's letter was endorsed by the Whites, but some portions were and some portions were not.

The main in his topic of the sanctuary was that the Most Holy Place in the heavenly sanctuary is what they endorsed. They did not later endorse his understanding that Daniel 8:11, which is the subject of the 'Daily' is Christ's high priestly ministration in the sanctuary, which Crosier did allude to in that document. Ellen White was later shown in a vision, that they had the right understanding of the 'Daily' in 1850 and so Elder White would once again reprint that same article by Crosier, and he would leave out Crosier's understanding of the 'Daily' being Christ's priestly ministry. So it says;

"In his article entitled "The Sanctuary," Crosier wrote: Let it be remembered that the definition of Sanctuary is "a holy or sacred place." Is the earth, is Palestine such a place? Their entire contents answer, No! Was Daniel so taught? Look at his vision. "And the place of his sanctuary was cast down;" Dan. 8:11 (*This is the text that Crosier thought was Christ's priestly sanctuary*). This casting down was in the days and by the means of the Roman power; therefore, the Sanctuary of this text was not the Earth, nor Palestine, because the former was cast down at the fall, more than 4,000 years, and the latter at the captivity, more than 700 years previous to the event of this passage, and neither by Roman agency. The Sanctuary cast down, is His against whom Rome magnified himself, which was the Prince of the host, Jesus Christ; and Paul teaches that his sanctuary is in heaven." (*Day Star Extra*, February 7, 1846)" {Ibid}

"By redefining Miller's *pagan* sanctuary as Christ's *heavenly* sanctuary, in an article endorsed by the Lord, Crosier almost aborted the foundation of the fledgling Adventist movement. But the movement was spared by James White, who republished the article in *The Advent Review Special* of 1850 (p. 38) with the offending paragraphs (*of Crosier's understanding of the 'daily' deleted. This is a very interesting history and you really can't understand it, until you take a look at the documents for yourself*) however inspired—deleted.

"For about fifty years (*that would be from 1850-1900*) Adventist leaders in good standing felt obligated to endorse simultaneously Miller's *paganism* interpretation and Crosier's heavenly sanctuary article, a difficult but evidently not impossible feat." {Ibid}

So what they did was, they retained the Millerite understanding of the 'Daily' but they also retained Crosier's understanding that the sanctuary that needed to be cleansed was in heaven, they kept both views.

"Joseph Bates identified the "daily" as *paganism* in 1846 (*The Opening Heavens*, p. 31), so did J.N. Andrews in 1853 (*Review and Herald*, 3:145, Feb. 3, 1853; cf. p. 129, Jan. 6, 1853), and later Uriah Smith (*ibid.*, 24:180, Nov. 1, 1864) and James White ("The Time," in his *Sermons on the Coming and Kingdom of ...Christ*, 1870 ed., pp. 116,117; cf. pp. 108, 118,122-125). In an early article (*Review and Herald*, 1:28, 29, January, 1851) White had followed Crosier in arguing at length that the sanctuary trodden down was the one in heaven, but he did not define the "Daily" in this article." {Ibid}

This is very interesting, in 1850 he retracts the article that he reprinted of Crosier's and he leaves out the portion about the 'Daily' that was originally in the Crosier article, and in 1851 he will write an article about Christ's high priestly ministration in the sanctuary but he does not define the 'Daily' in the 1851 article.

“When he later did define it he emphatically described "the daily, and the transgression of desolation" as "two desolating powers; the first paganism, and the other Papacy." (*Sermons*, p. 116) (*SDA Encyclopedia*, p. 322).” {Ibid}

This is what was the fountainhead of Miller’s understanding. In Damsteegt’s book on page 22; this is the very thing that led Miller to all of his conclusions, so James White was following on the heels of Miller. Let me read it for you:

“William Miller, when applying his hermeneutic (*the historicist, proof text method*), noticed in the various apocalyptic passages a recurring theme of controversy between the people of God and their enemies. In his analysis of the persecuting powers of God's people throughout the ages he developed the concept of the two abominations, defined as paganism (the first abomination) symbolizing the persecuting force outside the church, and the papacy (the second abomination) representing the persecuting power within the church. It was the motif of the two abominations that characterized most of his following prophetic interpretations.” {1977 PGD, FSDA 21.4}

So this two abominations motif for Miller, undergirded all his other prophetic interpretations; and it did so too with the pioneer Sabbatarian Adventists, all of them, for 50 years.

“But the event that made paganism a shibboleth amongst Adventists was Ellen White’s endorsement of it in “The Present Truth November 1850”, a vision that she received on September 23rd 1850 is now found on page 74-75 of Early Writings.” {Does 1844 Have a “Pagan” Foundation? Pg 22}

There is a little bit of a controversy behind that, and I recommend that you get Jeff’s lecture: ‘Alpha and Omega Apostasy’, on this – he covers this very portion that this man is covering here.

“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. Time has not been a test since 1844, and it will never again be a test.” {EW 74.2}

He goes through Uriah Smith but I won’t go there.

So the old view had been embraced for about 50 years, the Crosier article, some of it had been deleted by James White, and they kept the idea that from that early study on the sanctuary, that what took place on October 22nd 1844 was that Christ moved from the Holy Place into the Most Holy Place. That part was foundational; that’s one of the pillars they laid on this foundation; the sanctuary ministry of Christ in the Most Holy Place. But what they did not lay on this foundation, was the change of the ‘Daily’. They retained the ‘Daily’ understanding as paganism, and that is what I believe, is one of the pillars laid on the foundation of this history.

“The SDA "New View" of the "Daily"

“The first denominational leader to openly publish a view contrary to the Millerite "pagan daily" was L.R. Conradi in his 1905 volume. *Die Weissagung Daniel*. His "New View" was actually older

than the Millerite "Old View." (*That is because it goes back centuries...back to the time of Jerome even*) Like the reformers, he concluded that Daniel 8:14, pointed to the restoration of the long lost gospel, and that the "taking away of the daily" referred to the obscuration of that truth by the papacy. (Others subsequently would attempt to give it an Adventist flavor by describing it as the mediation of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary) From Conradi the view spread to A.T. Jones, A.G. Daniells, W.C. White, and W. W. Prescott.

"Conradi, General Conference vice president for the European Division, confronted the problem when it became his task to translate the church's prophetic works into German. Much to his chagrin he found that German translations of the Bible did not accommodate Miller's interpretation at all: When Elder Conradi was writing on the book of Daniel, in German, and came to this passage of Scripture concerning "the daily", he found the German rendering so worded that it was impossible for him to follow the commonly accepted exposition without very evidently wresting the plain meaning of the words in the German version." {Does 1844 Have a "Pagan" Foundation? Pg 23}

"The statement as found in the German Bible, was so plainly in contradiction to the exposition given in "Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation," that he was nonplussed; but he feared to give an exposition that seemed, on the face of it, not to be in harmony with the plain reading of the Scripture."

In other words, what he had learned as an Adventist and what he learned in his German Bible didn't match so he says that I am going to give what I read in my Bible rather than what I have been taught.

"He compared the German rendering with the original Hebrew (*here is another fellow that uses his Hebrew rendering of the interpretation of the 'Daily', this would begin a long chain of events in the history of Adventism.*) and with the Septuagint Greek, and also with the French, Danish and other versions of the foreign translations of the Bible. These were similar to the German; and it became clear to him that the text under consideration should not be interpreted in accordance with the view taught in "Thoughts on Daniel". ("A Review of Experiences Leading to a Consideration of the Question of 'The Daily' of Daniel 8:9-14," by A.G. Daniells)

"At the turn of the century, Conradi wrote to Ellen White in Australia informing her that unless she had counsel to the contrary, he would feel compelled to publish his conclusions (Arthur L. White, *The Later Elmshaven Years*, page 247). Not receiving a reply within the specified time, he published *Die Weissagung Daniel—the first denominational book to challenge the "daily" – equals- "paganism" equation*. His book was circulated widely in Europe by 1905; and by 1910, he had also succeeded in preventing *Daniel and Revelation* from being published in England. (Conradi to Daniells, March 8, 1910, cited in Bert Haloviak's "In the Shadow of the Daily," p. 38)" {ibid}

"Conradi's break with tradition was evidently a relief to many leaders who for years had harbored private doubts about the "pagan daily."

That is not all they had doubts about; they had doubts about the sanctuary doctrine as well.

"In our council-meeting where the matter was brought up for study, we learned many things that led us to question whether there might not be a stronger position for us to take than that allowed by an advocacy of the view taught in the days of William Miller. We learned that William Miller himself was apparently the first to arrive at the conclusion that the taking away

of "the daily" should be interpreted as signifying the taking away of Paganism in 508, and that he arrived at this conclusion by a series of blunders in scriptural interpretation and in his understanding of history." {Ibid pg.23-24}

These men are telling a lie; that is not the testimony of Ellen White, and they know it, they know it! They know that she defends this history. Then they have the audacity, the gall, to tell Willy White that look, we don't want your mother to be embarrassed by her misunderstanding of history. That is what they do; they do that to bring him in on their side. They convince poor Willy White that they are right and his mother, well we need to change the books and some of the things that she has written so that she won't be embarrassed, that is what this story is telling us.

"We learned also that many of our ministers, when presenting the prophecies of Daniel and the Revelation before unbelievers, have touched very lightly on the portion of Scripture relating to "the daily", and have for many years made no serious attempt to give a critical explanation of the meaning of the text. Brother W.A. Spicer has spoken thus of his avoidance of these texts while he was a public worker: (*This is also from A.G. Daniels*)

"When I used to give Bible readings (*This is Spicer*) in the earlier days in London, and took the people through the eighth of Daniel, I always skipped over those texts where we made the sanctuary one minute in heaven and the next on earth, and the host one time the saints, and the next the pagans, and I slipped over the statement that the taking away of 'the daily' meant the taking away of paganism by suggesting that the rendering in the original was a bit obscure so that the translation was difficult. (*These guys have done this to themselves and then they have rubbed it off on the rest of us*). That is what we used to be taught in the Bible School in Battle Creek in the old days. And all that, you observe, was making no particular use of that particular portion of scripture. It was simply passing over it to get down to the cleansing of the sanctuary." ("A Review of the Experiences Leading to a Consideration of the Question of 'The Daily' of Daniel 8:9-14", by A.G. Daniells, emphasis supplied)" {Ibid pg.24}

So this is a document we need to get and read by A.G. Daniells

"The public questioning of the "pagan daily" by the church's highest and most respected leaders touched off a fierce controversy that shook the denomination to its roots. The defenders of the "new view" included the General Conference president (A.G. Daniells), the future General Conference president (W.A. Spicer), the editor of the *Review* (W.W. Prescott), and Ellen White's son and confidante, William C. White."

So the man who began the Millerite movement, who turned the 'Daily' upside down in his day, who was a leader in the movement, as history is being repeated, it took the established...you couldn't get any higher leadership within Adventism to turn the 'Daily' upside down. It starts from the top down; it doesn't start from the bottom up).

The opposition, however, was not the least bit impressed (*Now these men now are the defenders of the faith once delivered to the saints*). Appealing to a higher authority in the form of *Early Writings* (pp. 74, 75,), they unleashed a vigorous counterattack that scandalized the shocked "New view" advocates (*What it did, it made them mad*). Willie White, in a letter (October 27, 1910) to J. S. Washburn (*this is the guy that went to his grave defending the old view of the 'Daily'*.), a staunch "old view" defender, cited a number of inflammatory actions

taken by the "old view" defenders. (*This is Willy White to Washburn*). Such actions, White believed, showed the "old view" defenders to be the aggressors in the escalating conflict over the "Daily." {Ibid pg. 24}

This gives license for this man, Gilbert Valentine in this book; and in another one, to call these men rebels. He is taking his view point from Willy White's letter to Washburn, that these people are the aggressors in this battle over the 'Daily'. Well as a matter of fact, they are not; as a matter of fact they are defenders against the ones that are the aggressors. The four Adventist leaders that were named at the head of this article, right here, were the aggressors, and in the long run, their view prevailed. Every Seventh-day Adventist since the days of W.W. Prescott, W. A. Spicer and A.G. Daniells, have been taught the new view of the 'Daily' hands down.

"Such actions, White believed, showed the "old view" defenders to be the aggressors in the escalating conflict over the "Daily." (*Notice how he phrases this*) The first public stone was cast by Elder Stephen Haskell, who published a facsimile of what he thought was the prophetic chart endorsed by *Early Writings*, with the quote from Mrs. White." {Ibid}

There was no question of what he reproduced, he reproduced this chart; and on some place on the chart, he had a quotation from *Early Writings* page 74, with Ellen White's endorsement of the chart by God, and that in 1844, all were in union on the 'Daily'. That is what he had on the chart.

"L.A. Smith (son of Uriah) circulated a tract of his own in the summer of 1909 in which he accused the "new view" advocates of disloyalty to the Spirit of Prophecy, right after a meeting in which it was agreed that the antagonists would refrain from personal criticism of each other (WCW to JSW, p. 27). Other ministers who felt compelled to join the battle against the "new view" included J.N. Loughborough, G. I. Butler, and F. C. Gilbert. (*Now those are big names in Adventism.*) Although Willie White tried to hold the "new view" fort (*he was a defender of the new view advocates*), the opposition scored some impressive political victories. Stephen Haskell bombarded Ellen White with letters complaining of Prescott's dangerous new view of the "daily" (June 20, 1907; November 18, 1907; January 30, 1908; February 21, 1909). He even hosted her at his home for about a week during this period. Haskell evidently made good use of that time because Prescott was subsequently pressured into leaving the *Review* in mid-1909 by Ellen White, who urged him to engage in city evangelism instead." {Ibid pg.24-25}

Now when you read her own account of this in the manuscripts, in the letters that she sent to this man, when she is telling him that he needs to go into evangelism of the cities, it's not under the idea that she is pressuring him because of the stays that she had at Elder Haskell's house, nor is it under the impression that Elder Haskell has made an influence on her to write this counsel to him. If you are a faithful Seventh day Adventist and believe in the testimony of Ellen White, that is the furthest thing from the truth. The Lord had showed Ellen White that Brother Prescott would do more for himself, and the church if he would enter into city evangelism, and that is the bottom line; but some writers want to remake this and are led to believe that Sister White was in some kind of conspiracy against the 'New View'; and if you think that, Sister White would be a liar, which is what they are making her out to be; then there is something wrong here.

"A.G. Daniells, as General Conference president, met a similar fate, and was virtually forced to relinquish his position to several associates in 1910 and engage in city evangelism. The tide

would turn, but two of the three most influential men in the denomination found themselves for a time in an exile of sorts. Was city evangelism suddenly so pressing that both the editor of the *Review* and the General Conference president had to leave their offices to become evangelists? Or was city evangelism merely a pretext for removing these men from a position of influence? (*Do you think Ellen White would do that? That is what he is suggesting.*) Did they incur Ellen White's wrath solely or at least primarily because of their promotion of the "new view" of the "daily"? Was Ellen White upset because she saw the "daily" controversy "as a threat to the long overdue drive for city evangelism," as Arthur White claims (*The Later Elmshaven Years*, p. 246)? Was Ellen White actually neutral on the issue, as material published over her name during that period suggests, or was she secretly resentful that Daniells, Prescott, and her son Willie, were seeing to it that her authority as a Bible interpreter was being, like the "daily" "taken away?" {Ibid pg. 25}

This is all conjecture; this man is asking questions. I can assure you that Sister White was in control of this affair. Sister White knew exactly what was going on, and what they are suggesting here was not part of her routine. This is a good article to let you understand and see how deep this controversy really goes within the heart of Adventism.

"If Sister White says that she does not mean what she said when she said what she did on the "daily", then I will say no more." {Ibid pg. 26}

This is Haskell responding to his critics, the men that are pressuring him to get off his soap box, so to speak, against the correct view of the 'Daily' and stop pressuring Daniells, Prescott and the others, on these things, and Haskell just tells them that if Ellen White says that it's not an issue, then I won't do it anymore.

"Her July 31, 1910, declaration that ended the controversy was no bipartisan appeal for a ceasefire from both sides. Ellen White was finally addressing the "old view" advocates, her shock troops who had, with her help hounded Prescott and Daniells into exile (*Well, that is not so but that is how this writer is writing this history*). After all, it was not the "new view" advocates who had to be restrained from using Early Writings as their leading argument." {Ibid pg.26}

"It was a signal to Prescott and Daniells (*Now notice this*) that they could come down from their respective trees now that their opposition had been forbidden to use her writings in fighting against their interpretation."

That's not the reason why Sister White did this, there was a colossal problem within the church that Sister White was saying, was taking away the focus on city evangelism; it wasn't all this, that she was on one side or the other, but she told them both to leave the 'Daily' alone and don't bring it up, because it was just going to bring in confusion, which it has done. If you have heard anything we have talked about this week, the confusion that is left on record is still with us to this very day. But Sister White's approach here is not as this writer is really addressing this.

"Ellen White's insistence on calling the "daily" issue an unimportant, trivial distraction indicates that she sided with the "old view." "New view" advocates could hardly be consistent in calling the issue trivial, since on their interpretation the "daily" became Christ's righteousness, the heavenly sanctuary, or the gospel. Could any Christian call that trivial or unimportant?" {Ibid}

"It was the "old view" advocates who were embarrassed that they were forced into defending "paganism." Stephen Haskell, for instance, admitted to Willie White (Haskell to White, 6 December 1909) that the "daily" itself did not "amount to a hill of beans"; but he felt compelled to defend it because the authority of the Spirit of Prophecy was at stake. When Washburn was interviewed on June 4, 1950 (*this was on his death bed*), by R. J. Weiland and D. K. Short, he was still complaining that the "new view" of the "daily" made it a "main spoke of the wheel—the ministry of Christ"; whereas in the "old view," it was a "non-essential point."

"Ellen White seemed to share the "old view" advocates' embarrassment over having to debate the subject. In the same interview, Washburn recalled that F.C. Gilbert had told him of Ellen White's comment to him: "I could have stopped this daily controversy, but they got hold of Willie, and that made it more difficult." By contrast, Ellen White showed no reluctance or embarrassment when she defended the sanctuary doctrine in 1905 (*Now notice this*) against A.F. Ballenger. True, she thought it an essential point, but there is good reason to believe that she would have elevated the importance of the "daily" if she had been converted to the "new view." She also said that Jones and Waggoner were agitating a trivial issue until she became a convert to their view in 1888. (EGW to Jones and Waggoner, 18 February 1887)." {Ibid pg. 26-27}

In other words, when Ellen White thought that there was something going on that wasn't right, she wrote to Wagner and Jones before 1888, and she thought that there might be something wrong with what they were about to get themselves involved in, the subject of the righteousness of Christ. This article is telling us that once she heard it for herself, she saw that it was from the Lord, that that's not how she accepted the 'Daily', the new view of the 'Daily' was never accepted in that fashion by her. She never advocated the 'new view' of the 'Daily'; but she did advocate the message of Waggoner and Jones. So you have to ask yourself the question, if the 'new view' is so correct, why is it in the writings of Ellen White you never find her advocating it, ever! Nowhere; you can't find it because its not there, but you can find in Early Writings her statement on the old view, which is plain as the nose on your face, that prior to 1844, all were in union on the subject of the 'Daily'.

"The "Daily" and the "Omega of Apostasy" Despite Ellen White's appeal to cease debate on the subject in 1910, the potentially deadly wound was not healed but continued to fester." {Ibid pg. 28}

"Time Setting and the "Daily" Despite what the "new view" devotees claimed, the theme of time setting and the identification of the "daily" were actually the same Topic."

Her statement in Early Writings was re-interpreted by Daniells and Prescott to mean that the 'daily' was really the subject of time setting.

"This is inadvertently proven by Arthur White in his discussion of the circumstances surrounding Ellen White's original vision on the subject in 1850. First, he quotes from Daniells' undated interview with her: (*Now this is the interview that had supposedly taken place with Daniells and Ellen White, which they don't have a record of.*) "As I recall her answer, she began by telling how some of the leaders who had been in the 1844 movement endeavoured to find new dates for the termination of the 2300-year period. This endeavor was to fix new dates for the coming of the Lord. This was causing confusion among those who had been in the Advent Movement." (*The Later Elmshaven Years*, p. 256)" {Ibid g.27}

He is referring to the statement made in Early Writings page 74. Those that were involved in the age to come; and one of the main leaders in that movement was Crosier, and so they were taking the subject of the 'Daily' in Daniel, they were resetting the time frames for 508, they were adjusting these time frames to place the second coming of Christ as they believed would take place in the 'Age to Come', down into 1851, down into 1857, 1853, and they had various date that they were changing the time, and they were using the 'Daily' as their fulcrum to do it. That is the relationship between the 'Daily' and the time setting statement in Early Writings; it's not just that the 'Daily' is being discussed merely as a time element as Prescott would do. Prescott was very shrewd in turning this thing upside down. But Ellen White was saying that the men who were doing the changing of the 'Daily' based on the setting of time, were wrong, because prior to 1844, all were in union of the subject of the 'Daily', meant that it was paganism and it was 508. It didn't need to have the time reset.

"Since charts figure in this matter (These men who were resetting the 'Daily' in those times, they had charts that they were using), Ellen White's attitude in this interview is given strong support as the reckoning of the Cummings 1854 "prophetic chart" is studied. In this, the Jewish altar of "daily sacrifice" in 446 B.C. is used as the starting point for a new 2300-year time span set to end in 1854."

Right here, they change the subject of the 'Daily' when they start arguing over the time setting, its changed from paganism back to the Jewish sacrifices, and they have a chart that is dated BC 446. They are changing the time using the 'Daily', and that is what Sister White is referring to in Early Writings. What these people are doing is that they are combining some of Miller's ideas with some of the Dowling ideas to try and adjust the time, to find some reasonable conclusion to what took place on October 22nd 1844 somewhere down further in time.

"This chart, published at Concord, New Hampshire, in 1853, was typical of charts that commenced the 2300 days with what was said to be the taking away of the "daily sacrifice." [see chart in the PDF of 'Does 1844 Have a "Pagan" Foundation?']. " {Ibid g.28}

So right away they started using the 'daily sacrifice', the Jewish idea again, as a way to adjust the time periods. That is why also in the same statement in 'Early Writings' she later says that we are not to go back to old Jerusalem, because that is what they were advocating, that was the 'Age to Come' men, they were advocating those who were going to be following the true understanding of Daniel and Revelation, the church was going to Jerusalem and rebuild the temple; and if anybody knows about modern evangelicalism, that is what they believe. The 'Age to Come' people are with us today; it's called harvest crusade in California, and many other factions. So what this means to us personally as a church, and as a testimony to others around us, if we actually teach the right concept of the 'Daily', we can actually bring those people out of darkness into the light of the Third Angel's Message, we have that responsibility.

"The "Daily" and the "Omega of Apostasy" Despite Ellen White's appeal to cease debate on the subject in 1910, the potentially deadly wound was not healed but continued to fester. What had changed was that now the "old view" advocates found themselves in exile, while the "new view" advocates returned to power. Denied permission to use *Early Writings*, the "old view" supporters were helpless against the "new view" which "practiced and prospered." (*Now I agree with that*)

“The "new view" of the "daily" began to take on an even more ominous significance to the old guard in the years following 1910. To them, the 1919 Bible Conference, in which problems with the "Spirit of Prophecy" were openly acknowledged (*that meaning that there were those in the 1919 Bible Conference that believed that even the writings of Ellen White now needed to be corrected*), was a logical outcome of Daniells,' Prescott's, and Willie White's new stance on the "daily". (*This was Haskell's original argument; they were undermining the authority of Ellen White. Prescott and Willy White would tell his mother, that this new view of the 'Daily' was defending her articles and her authority, keeping her from embarrassment; but these men knew better than that.*) For the old guard, the "daily" represented the institutional church's first open defiance of Ellen White and the first questioning of the Adventist landmarks. (*Therefore my opening text in Jeremiah about the high heaps and the land marks.*) It had to be the dreaded "omega of apostasy" that was spoken of by Ellen White.” {Ibid pg.28}

And it was. From this time forward, from 1920 forward, Elder Froom admits there was a new generation of books. That's his own statement from the book 'Movement of Destiny'. Right after the 1919 Bible conference, all the books in Adventism came out under the 'New View' of the 'Daily', every single one; every single one without exception. They are all premised on the 'New View' of the 'Daily', which by the 1940's. 1945-1950, that era, would led Desmond Ford and Raymond Cottrell to conclude that there is no justification in the book of Daniel, linguistically or contextually, using the ancient Hebrew, to defend Seventh-day Adventist doctrine on the investigative judgment.

The Resurrection of Antiochus Epiphanes in the Eighties.

Dowling presented Antiochus Epiphanes as his champion against Miller. The literal local translation of this using the 2300 days, to be a literal 1150 days, leading down to Antiochus Epiphanes in that history.

This is Raymond Cottrell on Daniel 8:14: this article is somewhere around 1996.

“The first imperative for comparing the prophecies on Daniel in the sense that inspiration intended, in an objective frame of mind, divested of every personal objective, modern supposition with respect to its import (*so in other words, you need to throw all this out before you take a look at the book of Daniel. That is what he calls an objective view. You can't consider any of this. He goes on to say. .*) accordingly in order to understand these passages as inspiration intended them to be understood, we must do so with that historical perspective, just like Dowling did, in our minds and from the same perspective as salvation history as Daniel, and his intended readers did, (*in other words, a local event, having nothing to do with any future event.*) Any interpretation that ignores or controverts that historical perspective; and or the salvation perspective of the time of Daniel, is automatically suspect and imposes an alien uninspired interpretation on these prophecies” {The eschatology of Daniel by Raymond Cottrell}

What he is saying to you is that all this is alien and uninspired; he is telling you in a nutshell that the whole history of Adventism needs to be thrown in the garbage can. That is why today you cannot use these two charts in a local church. Joseph Bates used to take this charts with him and wherever he went, he would hang them up and people would gather around them and ask him, “what is this?”, and he would come up behind and ask, What are you looking at? Oh, would you like to know? And then

Brother Bates would give them a Bible study, and then they would know for themselves the First and Second Angel's Messages and the Third. Cottrell writes this in the 90's, but he came to his conclusion earlier than that, 40 years earlier.

"It is of crucial importance to know that Gabriel explicitly identifies the word in Daniel 9:23 (*When Gabriel first flies to answer Daniel's prayer in Daniel 9, Gabriel says the word came forth, the KJV says the commandment came forth.*) went out to restore and rebuild Jerusalem at the commencement of the 70 weeks of years as the word that went out in heaven, while Daniel was praying, that word or that commandment that came forth was obviously one that only God himself, and no earthly monarch could possibly have issued on the authority of no less a person than the angel Gabriel, the 70 weeks of years thus begins in 537 BC." {The Eschatology of Daniel by Raymond Cottrell}

What is this man is saying that the commandment to restore and rebuild Jerusalem was not issued by Artaxerxes Longimanus in 457 BC, but the command was issued by God Himself and no earthly monarch could have possibly issued this command.

Now how far out to the window do you suppose that take all this? That means that the Advent movement is invalid. Now you have to understand what this man has done, to understand what this man is going to say about what I just read.

"This monstrous absurdity in the very pillar of Adventist theology eventually led to serious hemorrhaging in the 1980s." {Does 1844 Have a "Pagan" Foundation? pg.28}

What I just read you here, this type of hermeneutics;

"This monstrous absurdity in the very pillar of Adventist theology eventually led to serious hemorrhaging in the 1980s. Theologians could no longer keep their cognitive dissonance secret from their employers. Desmond Ford and Ray Cottrell went public with their discontent but were careful to blunt the impact of the problem by offering solutions such as the "apotelesmatic" principle and context by divine fiat, respectively. Others were more relentless in their logic. Robert Brinsmead rejected 1844 as having any prophetic significance whatsoever."

Brinsmead was once a defender of righteousness by faith and the sanctuary doctrine, after 1980 with the revelations of Desmond Ford and Ray Cottrell, he completely abandons Adventism and today he is growing avocados somewhere in Australia, and he has nothing to do with the church, with God. He has completely abandoned God.

By the time that 1844 was openly questioned and rejected by many Adventists in the 1980s, however, it appears that they were only carrying the "new view" of 1910 to its logical end. Robert Wieland, one of the few surviving "old view" advocates, sees a clear relationship between the two events (*Now Robert Wieland here is spot on.*): Many have not pursued Conradi's view to its logical end." {Ibid}

"But some of our astute scholars have, and it has proved a short circuit that makes Antiochus Epiphanes of 168 B.C. to be the necessary "primary" fulfillment of the Dan. 8 prophecy. In their scheme, there is no room for an 1844 application except by a contrived "secondary" or "apotelesmatic" fulfillment. This is seen as a "face-saving" accommodation openly ridiculed by

non-Adventist theologians and now by some of our own, built on Ellen White. (Have We Followed 'Cunningly Devised Fables'?, an undated outline of a proposed thought paper) *(I don't think that this brother Wieland ever finished this thing, but this man concludes).*

“The history of the "daily" in the Seventh-day Adventist church seems to verify Washburn's and Wieland's conviction that the "taking away" of Adventism's pagan platform seriously compromised, if it did not destroy, the entire 1844 foundation. A logical analysis of the implications of Miller's "paganism" would certainly seem to lead one to endorse the verdict of history. It would appear that when the church abandoned "paganism" in 1910, it also unwittingly abandoned 1844, without which Adventism may have no reason to exist. Have not our Adventists progenitors, by their forced mating of the "new view" of "the daily" with 1844, set up the abomination of amalgamation in the sanctuary?” {Ibid}

Shall we pray?

Loving Father in heaven, these subjects dear Lord, are too short a time to cover in the time that we have covered them in, and we do pray dear Lord, that those who have heard these things, will study these things for themselves, that they will use their KJV Bibles, they will use the Spirit of Prophecy, and the writings of the pioneers; that they will study as they have never studied before. I know for myself Lord, the things that I have shared this week cannot be shared unless I have studied these things out.

Dear Lord, our object here is not to condemn any, but to save as many as we can, and to plead with ourselves and others, that the time is short and the characters that we are going to prefect, need to be perfected now before the decree goes forth, before the crisis, the overwhelming scourge takes place at the Sunday law. Loving Father in heaven, Sister White tells us that there are so few ready for this, that it's really frightening. Help us dear Lord to understand the momentous concept that You are now dealing with us as Your people. In the days of Zedekiah when he had an opportunity to turn and live, he refused to turn and live; and it will be so with many of us, if we will not heed the voice of Your Spirit calling us today, “Come out of her my people and be ye not partakers of her sins, for her sins have reached unto heaven and they have come in remembrance of God Almighty”. Bless us with these things we pray, in Jesus name, Amen.