

## The Desolations of Jerusalem 08

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 indeed grateful again that we can call upon You. Lord without You, we cannot accomplish these things that need to be accomplished in these meetings, or in our lives. Lord I know that You are doing things in these histories that we don't recognise in our own lives that we are living today, and You are going to bring us through these things by Your omnipotent power and might and strength, and I know that we will be surprised at the results that you accomplish in us. So we want to recognise dear Lord that apart from You, we can do nothing. So this morning as we again open up Your Word and these histories, please bless us by Your presence, both in mind and heart. Fill our hearts dear Lord and our minds with Your Holy Spirit, and help us to see that these things are not about trivial points in history, but they are about receiving the Righteousness of Christ in all its verity, truth and power; and that You brought forth the Seventh-day Adventist church to give these messages to a world lying in darkness. The Bible says that multitudes are in the valley of decision; unless someone goes and tells them Lord, they won't know, so please help us to respond to that still small voice that spoke so long ago in the ears of William Miller, when You told him to "go and tell it to the world". So please help us to do these things for heaven, and for those who need to hear it so badly, and that we will receive Christ in the First, Second and Third Angel's Messages, and we will go and tell it to the world. Bless us to these ends we pray, and we ask for it in Jesus name, Amen.

We are going to switch gears a little bit, we are going to be on the same subject but I want to take you a little deeper into this history. This chapter is called 'Protesting against War; Within and Without'; pages 250-265.

"Prescott had established himself as a resident historian scholar in the church. To many Americans such developments (*well they go on to tell about the Catholic immigration into the United States in the early parts of the 1900's*) were a threat to republicanism. Adventists saw them much more as a fulfilment of prophecy, but they believed such things would lead to the formation of the beast of Revelation 13, and eventually to the destruction of religious liberty. Prescott became personally involved in making representations to congress (*Can you imagine what his presentation might have been had he remained faithful to the truth?*) and the review reported extensively on the developments. The new threat led church officials to establish a new 32 page quarterly called 'Liberty'. The masthead of the first issue of the new journal listed Prescott as an associate editor. Correspondence however indicates that he took the leading editorial role, investing large amounts of time in producing the magazine and in fostering its interests. By 1909 church leaders perceived the increasing aggressiveness of Catholicism as a major challenge. As Prescott pointed to them, Rome had decreed in 1908 that America was no longer a missionary country, but a Roman Catholic Christian nation." {W.W. Prescott: Forgotten giant of Adventism's Second generation, pg. 250-265}

Someone reminded me in the not too far distance past, about cause and effect, and if we understand some things—this means here that if Elder Prescott had not drifted off into this New Theology, his impact on these incidents about religious liberty and some other issues would have had much more teeth in it. They would have been more adequately prepared to take the Third Angel's Message to

those who sat as representatives in the congress of the United States; but instead he gave watered down milk-toast to those who needed to hear the messages that brought us out of the churches in the First, Second and Third Angels Messages; but this writer does not recognise that. He goes on to tell you now about a new magazine:

“Large Catholic conferences convened around the country and a new Catholic weekly started with a specific purpose of influencing the public mind...” {Ibid}

The “Daily” is about the rise of the papacy; it’s the time in that history when the papacy receives military and economic strength from the Franks, i.e. Clovis, and it brings that opportunity to the papacy so that he can exalt himself to the throne of the earth. Now, if you take that history out of our doctrines and out of the Present Truth, which we could have delivered to congress in 1908, we could have made a much more biblical impression on the minds of congress about the threat that the Papacy really is, had we rightly taught the ‘Daily’ on the floor in the House of Congress in 1908. It goes on to say...

“Large Catholic congresses convened around the country and a new Catholic weekly started with a specific purpose of influencing the public mind. It was the stated plan of the hierarchy of Rome to win America for the church (*How much more important do you think it should be that we rightly understand the doctrines of the First, Second and Third Angel under those circumstances?*) Prescott argued that Adventists needed to make a response to this (*I agree*) but that Liberty magazine was not really well suited to the task. Another journal designed especially to confront the challenge seemed to be warranted. When Prescott presented the idea to his board of January 1909, its members were immediately enthusiastic and gave hearty approval. They felt that the first issue should be published as soon as possible. Four months later, delegates attending the General Conference session received the first copies of the premier issue. “We make no apologies for issuing the ‘Protestant Magazine’, Prescott declared in his opening editorial, “no other publication so far as we are concerned has this same purpose. In the tradition of the 16<sup>th</sup> century reformers and protesting German Princes, the magazine would protest against the apostasy of both Roman Catholic and the professedly Protestant Churches and plead for the faith which was once delivered to the saints. The basic problem of Protestantism”, he asserted, “was that it had ceased to protest.” {Ibid}

All these things might be true, but I don’t believe that Prescott’s answer to these vital questions was the answer which should have been given. It says...

“Prescott lived up to his word; features on justification by faith, mediation of Christ and the prophecies of Daniel and Revelation dominated the early issues, but they also carried articles analysing the Roman Catholic doctrine and outlining the history of the papacy. (*this was another good opportunity that if we had the right information, people would have known the truth*). Prescott prominently featured pieces illustrating the papacy’s involvement in politics. A special section in each issue presented notes and press clippings designed to keep readers up to date on the activities of the Catholic Church in America.” {Ibid}

Eventually, this writer will tell us that some of it was sensationalism in this magazine. Heaven wants to be defended by the truth, but not by sensationalism. To pit people against each other in political arenas is not the Third Angel’s Message; it is not—because the same Third Angel’s Message that could have had a good impact in congress could have had an effect on the hearts of Roman Catholics as well.

But instead, we did not give them what they needed to hear.

“The public notice accorded “The Protestant”, provided Prescott with an excellent opportunity to carry out Ellen White’s counsel regarding city evangelism.” {Ibid}

They make this a white washed excuse for him carrying out her counsel to him, in the controversy over the ‘Daily’. She told him that he needed to leave the ‘Daily’ alone, forget about it, and go into city evangelism. But here they are saying that this is what he was doing by doing this work on the ‘Protestant Magazine’. You will find out here in a minute that was not really his intent.

“He capitalised on the magazine’s success in his advertising campaign. In some instances he was the guest speaker at political campaigns, while on other occasions he ran short evangelism series himself in the eastern cities. As editor of the nationally known ‘Protestant’ and with a reputation as a respected defender of the Protestant cause, he found it easy to draw large audiences” {Ibid}

Once again, had he been telling the truth from the Bible, things might have been different. There is a quote from 1 Spiritual Gifts page 35. In the time of Jesus there were some things that took place that allowed the people to be deceived. Listen to this...what you are seeing here is a very subtle attack by the enemy. He carries out these things in the very same way as he has always done. There is something about him and Jesus that are similar and that is they never change. Satan is very skilful in using what he has done in the past; he uses it over and over again. He is doing it even now. The angels were deceived in this very way. There was new light brought in that convinced them that they were being mistreated by the Lord of heaven and that new light was instigated by Satan himself. Then he let that new light spread amongst the angels then he would stand back and they actually thought that they had thought that stuff up themselves. They thought that they were embracing something wonderful and new but it was really the master working behind the arch enemy.

“After Satan had ended his temptations, he departed from Jesus for a season, and angels prepared him food in the wilderness, and strengthened him, and the blessing of his Father rested upon him. Satan had failed in his fiercest temptations, yet he looked forward to the period of Jesus' ministry, when he should at different times try his cunning against him. He still hoped to prevail against him by stirring up those who would not receive Jesus, to hate and seek to destroy him. Satan held a special counsel with his angels. They were disappointed and enraged that they had prevailed nothing against the Son of God. They decided that they must be more cunning, and use their power to the utmost to inspire unbelief in the minds of his own nation as to his being the Saviour of the world, and in this way discourage Jesus in his mission. No matter how exact the Jews might be in their ceremonies and sacrifices, if they could keep their eyes blinded as to the prophecies, and make them believe that it was a mighty, worldly king who was to fulfill these prophecies, they would keep their minds on the stretch for a Messiah to come.” {1SG 35.1}

A misunderstanding of the prophecies is the way that Satan works. Today in the church, the church is looking for the Latter Rain; they’re praying for it. But Ellen White describes that the Latter Rain is the Third Angels’ Message; it began to fall in 1888. The Latter Rain is a message coming from the prophecies. Satan used his subtleties to deceive the Jews on their understanding of the prophecies and he is using the same tactics today in the Seventh-day Adventist church. And to be confused on these issues and think that what you’re seeing is the truth about a prophecy when as a matter of fact it is the

exact opposite, and it is not the truth, is the very scheme that Satan used very successfully. Then His own people then would take Jesus and put him on trial in Pilate's judgement hall, siding with Caesar and the outcome was they would declare; "We have no king but Caesar".

Jesus faced what every Seventh-day Adventist will soon face. He faced church-craft and state-craft united, and in so doing, He gave His life under those circumstances. The plan of salvation is very close. Men and women do not realise what it means to be a Seventh-day Adventist at the end of the world. We are to represent Christ, and if Brother Prescott understood it like he should have, he would have never changed the issues on the 'Daily'. He would have went forward, taking the Third Angel's Message as it had been given by God's Spirit in the days of the Millerites and in the days of Sabbatarian Adventism—and we might not still be here, we might be in heaven had they finished the work. But this goes on to say...now this is the saga of the 'Daily'. In writing the 'Protestant Magazine', they finally had to discontinue it—it was discontinued.

*"The saga of the daily continued to dog its steps. Although Prescott had been careful not to specifically raise the 'daily' issue or even exegete Daniel 8:11-13 in the 'Protestant'" (I want to let you know that in the 'Protestant Magazine', what he would do what, he would take all of his new views of the 'Daily' and he would inculcate it in the context of the editorial articles that he was writing for the 'Protestant Magazine') {W.W. Prescott: Forgotten giant of Adventism's Second generation, pg. 250-265}*

Notice how sly they were, because in this time period, Haskell was on the side lines, being an antagonist, according to this guy, so he didn't want to give Haskell any ammunition. So as he perverts the teaching on the 'Daily' ... notice what he does"

*"The saga of the 'Daily' continued to dog his steps. (That means that Haskell and Loughborough were on the side lines). Although Prescott had been careful not to specifically raise the 'Daily' issue or even exegete Daniel 8:11-13 in the 'Protestant', the whole underlying theological rationale of the journal nevertheless derived from the new view of the 'Daily'. (This is a man that is determined.) Prescott's basic approach involved contrasting the Catholic mass, which took away the need for Christ's high priestly ministry, with the true gospel, the continual mediation of Christ. The Adventist church with its emphasis on the priesthood of Christ, he asserted, had been raised up prophetically, Daniel 8:13 (This is an untruth) to restore this central truth, His high priestly ministrations in the sanctuary. The thrust of the magazine rested on that premise and the professor's opponents understood it clearly. J. S. Washburn for example was particularly antagonistic and conducted a bitter personal campaign against the magazine and its editor throughout the Columbia Union Conference. Even a summons to Washington to give an account of his device activities to the General Conference officers, would not deter Elder Washburn. He was not afraid of the inquisition as he called it." {Ibid}*

Now one of the things that we don't know in Adventism, there are some books that Prescott produced, we introduced one of them yesterday; 'The Doctrine of Christ', and this was after the 1919 Bible Conference. But we had an old book in our history called 'Facts for the Times', this is 1893. I told you earlier about my cardboard box of books; well in my quest for gaining access to Adventist materials back in the 70's, I ran into some fellows at the Heritage Room and they gave me some pointers on what to pick up, where to find them, and so forth and so on, because they informed me that these books—very shortly—they would not be able to find this material, because it would vanish off the face of the earth. So with their wise counsel, I began to pick up whatever I could. In those days I picked up

this book, called 'Facts for the Times', (by G I Butler) and its mentioned in this book on the life of W.W. Prescott. This is our old source book for ministers and Bible workers and colporteurs, they would carry this with them and they would teach the people from this on various points in history about the Papacy; this was a good book. Prescott wanted to re-do this book. Prescott's passion was to re-do all the books. This book is called 'The Source book' this was 1919, this was the same year they had the Bible conference. This is my wife's book she got from one of her relatives and this is also a 'Source book' but this is a 1927 edition, the paging is a little different, but the content is the same. Now I want to tell you a little story here. It says here, "The legacy of the Protestant magazine."

This book that Prescott would write is 'The legacy of the Protestant magazine'. It says...

"Another part of the legacy resulting from his work on the 'Protestant' was the enduring, 'Source Book' for Bible students. *(By the way, I haven't got to ask him yet, but I could surmise that, probably, Heidi Hikes took his title from his book from this one; that's why he calls it 'The Source book')* While checking the accuracy of quotations used by the church in its polemic against Rome, Professor Prescott discovered other authoritative statements on church history and doctrinal development that were helpful in defending Adventist teaching. *(What that means is, defending the 'New View'. So he wants to re-do this book, change it, produce this book to defend Adventist teaching and defend the New View).* He printed them regularly in the 'Protestant' and occasionally in the 'Review'. *(This work began while he was still printing in the 'Protestant'.)* In 1913 at the request of the General Conference he began to prepare the quotations for publication and permanent form for the benefit of pastors. Originally his plan was to revise and expand the already existing book, 'Facts for These Times', but various interruptions delayed the project. The completed volume finally came out in 1919 under the new title and a new format *(that's the 'The Source book', 'Books of a new order').*" {Ibid}

"Under a new title and a new format while other assisted on the work on 'The Source book', it was largely a Prescott production and helped confirm his role as historian laureate in the denomination. *(So this man was on a roll. All the time, this writer is telling us that he was following the counsels of Ellen White, but the counsels of Ellen White, when you read them for yourself are, clear enough, she told him to leave the 'Daily' alone and don't bother with it; also she told him to leave the books alone).* The wide variety of sources utilized in 'The Source Book' illustrates well just how broadly Prescott read. *(You know the devil reads too!)* Graduation from Dartmouth had not meant the end of his education" {Ibid}

"Ellen White's editorial staff also valued Prescott's education" {Ibid}

Now this is the editorial staff, this isn't Ellen White. Don't read into this history what you don't need to!

"Ellen White's editorial staff also valued Prescott's education, for example in late 1907 when C.C Crisler was working on a series of Ellen White articles on Ezra *(this is very important when we get to the subject of 1919)* he had urged the professor to assist them because of his expertise in the area *(this is on the book of Ezra, the chronology)* although he was using the best authorities *(meaning Crisler)* available to guide in him getting the chronology and the names of kings correct *(Have you have ever tried to do that? It's tough)*. He recognised the help that Prescott had been in preparing the articles of publication. Prescott, on his own initiative, had earlier edited *(now I want you to catch this)* some of Ellen White's sentences out of the articles before he printed them *(this is while he was the editor of the Review and Herald)*. They consisted of passages that disagreed with standard history books on the Ezra period." {Ibid}

So, you're Elder Prescott, and one day you get an article from Ellen White to print. You're the editor of the Review and Herald office and you take a look at it and as an editor you proof read everything, right? Well, if you're reading the prophet's words and you say "Oh well, that is not right, let me see, let me get my history book and knock the dust off and let me look it up. Oh yes, she's not right there. Let's just take that out". That is the admittance of these people; that is what he did.

"They consisted of passages that disagreed with standard history books (*In other words, standard history books are above and beyond that which inspiration has provided, that's what it's telling me*). He had then written to W.C White to explain his actions (*Something obviously is going in here that he had to write and explain himself*). It was Prescott's understanding that Ellen White did not (*you know, him and Conradi, Sister White never answered Conradi so he assumed that it was ok for him to go ahead on his book on the 'Daily' in Germany. This guy says that it was Prescott's understanding that Ellen White did not intend her writing to settle matters of a historical controversy. That means that according to Prescott, that would make him the authority, "If she wasn't then am going to be" that is the logic here*). Statements in her articles did not carry that kind of authority; unless she had specific light on these historical matters, I am somewhat at a loss to know how these historical controversies can thus be settled." {Ibid}

Prescott is the one that brought in the historical controversies; now he is claiming that Sister White is not an authority so, lo and behold, who can settle these things? Well, obviously it's Brother Prescott. Notice how he frames this...

"His purpose in deleting the passages was to protect her from unfriendly criticism and attack. Crisler was glad that Prescott had taken the initiative and urged him to continue deleting portions in the remaining articles that he thought might do more harm than good. (*This is the editorial staff at Elmshaven doing this; C. C Crisler*) Before the series had been completed however, the professor found himself pressed into visit Elmshaven personally to give critical help and planning further E.G White articles (*this history is very interesting*). The scholarly help he gave in the process of revising Ellen White's 'Great Controversy' also provides an illustration of the professor's role as resident historian. W.C White visited him at his home on Washington early in 1910 to urge him to assist with the work, but Prescott was reluctant to get involved, he was already overworked, but more than that, he feared that involvement would simply provide his critics with more ammunition against him should they hear he had any connection with changes in Ellen White's books. (*He means Haskell, Loughborough, Washburn and some others. Notice this :)* His re-interpretation of the daily passage in Early Writing had already incensed them." {Ibid}

At least these men admit that Prescott re-interpreted the 'Daily' passage. Sister White did not have the intention that Prescott interpreted in her statement in Early Writings; this is his interpretation of her words—that the 'Daily' was not the issue in the Early Writings passage, but time setting was the issue, is how he puts it.

"His re-interpretation of the daily passage in Early Writing had already incensed them. At W.C White's assistance however, he consented to go through the book (*meaning the Great Controversy*) and write out his suggestions. White also pressed Daniels to encourage Prescott in this task. (*Notice that it is coming from Willy White and from A.G Daniels and to Prescott now*). He desired that the professor be free in his suggestions (*this is Willy*), the result was a 39 page document detailing 105 changes that Prescott thought would improve the book and make it

more accurate. No doubt he could suggest other changes, he said, but he had been short of time thus his list was not exhaustive. White was grateful for the professor's work and treated it confidentially. *(This is the part that is really implicating!)* He had said very little to his staff *(Willy White didn't mention this to the staff. So now it's a private matter between Prescott, Daniels and Willy White, that Prescott is going to be supplying this material.)* as to who had pointed out the passages *(meaning these corrections that are being made in certain passages, Willy was keeping this to himself.)* as we thought he would wish us to do. *(Willy is doing this because Prescott didn't want anybody to know that he was helping on the book).* W.C White did not regard Prescott as a renegade for proposing changes as some studies have implicated or implied, in fact Elmshaven later asked him *(meaning Prescott)* for further suggestions. W.C White also glad for the alternative quotations Prescott had supplied." {Ibid}

"The professor had sent across additional historical material as a basis for further revision. Some of it eventually found its way into the appendixes of The Great Controversy. As might be expected, Elmshaven did not adopt all of Professor Prescott's suggested revisions, though some leaders thought all of them should have been received and more besides. For example, Spicer's view was, Crisler, Robinson and W.C White had been too cautious, and too hard to get along with. They, he thought, had turned down some of his own suggestions without good reason. Although the new edition would have many things changed, Spicer wrote to Conradi, *(now this is Spicer to Conradi)* "Some things should surely have been corrected further". Robinson's reluctance to except all the modifications was that Ellen White's staff felt sure that evidence to support certain positions she had taken had at one time existed but they believed that Roman Catholics had intentionally destroyed many of the sources." {Ibid}

Do you know where they get this source from? They get it from the men who are trying to change Ellen White's books at the 1919 Bible Conference. That's this argument that he is presenting. It has no foundation and there is no accuracy in it. These things that are being said about the workers and the Ellen White staff are probably untrue, because it's coming from the very people who would eventually try to change the writings of Ellen White. So what am telling you is that this is not a primary source piece of evidence. It's hearsay coming from the men who were at the 1919 Bible Conference. The footnote, tells you the 1919 Bible Conference and where they took it from, so this is not credible. (Editor's Note: It WAS true that many history books available earlier in the 1800s, WERE being systematically destroyed by Jesuit Scholars, but still, it was possible this was being used as a convenient excuse to change the quotes.)

"W.C White had been working however under considerable difficulty The controversy over the 'Daily' had created an atmosphere of suspicion and mistrust *(This guy would like you to believe that Haskell and all the others provided this atmosphere of distrust.)* and it seems that he had no been able to tell Ellen White freely, *(now notice this)* if at all about who was involved in the revision of the Great Controversy. *(Didn't know that did you? Ellen White was never informed by her son that Prescott was the one providing the material for the revision of the 1911 Great Controversy; sound a little fishy (devious) to me).* As already noted, during this period, his mother had been in great weakness *(this writer likes to paint Ellen White as a simpleton and a weakling)* and suffered from depression for extensive periods." {Ibid}

"Longtime family friend, C.H Jones reported that W.C White had been trying to prevent her from being perplexed by details which might remind her of former occasions and start her off on some line. *(They paint her as some type of a lunatic!)* Eventually, she became apprehensive

about the book revisions, because of rumours she had picked up at St Helena hospital concerning Daniels' and Prescott's role in the work on the Great Controversy. *(She finally got wind of it)*. The rumours suggested that the two men were using the opportunity to change the doctrines of the church. *(That's exactly what they were doing)*. W.C White had planned to get the bulk of the revisions done quickly so he could show it to her, *(his mother)* in a largely completed form and in thus ease her mind of any anxiety over the project." {Ibid}

"Most of the changes simply involved giving credit for quotations. *(If it was just credits for the quotations, then why didn't they tell her upfront? There is something devious about this.)* The task of revision was not an easy one for W.C White, and whether he was able to fully explain Prescott's part in a way that would remove Ellen White's apprehensions is not clear. He was glad when it was finished and then could explain and illustrate just what had been done, to put to rest some of the rumours. So high was the risk of being misunderstood, that it was apparently not until the project had been fully completed in January of 1911, that he was able even to mention the project to Stephen Haskell. *(So if you believe that this was all done openly and honestly. . .)*. The Great Controversy was not the only book revised during this period. Roman craft, Catholic aggressiveness had heightened the need for more care in other leading church publications as well, and the need to replace printing plates provided an appropriate opportunity. Uriah Smith's 'Daniel and Revelation' and the widely circulated 'Bible readings for the Home Circle' were the two that came under the preview and review of Prescott, and Prescott took a leading role in this as well." {Ibid}

Later in this horrible history, the redoing of the 'Bible readings for the Home Circle' that Prescott would do, Cottrell would find unsatisfactory; and then he would redo it with these principles, the 'Historical Critical Method' and he would make it match the Commentary set, because the Commentaries were done under that same principle. So they would re-do it once again, and further deepen the darkness in Adventism. Now we want to turn to the 1919 Bible conference:

"1919, a Year of Conferences: The year 1919 in fact turned out to be a year of conferences, six in all. The most notable and the significant in retrospect was the Bible Conference. Prescott missed the first set of meetings, a bookman's convention in early April, but he participated prominently in all the rest. The education convention in late April, two days after he arrived home; the evangelists' convention in May; the editor's convention in June; and the Bible and History teachers counsel in July. Prescott led the convention of editors, a first for the church. It had been a long cherished dream to bring denomination editors together to deal with the kind of issues that had arisen during his 'Protestant Magazine' years". {Ibid}

Now 'those issues' for him, was a re-doing of all the books; a re-doing of the prophecies of Daniel. The issues for him was to get this before the people, so that the people, and all of our publications would be under this new view of the 'Daily'—that's what his issues were, and he was successful in doing all of this. That's why today, even men who are in disagreement with the progressives, would allow the historical and critical method to basically ruin our fundamental beliefs and our theology—even they are mistaken and embracing still the Prescott view of the 'Daily'. This has had a devastating influence in the church. That's why when these men say that this 'Daily' thing is not a very big deal, they are mistaken. The 'Daily' is the straw that broke the camel's back in Adventism. Without this controversy, we might not be here, we might be home! We might be enjoying paradise. We might be conversing face to face with Jesus, but instead, we are in this argument over the 'Daily'.



“He also played a prominent part at the Bible Conference which as noted was undoubtedly the most significant meeting of the year. *(You can say that again!)* Full verbatim transcripts of over 1300 pages of typewritten transcript of the meetings offer valuable insights both into Prescott’s preaching and into an important stage in the theological development of the church. *(Ron Graybill found these transcripts in 1974)*. Church leaders had felt for some years the need for a counsel of Bible teachers, editors and administrators. Such a conference, they hoped, would permit theological discussions to take place without the rancor that has surfaced in the past.” {ibid}

This was also Cottrell’s wish before his death, that the men that were against him here that he believed were his theological enemies in the 1960’s and 70’s. He believes that this era here (30’s to 50’s) was an era of openness between the General Conference and the theologians of the church. Now these men are thinking the same thing in this history, they want to go back to a time; they want to create an open field of play for those who are trying to bring in new things into the church. These histories are repeating each other.

“Such a conference they hoped would permit theological discussions to take place without the rancor that has surfaced in the past. It could also allow thought leaders in the church to clarify their thinking and reach a greater measure of consensus. Three weeks after Prescott returned from China, the Spring Counsel Meeting set the dates for the Bible Conference, and the professor found himself in the chair of the planning committee for the 1919 Bible Conference. *(From here Prescott could really begin to steer things in the direction that he thought the church should go)*. The committee preferred Harbour Springs in Michigan as the site. Perhaps some hoped that a return to the site that Prescott’s landmark 1891 convention might help reproduce the same spirit, and maybe it might also lead to the same of kind of revolutionary results, but it was not to be, the conference eventually took place in Washington DC where reference materials and libraries were readily accessible.” {ibid}

The comment about 1891, was after the 1888 General Conference in Minneapolis, Prescott began to study these New Views that he would finally bring into the church. One of the things that helped him bring this thing from 1891, that acted as a catalyst for him, so that he could begin to think that he was in the right track, was his conversations with Louis Conradi in Europe. So from 1891 to his conversations with Conradi, he was developing these New Views; and it was based on what he thought was the righteousness of Christ.

“The two conferences met jointly; the Bible History Teachers’ Counsel convened in the evening during the Bible Conference and continued for (?) days after the Bible Conference concluded. Sixty five participants attended, and discussed a number of topics that clustered around Christology and prophetic interpretation. *(Now friends, you need to understand that this is where the church goes down the tubes, (falls into apostasy.)our understanding of the Third Angel’s Message is here under attack)*. Prescott himself was the major speaker, he gave more than a third of the sixty-nine presentations and contributed largely in many of the discussions periods. *(he dominated this thing)*. His theme, as one would expect, ‘How to give the Adventist message a christio-centric focus’. His talks seemed to have had as their basis, the manuscript he had developed in 1917 and had used in Eastern Asia.” {ibid}

From 1891, to the time he speaks with Conradi, to the time he gets to his post in Asia where he works with the Chinese; the thing he now brings into this 1919 Bible Conference is all this experience he has

up to 1917 in presenting all these new views in Adventism and for his source for this is this manuscript. I would love to see this manuscript they have reference to here.

“The reaction to Prescott’s presentations amply demonstrate the church’s need to achieve greater clarity and a stronger consensus in its Christology. For example on July 6, quite a number of the delegates strongly resisted his assertion that Christ was without a Being. (*There was a controversy over the Trinity in this conference.*) In Prescott trying to defend his view of the Trinity, accurate language eluded him. Subordination, he suggested, did not relate the question of attributes or of His existence. (*Meaning Christ’s subordination to the Father*). Christ, though eternal and self-existent, yet somehow was also derived; and then taking John 5:26 at face value, (*“For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself.”* That’s Prescott’s idea of the meaning of the text.) though he later backed away from the term evidently uncomfortable with its connotations and implications. The centuries-old dilemma concerning what one might call ‘inner Trinitarian relations’, was not easy to articulate clearly, and Prescott struggled to make his point clear.” {Ibid}

This thing got into a ruckus, a real storm of voices;

“Daniels had to come to his defence over the Trinitarian issue. “Don’t let the conservatives think that something is going to happen, and the progressives get alarmed for fear it won’t.” Then he asked the stenographer, (*person transcribing*) to discontinue transcribing the discussion until tempers cooled down. (*This is the 1919 Bible conference, I wish the stenographer had not been told to stop, we might have some interesting dialogue*). Some participants also reacted to Prescott’s strong emphasis on the indwelling Christ because it sounded too much like Kellogg’s teachings. The suggestion that he was teaching pantheistic ideas, stung the professor and brought an angry response from Elder Prescott; how could people misunderstand so easily? The vital distinction between Kellogg and himself was this very christio-centric emphasis. How could one who was so strongly Trinitarian, who believed in the full Deity of Jesus and the personality of the Holy Spirit on one hand, be perceived as being pantheistic on the other? Again the meeting came to a halt; Prescott refused to continue with his lecture until the matter had been sorted out.” {Ibid}

Loving Father in heaven, we are indeed grateful today dear Lord for Your loving care. Lord I hope that these presentations that we have been discussing will enlighten the minds of those who are faithful and even the ones that may be new to the faith—whatever their experience may have been, that they will explore these things for themselves, and that they would give an opportunity to let the pioneers speak; that they would read the writings of Ellen White. Help us, dear Lord not to be like William Miller described, men that can be trained by other men. Miller said that if you are trained by another man’s thinking, you can just put a bigot on your head and be sent out into the world, but Jesus wants us to stand on our own two feet with Him as our only support. Bless us dear Lord, that we will look to Jesus for the answer to these things in the church today and our own experience, and that we will not be hypocrites, or bigots, or anything else but, dear Lord you will make us your sons and daughters that the testimony in Revelation will be ours and that this mystery will be finished, and that Christ in you the hope of glory will finally be seen, and we will be the church victorious. Help us in these things dear Lord, and we thank You for all Your love and care and for meeting with us today; in Jesus name we pray, Amen.