

Bert Haloviak Paper — Commented

Comments by Art at sopvindicated.org

Thursday April 19, 2012

It's time to look at the 1919 Bible Conference paper by Bert Haloviak. We are going to "butcher" the paper, with our comments on this as we have the benefit of a fair amount of hindsight. We will be using the format of the past posting of our new book, *Beginning & End*, but this material will not be in that book.

The paper is freely available at the church's archive download site.

http://www.adventistarchives.org/doc_info.asp?DocID=30

By Bert Haloviak
Assistant Director
Office of Archives and Statistics
A Paper Presented at the Meeting of Seventh-day Adventist
Biblical Scholars in New York City
November 14, 1979

In the Shadow of the 'Daily': Background and the Aftermath of the 1919 Bible and History Teachers' Conference. By Bert Haloviak. p. 1, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

INTRODUCTION p. 1, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

Arthur G. Daniells, after the initial three-week, phase of the 1919 Bible and History Teachers' Conference wrote W. C. White: p. 1, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

"I think I can truly say that at the close of this important meeting, we stand together more unitedly and firmly for all the fundamentals than when we began the meeting." p. 1, Para. 4, [1919BIBL].

There is nothing quite like good propaganda. Keep up the front. Some suppose that Daniells was a Jesuit. We may never know. We do know that he was present when God executed a top editor of the church, right before his face, with a bolt of lightning out of a clear sky. But, that did not slow him down. Just like the Scribes and Pharisees.

A contrary opinion was expressed three years later by J. S. Washburn, a minister of thirty-eight years, when he stated: p. 1, Para. 5, [1919BIBL].

"Under the authority, and sanction or permission at least of this so called Bible Institute, teachers were undermining the confidence of our sons and daughters in the very fundamentals of our truth, while the parents were not allowed to inquire into the sacred secrets of this private council.... One of our most faithful workers said the holding of the [1919] Bible Institute was the most terrible thing that had ever happened in the history of this denomination." [1] p. 1, Para. 6, [1919BIBL]. [1] A. G. Daniells to W. C. White, July 20, 1919, WCW Correspondence Bk. 116, 1917-19 -- D, White Estate: J. S. Washburn, "An Open Letter to Elder A. G. Daniells and an Appeal to the General Conference," 1922,

It is clear that Washburn was much more accurate and factual in his assessment of the Conference.

The Washburn statement reflected a viewpoint that had deep roots in the denominational past, but a viewpoint that was not represented at the 1919 Conference. That viewpoint was not excluded by design, but rather because the initiative for the Conference came from the education field, and delegates were selected largely from the Bible and history faculties of the major educational institutions. p. 1, Para. 7, [1919BIBL].

This paragraph has a great deal of information, important to a correct understanding of just what took place at that

conference: 1.) The viewpoint was of historic origin; this was because it was part and parcel of the faith of the pioneers, none of whom would have put up with such a departure from that faith. 2.) Notice that that viewpoint was not represented at the Conference. 3.) Immediately we have **the lie**, it “was not excluded by design.” 4.) Immediately then, we are told who it was that initiated the Conference, **another lie**, and 5.) who it was that was invited, by class, no roster given.

They would be happy if we would just accept whatever they want to claim, **but here we know they are lying through their teeth.**

Washburn called it a “private council,” which it was, all attendees were by invitation only. Furthermore, if it was what they would have us believe, then what was W. W. Prescott and A. G. Daniells doing there??? We are supposed to believe that Daniells and Prescott were just out wandering around one day, and by chance, happened to end up at the Conference, and just as well, happened to be asked to speak, and the subject just happened to be on the definition of “inspiration.” What a coincidence.

The discord with this unrepresented segment had begun far earlier than 1919 and would continue after the Conference. The nature of the disharmony concerned conflicting viewpoints regarding the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy and was fought with the theological question of the "daily" of Daniell 8 as a backdrop. p. 1, Para. 8, [1919BIBL].

Please remember that the man writing the paper is getting paid by the church, and shows his own bias from time to time.

This paper will attempt to outline the two major conflicting positions on the nature of the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy and to illustrate the consequences of the friction between those positions. It will also examine some of the crises that militated against a successful dialogue that might have synthesized the conflicting viewpoints. The writer believes that the tragedy of the decade that preceded, and the decades that followed the Conference was that each side had elements of truth that were needed by the other.

I think it's important to keep your thinking straight here. **It is Satan that deals with both hands, one of lies, one of truth; combined they make many feel good, but bring spiritual death; which is where the church is today.**

Distrust, however, resulted in one position dismissing the other as "verbal inspirationists," while the second camp considered its opponents to be moving, consciously or unconsciously, toward the destruction of the spirit of prophecy, with that distrust came solidification of positions that rendered more unlikely the needed dialogue. p. 1, Para. 9, [1919BIBL].

After looking at the Conference itself and some of its unresolved questions, the paper briefly examines certain apostasies that colored the atmosphere as the debate on the "daily" was beginning. It then examines the major proponents of each of the positions that became solidified over the question of the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy. p. 2, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

The discussion over the “daily” never would have occurred had the church leadership been following God and embraced his prophet and what God told them through her.

It should be noted that the nature of the questions involved in this paper necessitated a broad attempt for documentation. It should be understood that, while the writer believes that the evidence justifies the general conclusions reached, the paper in no way purports to be a thorough exposition of the many involved episodes that it touches. p. 2, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

The sponsors of the 1919 Bible and History Teachers' Conference did not produce minutes of the meeting nor did they issue a formal report of positions taken on the various topics presented. The transcript of this conference therefore, does not constitute any kind of an official statement.

No, it's not an official statement, whitewashed to death. What it is, is a collection of facts!

The transcript consists of both study papers and discussions. Some of the discussions covered topics not on the agenda. p. 2, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

Inspiration was one of those topics not on the agenda; however, the invitation stated that other topics could come up.

Careful scholarship would place more weight on the thoughts expressed in the papers than in the ideas presented during the discussions, insofar as denominational consensus is concerned. While the extemporaneous remark of a delegate might reveal his own deepest theological problems, the same topic handled by the same person but appearing in a denominational journal or book would more nearly represent the church at large or a major school of denomination thought. p. 2, Para. 4, [1919BIBL].

And, now for the conclusion of the introduction; (drum roll please) **we will tell you what and how to think.** I just love this paragraph. **It so clearly, neatly defines the thought path they want you to take.** To me, it's a total psyop.

1919 BIBLE AND HISTORY TEACHERS CONFERENCE. p. 3, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

T. E. Bowen, in a poetic outburst to his friend A. O. Tait, sought to prepare him for the seasonable Washington climate he could expect during the forthcoming Bible and History Teachers' Conference to be held for six weeks beginning July 1, 1919: p. 3, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

"The days are getting slimmer, The heat begins to simmer." p. 3, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

To make his point painfully clear, Bowen noted that by the time July comes on "it will be delightfully warm, so come on and help us enjoy it." He recalled that when the location for the Conference was under consideration, A. G. Daniells noted that Bowen had stayed around Washington for the past 10 to 12 summers and survived. [2] p. 3, Para. 4, [1919BIBL].

A fair amount of the initiative for holding such a conference had come from the Pacific Press, where Tait was serving as an editor. As early as 1913, M. C. Wilcox, editor of the "Signs of the Times", had called for such a meeting to undertake in-depth Bible studies similar to those he recalled from a bygone era. Another thing that Wilcox recalled from that earlier period was that there was not "that awful fear that somebody was going to teach heresy if they held a little different view from what somebody else did." [3] p. 3, Para. 5, [1919BIBL].

Notice just who is being listened to, Tait and Wilcox, both, editors for the church. It really would be nice to see the roster of Jesuits that were associated to the SDA church. **To think that there were none, would be naive at best.**

Two years later Wilcox renewed his call. This time he listed the points of difference among editors, Bible teachers, and ministers, and hoped such questions as (a) prophetic dates relating to the beginning and ending of the 1260 years, (b) meaning of the term "Spirit of Prophecy" in Rev. 12:17 and 19:10, (c) the "daily" of Daniel 8, (d) the king of the North of Daniel 11, (e) "This generation" of Matthew 24, and (f) the plagues of Rev. 16, would be considered. The matter was discussed during Fall Council and the delegates looked toward such a meeting "as the first opportunity." A year later A. O. Tait made a similar recommendation. [4] p. 3, Para. 6, [1919BIBL].

It is important to note that these questions had all been settled years ago, but, by not walking in the light of the Midnight Cry, ALL the light the church had become darkness to them. It's confusing to be in darkness.

In 1917 W. C. White became wearied by the overconcentration on war themes depicted in denominational periodicals. He wondered if the denomination then had scholarship sufficient to develop prophetic themes broader than the immediate war situation. As he looked toward the Bible teachers he believed, "with a few exceptions," that they could be classed within two categories: (a) orthodox, but unprogressive and boring, (b) progressive and (b) interesting, but not orthodox. He called for a systematic method of improvement and

urged that a summer Bible school be conducted annually. Daniells responded favorably to the proposal by recalling his own attempts in 1913 to conduct a Bible Teachers' Institute. He believed that such meetings with Bible teachers and editors should result in a "blending in unity." [5] p. 4, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

The General Conference Committee on April 5, 1918, adopted a resolution calling for a Bible and History Teachers' Council of six weeks' duration to begin July 1, 1918. Bible and history teachers from SDA colleges and junior colleges, leading editors and "such other leading men" as the GCC might designate, were invited to attend. A committee of seven selected some 40 delegates and assigned approximately 67 Bible and history topics to be considered. Some of the suggested topics and proposed speakers were: "The Use of the Spirit of Prophecy in Bible and History Teaching," A. G. Daniells or W. A. Spicer; "The 'Daily' of the Book of Daniel," F. M. Wilcox; "Inspiration: What Is It in the Bible and in the Testimonies?" A. G. Daniells; "What Shall Our Attitude Be on the Flesh questions?", F. M. Wilcox. When the war situation caused cancellation of the proposed Conference, the General Conference Committee recommended one similar in scope to be held in 1919. Rather interestingly, however, the topics approved by the GCC did not include either the spirit of prophecy or the "daily." The covering letter sent to the delegates did note, however, that it was not intended that the 11 listed topics would be the only subjects considered, but that others could be considered "as may seem best." p. 4, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

Again topics are put forth that need no discussion, except for the departure of the church from following Christ, AND, an unknown fact by many, that W. C. White was creating the counterfeit SOP.

As a member of the General Conference Committee, W. C. White automatically qualified as a delegate to the Conference. Daniells extended to him, however, a special invitation to attend. Although White could think of nothing he would enjoy as much as attending the Conference, his urgent work in manuscript preparation prevented his attendance. [7] p. 5, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

In my opinion, Willie labored assiduously to control his public appearances. I believe the letter, "Ellen Dreams of James," is proof of this position. I would, however, like to know what was so "urgent" about his work. This sounds to me like an excuse.

The area of perhaps greatest interest during the discussions at the 1919 Bible and History Teachers' Conference concerned the nature of the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy. Although the subject was formally discussed on three separate occasions, other areas of the stenographic report of the meetings afford additional insight into the various understandings of the nature of the inspiration of Ellen G. White. p. 5, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

Now, mind you, the topic of "inspiration" was not on the agenda, **but is the harsh light of the facts of history, I would say it was on the top of the stack of un-stated, but, understood, subjects.**

W. W. Prescott, General Conference field secretary, first broached the subject **by suggesting that statements in the spirit of prophecy needed to be "interpreted" to bring them into "harmony with history and fact."** This, he noted, might at times conflict with the normal first reading of a specific statement. Prescott then moved from that point to concluding that the spirit of prophecy should be "corrected" when errors of fact were uncovered. He listed six such "corrections" that had been made in the 1911 edition of Great Controversy. [8] p. 5, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

Knowing now, many of the gross errors of the 1911GC, we can see why they had to be corrected. The blasphemous sin of the responsible parties was attaching the name of God's prophet to the mess and telling the membership that it came from God.

F. M. Wilcox, editor of the Review, while agreeing that Mrs. White in the past had recognized fallibility in her recall of certain events about which she was writing from memory, emphasized a wholeistic approach to the writings that enabled him to avoid the need of deciding whether specific historical statements were inspired or not. This basic divergence seemed to be present throughout the discussions on the spirit of prophecy, and seemed to be unresolved when the Conference ended. [9] p. 5, Para. 4, [1919BIBL].

I am quite sure that the letter communications between “Ellen” and Wilcox, was none other than between W. C. and Wilcox. Many of the things attributed to Ellen, just could not have been, had she been faithful to God. So, again, **everyone is forced to make a decision.** Now the decisions of the church are fully extant, what is yours?

A. O. Tait picked up the Prescott theme and stated. "In other words, she never claimed she had inspired evidence in regard to those dates and historical facts." Prescott responded by inaccurately attributing the following position to W. C. White. p. 6, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

Here Bert is attempting to cover for W. C. White. It is, or should be, painfully obvious that Prescott knew who it was he was talking with. Over and over people are going back in history and refusing to accept others, published, public testimony. It's this twisting of the truth that gets them in the end.

"I talked to Eld. W. C. White about this matter, as I had something to do with this book, and he has told me that there was no claim that this book was to be an inspired authority on facts of history." [10] p. 6, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

Of course there was no claim, W. C. knew better. This is also the admission that Prescott was involved in the building of one, at least, of the books; a faux pas the church went to great lengths to recover from.

As will be examined later, W. C. White never attempted to divide portions of the spirit of prophecy writings into inspired and uninspired sections. While he did not consider Mrs. White as final authority on questions of historical accuracy, and not to be used as authority in settling disputed historical questions, he studiously avoided distinguishing between so-call inspired and uninspired aspects of the spirit of prophecy. p. 6, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

Here is a depiction of Willie. His character is being traced by another. W. C. was under the tutelage of Satan, artful and just like a snake, refusing to take the appropriate stand to defend the SOP, because he knew what he was doing.

While D. E. Robinson offered an explanation that could account for at least 'three of the six "corrections" mentioned by Prescott, W. G. Wirth, Bible teacher, from Pacific Union College, affirmed that he had never believed "that the history of the spirit of prophecy was to be taken as inspired." He considered that the "history was merely thrown in to substantiate the principles." [11] p. 6, Para. 4, [1919BIBL].

Notice how these men are revealing their true stance with the SOP. Now, granted, they probably did not understand what Willie was doing, but neither were they committed to God, nothing like a Daniel and his three friends.

Six days after that general discussion on the spirit of prophecy, A. G. Daniells expressed pleasure for the opportunity of meeting and having a "plain talk about this question." He also expressed happiness for the chance to place himself "on record regarding this gift to the church" because of the criticisms that seemed to plague him and other members of the General Conference that they were "shaky with reference to the spirit of prophecy," and that they stood on slippery ground. [12] p. 6, Para. 5, [1919BIBL].

Of course they were plagued with such, but only by the old members, the ones who were taught differently, before Ellen died.

Daniells concluded his introduction to the subject **by expressing his deep concern over the possibility of his influencing someone to have less than full confidence in the prophetic gift in the church.** He then related experiences both in the United States and Australia that solidified his firm confidence in the spirit of prophecy.

This is just like Satan, saying the truth out of one side and lies out of the other. "Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh," and that is just what we have here. Daniells' is speaking his heart out, only in the reverse.

As he was discussing the details of the crisis "that would shake this denomination to its foundation," the Kellogg crisis, Daniells informed the stenographers not to transcribe the remainder of that meeting "which would take over 60 pages of typewriting." [13] p. 7, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

Now this is interesting. Here we have positive proof of what Daniells is up to. Satan and his agents always like to do things in the dark, in secret. Why? It's real simple, they don't want to wake up the sheep, or cause a wave of complaints. [People who have studied this point, believe Kellogg was framed.](#)

At the beginning of his talks on the spirit of prophecy during the second series of meetings, Daniells again started with the hope that he would not say **"one word that will destroy confidence in this gift.... I do not want to create doubts."**

As we get deeper into this document, you will see, plainly, that people will say just the same thing as Daniells just did and turn around and do that very thing. I have to say, [what Daniells did, speaks so loudly that I can hear what he is saying.](#)

On several occasions he called for an affirmation from the teachers that his position was not one that would cause them to think he was shaky on the spirit of prophecy. It seemed clear that Daniells considered he was dealing with sympathetic listeners. One of the teachers sympathetically pointed to the widespread belief that neither he nor Prescott believed the Testimonies and this seemed to solidify Daniells' intention of "explaining" the position of those who caused him to have that reputation. Daniells, as well as others, consistently attributed to that segment a belief in the verbal inspiration of the spirit of prophecy. [14] p. 7, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

And that verbal inspiration is exactly what they came to destroy. I do not use the term "verbal inspiration." **I believe it is a construct devised by Satan.** I use simply, "inspiration," because that is all that is needed. Ellen was so in harmony with the Holy Ghost, and it could work using her, to the point that she, like Paul, believed that she was not under the control of the Holy Ghost, but she was. That is inspiration. That is how I define it. **The reason I define it this way is to be found in No. 26, page 5. God plainly states, "The scribes of God wrote as they were dictated by the Holy Spirit, having no control of the work themselves."** What do you want to believe?

During his July 30 talk, Daniells seemed to reveal rather fully his concept of the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy. While he clearly considered the Testimonies to be from the Lord, **he likewise stressed that there was a need for interpretation to occur.** He emphasized that the real basis for his confidence in the gift was the fruitage of the gift with the church. p. 7, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

He is talking out of both sides of his mouth again. It doesn't stop. The very reason for the "fruitage" was because of the pioneer's teaching that reached down even to his day. **But, he is setting up the leaders to understand that they need to make fine distinctions, think critically, in short, don't have faith; which is just what was done.**

Daniells considered the spirit of prophecy as an inspired commentary upon the Bible, **but he rejected the concept that it was the only safe interpreter of the Bible** or that it was "an infallible interpreter" of the Bible. On questions of interpretation, Daniells stressed his belief in a wholeistic approach on a teaching in the spirit of prophecy. He emphasized that the "whole trend of teaching and thought that is put through the Testimonies on that subject" should determine the conclusions. [15] p. 7, Para. 4, [1919BIBL].

Hear the snake speak, linger, listen, learn, believe yourself wise, wiser even than God. **We have proven on this site that God is speaking through the authentic Spirit of Prophecy, not Ellen. She was not educated enough to have put together the beautiful harmony that exists there. Only God could.** Daniells is here boldly stating his true position, **"We will not have this man to rule over us."**

If I sound sarcastic, it's because this drivel is disgusting to me. I would much rather be studying truth. But, from time to time we must answer to issues.

Daniells did not consider that Mrs. White claimed "to be an authority on history, and never claimed to be a

dogmatic teacher on theology," He emphasized that he believed that "as far as she was concerned, she was ready to correct in revision such statements as she thought should be corrected." He seemed to be stressing that, just as Mrs. White should not be considered an "infallible interpreter" of the Bible, so she should not be considered an "infallible guide to history." It should be noticed that Daniells seemed to avoid the position Prescott seemed to take of considering Mrs. White not "inspired", upon certain points. Daniells distinguished between the question of infallibility and inspiration and state, "I never understood that she put infallibility into the historical quotations," while also agreeing that the final proof of the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy was its spiritual value rather than its historical veracity. [16] p. 8, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

One point that we must remember here, is that W. C. White was in full control of Ellen's communications. Thus, in this entire paper, and any reference to any communications between Ellen and another party, dated after August 6, 1881, that communication is highly suspect.

Notice too, the real position Daniells has taken to the SOP; he is shaving off thin layers of belief and at the same time, praising the "spiritual value." Somebody tell me just what value the SOP has if it is not from God. NONE!

Another facet of Daniells' understanding of the proper use of the spirit of prophecy related to his belief that some claimed too much for the writings. While he warned that all efforts should be made to avoid casting doubts upon the gift to students, another way to injure the student would be "to take an extreme and unwarranted position." [17] p. 8, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

More of the mix of truth and lies.

Daniell's philosophy toward interpreting the spirit of prophecy in terms of the context was enunciated in response to a question concerning the use of butter. He knew, Daniells asserted, that from conversations he had with Mrs. White that she well understood that common sense dictated that people should be governed by the locality and circumstances in their relation to the health question. [18] p. 8, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

You should mark this comment well, it comes up again later, and there you will see the lies pour forth.

The most prominent feature in the discussions of the spirit of prophecy on August 1 was the question of verbal inspiration. F. M. Wilcox stated because of his knowledge of the methods used in the Ellen White works he "never believed in the verbal inspiration of the Testimonies."

It's a pretty fair guess that Wilcox only knew a small something of the full process of Willie's team at work.

J. N. Anderson, wondered if the leadership should continue to "let our people in general go on holding to the verbal inspiration of the Testimonies?" He called for cautious moves in the direction of educating the membership to avoid the serious crisis that might someday occur.

Anderson has let the cat out of the bag. Here is stated the problem and the goal to overcome it. I would say they were highly successful at achieving that goal; ever how Satanic it was.

C. L. Taylor doubted that the membership generally believed in the verbal inspiration of the Testimonies. He noted that the question was discussed far more at the Conference "in one day" than he ever heard of it in his entire life. Daniells again seemed to be reacting to those who questioned his standing on the spirit of prophecy when he stated: p. 9, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

"I think more mischief can be done with the Testimonies by claiming their verbal inspiration than can with the Bible. If you ask for the logic of it, it might take some time to bring it out, and I might not be able to satisfy every mind; but if you ask for practical experience, I can give it to you, plenty of it." p. 9, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

In these last days, people who reject the true inspiration of the authentic Spirit of Prophecy never stop with that; the Bible is next.

Daniells expressed his opinion that holding to a verbal inspiration concept of the Testimonies was illogical "because everybody who has ever seen the work done knows better, and we might as well dismiss it." [19] p. 9, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

Here, is clearly identified the work of Willie and his team. And, on that score, Daniells was correct in stating it was not inspired. The big problem with all this, is that Ellen's name was put to it, and claim was made that it was inspired, making that claim, *blasphemy*; and thus, we have the creation of the counterfeit SOP.

G. B. Thompson believed that the church had been incorrectly educated and thus the denomination faced the possibility of a shock on the question of verbal inspiration. His confidence in the spirit of prophecy was not in its verbal inspiration, he stated, but rather "in their influence and power in the denomination." He concluded, "They are not verbally inspired we know that -- and what is the use of teaching that they are?" M. E. Kern suggested that the question of verbal inspiration did not settle the problem of defining the inspiration of Ellen White and Daniells responded by suggesting that difficulties sprang from the two questions of infallibility and verbal inspiration. He then referred to James White statements in the Review and Herald that attempted to correct erroneous ideas about verbal inspiration. Daniells believed that because that explanation was not accepted "and passed on down," the present generation faced that perplexity. He continued: p. 9, Para. 4, [1919BIBL].

Notice that there is no reference attached to the claim of James' statement. Humm. . . .

"We could mention some old and some young who think they cannot believe the Testimonies without just putting them up as absolutely infallible and word-inspired, taking the whole thing as given verbally by the Lord. They do not see how to believe them and how to get good out of them except in that way.... I am sure there has been advocated an idea of infallibility in Sister White and verbal inspiration in the Testimonies that has led people to expect too much and to make too great claims, and so we have gotten into difficulty.... Brethren are we going to evade difficulties or help out the difficulties by taking a false position?" (VOICES: NO!) p. 10, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

The Boss has spoken; the Man who signs the paychecks gives instruction; the employees listen, learn and obey. Tomorrow we will take another bite.

The next three pages of transcript depict Daniells applying the question of verbal inspiration to such questions as salt, eggs, butter, and book revision. **How, he asks, could the writings be revised, if they were verbally inspired.** [20] p. 10, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

We think this is a very good question indeed! We do know the answer now. Arthur White himself tells us, on page 217 of the book, "The Lonely Years," that it was right after James' death, "in late 1881." And it was W. C. White leading the van on that one.

Several attempts were made to arrive at a practical way to deal with the concept of inspiration. B. L. House considered the problem not to be the question of verbal inspiration but rather the methodology used in preparing the books. Because he believed the Testimonies were prepared differently than other works containing historical extracts, he implied that the Testimonies were more inspired. F. M. Wilcox again stressed his over-all concept of inspiration that would allow for the possibility of fallibility in a specific detail. "It seems to me I would have to accept what she says on some of those general policies or I would have to sweep away the whole thing," he stated. [21] p. 10, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

These men are trying to justify holding the SOP high while totally undermining the real import of their teachings. This leads me to think that at least some of these men were actually part of the problem, that of putting the original SOP away and the creation of the counterfeit. God knows.

The discussion closed, however, **with most questions unresolved.** Perhaps the most basic was that posed by

C. L. Benson, dean and history teacher at Pacific Union College: p. 10, Para. 4, [1919BIBL].

"If there are such uncertainties with reference to our historical position, and if the Testimonies are not to be relied on to throw a great deal of light upon our historical positions, and if the same is true with reference to our theological interpretation of texts, then how can we consistently place implicit confidence in the direction that is given with references to our educational problem, and our medical school, and even our denominational organization? If there is a definite spiritual leadership in these things, then how can we consistently lay aside the Testimonies or partially lay them aside when it comes to the prophetic and historical side of the message and place these things on the basis of research work." [22] p. 11, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

B. L. Taylor, Bible instructor at Canadian Junior College, restated the Benson question by noting that if Ellen White's statements concerning history and possibly certain expositions of scripture were considered unreliable: p. 11, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

"The only natural conclusion for me, and probably for a great many others, would be that the same authorship is unreliable regarding organization, regarding pantheism, and every other subject that she ever treated on -- that she may have told the truth, but we had better get all the historical data we can to see whether she told the truth or not. That is something I would like to hear discussed. I do not believe we shall get to the foundation of the question unless we answer Professor Benson's question." [23] p. 11, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

Notice this struggle. Logic has to have a home. Here it is to be created.

M. E. Kern, Secretary of the GC Youth Department, likewise touched on that question when he wondered how the same individual (probably referring to Prescott) could consider the historical data in the spirit of prophecy as unreliable "and then assert his absolute confidence in the spirit of prophecy." He likewise wondered how an individual (obviously meaning Daniells) could ignore the definite testimony concerning butter and still claim absolute confidence in the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy. The question is, stated Kern, "What is the nature of inspiration?" Kern emphasized the twin problems of explaining such a philosophy of inspiration to young people and also the problem of avoiding rationalizing away the entire spirit of prophecy. Kern continued: p. 11, Para. 4, [1919BIBL].

"Can we, either in the Bible or the Testimonies, play upon a word instead of the general view of the whole scope of interpretation? I do not believe a man can believe in the general inspiration of the spirit of prophecy and still not believe that vegetarianism is the thing for mankind. I can understand how that testimony was written for individuals, and there are exceptions to it, and how Sister White question is how to present these matters to the people." [24] p. 11, Para. 5, [1919BIBL].

Prescott likewise, considered the question of "inaccuracies" within the spirit of prophecy as a dilemma regarding the question of inspiration. He recalled his experience relating to the revision of Great Controversy. His problem was, he stated, to "retain faith" in those areas of the spirit of prophecy that he had no possibility of verifying as he did the historical revisions that were accepted. He noted that he had not given up the spirit of prophecy despite this difficulty, but "had to adjust" his "view of things." He alluded to his poor reputation concerning his stance upon the spirit of prophecy and sympathized with the question posed by Benson noting: p. 12, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

It's obvious here that he did not understand that Willie felt very free to change the Great Controversy, because the 1884GC was his own creation!

"I have gone through the personal experience myself over that very thing that you speak of. If we correct it here and correct it there, how are we going to stand with it in the other places?" p. 12, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

His solution seemed to be to distinguish between the books that he judged were prepared largely by Mrs. White and **those "prepared by others for sale to the public,"** while at the same time asserting,

inconsistently, that he would not draw a line "between what was authoritative and what was not." [25] p. 12, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

Look at the double-talk! Apparently one has to have a college degree to come up with this trash. **One thing we do have, is an admission that they KNEW that many of the books were "created."** Now, the only one doing this was W. C. White; he was the point man, the man in charge of the whole operation. **This testimony leads one to believe that the accusations of the help, of no credit being given for their work, is in fact, correct.**

The Conference concluded without answering this basic question. Perhaps it was not equipped to do so. Perhaps the range of alternatives was not given a wide enough hearing. Perhaps a varying view of the nature of the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy needed to be combined with the views represented at the Conference. p. 12, Para. 4, [1919BIBL].

During his last discussion on the spirit of prophecy at the Conference, Daniells alluded to his in-depth exposure to the workings of that gift within the church. Indeed, very few were alive by 1919 who had a more thorough exposure to the spirit of prophecy than A. G. Daniells. Note this statement made to the Conference delegates: p. 12, Para. 5, [1919BIBL].

"All these years since the Battle Creek controversy began I have been face to face with this question of the testimonies. I have met all doubters, the chief ones, and have dealt with it in ministerial institutes, and have talked it over and over until I am thoroughly familiar with it, whether I am straight or not. I do not know that there is a crook or a kink in it that I have not heard brought up by these men that have fallen away from us." [26] p. 13, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

"Fallen away from us," is obviously an aspersion cast upon those not willing to compromise. But this is the purpose of the Shaking, which, you will remember, started back in January 26, 1850! And, don't forget the voice of the 1858 Great Controversy, on page 184-185, that these very ones who are "fallen away from us," are such because of the anger of the leaders, who will not be reproved. So they kick out the "trouble-makers." You know whereof I speak.

A glimpse at some of the questions raised during the controversy with J. H. Kellogg and A. T. Jones in Battle Creek might be helpful in gaining a perspective of Daniells' and others' attitudes toward the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy. p. 13, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

KELLOGG-JONES CRISIS p. 13, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

At this point in our journey, of research into church matters, **we believe enough evidence has come out that indicates Kellogg was framed.** That, at some point, Kellogg lost control of his book, and others put the material about pantheism in the book, probably just before publishing. If this is correct, I take it as indication that W. C. White was also laboring in harmony with the same parties, and was responsible for statements published in the name of Ellen against Kellogg. The dirt is deep.

As the Kellogg-Jones crisis was approaching a peak of intensity, George Butler, former president of the General Conference wrote the current president, A. G. Daniells, his reaction: "It is a terrible, terrible thing! and are we going into the conflict before us ... the great and closing conflict, with two camps wrangling with each other, Arthur? I do not believe it is possible, unless we get this thing fixed up in some way, and union restored, to go on without being terribly crippled for years, and the loss of many souls." p. 13, Para. 4, [1919BIBL].

A fundamental element of the wrangling mentioned by Butler concerned conflicting interpretations of the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy. [27] p. 13, Para. 5, [1919BIBL].

This theme is the real motivation for the Conference in the first place. It is a strong undercurrent in every discussion. Something had to be done, for, it was hindering "progress;" **which has to be defined in terms of what certain people wanted to do.**

The attitude that both John Harvey Kellogg and Alonzo T. Jones had toward the spirit of prophecy seemed to preclude or at least to sharply minimize the possibility of considering the context of the message given or of "interpreting" it. When urged, in 1905, to explain or have A. T. Jones explain a pre-1900 testimony relating to medical work Kellogg stated, "I don't know that it needs explanation. There is just the statement there." Jones commented, "I never explain the Testimonies. I believe them." Kellogg agreed with that position and affirmed: p. 13, Para. 6, [1919BIBL].

"What is the use of trying to explain what the Lord is doing, what the Lord says. The Lord says it as he wants to say it." p. 14, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

It is difficult to deal with people who will not question God. It's kinda like the three Hebrews facing off with the king and the fiery furnace; they are willing to be thrown in, and others are willing to do the throwing.

A little later during this same meeting Kellogg reiterated this attitude: p. 14, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

"I am not going to explain what the Lord says. I am not going to try to. When I read my Bible I believe the Bible - - the word the Lord has sent to me, and I will just get out of it all I can. I will ask the Lord to interpret that to me so I can understand it. I read the Testimonies in just the same way." [28] p. 14, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

A big part of what is happening here is a Jesuit oriented approach to course and direction, or, leadership. **In short, the leadership will take the lead and others will follow.** In the point under examination here, **it is the leadership that will tell the members how to interpret the SOP; same with the Bible. God's true people are called to follow him, not man.** While we are to strive for unity, each must understand the position they take, intelligently so. Blindly following the leadership, leads directly to problems. As Christ has clearly shown, those who strive for leadership, are to be servants of all. **This, the church is not willing to do.**

Jones affirmed that his understanding of the inspiration of the testimonies was undercut when he could not explain a seeming inconsistency. Like Kellogg he refused to explain or consider the changing circumstances when he related to the spirit of prophecy, Jones told the congregation at the Battle Creek Tabernacle: p. 14, Para. 4, [1919BIBL].

Unfortunately, Jones did not know about the deception of Satan on the whole church, the creation of the counterfeit SOP.

"I have not a cent's worth of respect for any such plea as is made too often and especially of late years on 'Testimonies up-to-date'; as if a Testimony up-to-date is to take the place of all that ever went before it. Mahomet taught that doctrine as to his revelations -- that the last revelation took the place of all that went before it. But God's revelation is not that way. God's revelation is truth, and is just as good today as it was a thousand years ago. It never gets out of date; and the last one that comes is not going to contradict, or vitiate, or set aside, or annihilate any that went before it... No sir, the Bible is the Word of God. It is the same today as it was when Isaiah wrote it, when Amos wrote it, when Hosea wrote it, when Paul wrote it, and will be the same after the world is ended and gone. It is so with the Testimonies, too, as certainly as they are the truth of God." [29] p. 14, Para. 5, [1919BIBL].

Jones thus reacted strongly against those who he believed "explained away," or took a "broad view" of the testimonies, and he considered that they were violating the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy. He likewise continued to believe that the testimony applying to the presidency of the General Conference in 1897 continued to have relevance in 1906, and thus Daniells was not loyal to the testimonies since the testimony stated that it was not wise to have one man as president. He rejected all explanations of that testimony, noting that "whenever it has been quoted it has been explained, instead of obeyed, and doubtless will be so to the end." He noted that everyone agreed that the testimony stated that there should not be one president, but it was always explained to mean something "different from what it says." He concluded: p. 14, Para. 6, [1919BIBL].

Here we have direct testimony from a competent man, bearing directly to the point, those who do not want to obey, want to explain away.

"Why must we be required to accept all these explanations of what the Testimonies mean, instead of being left free to believe them for just what they say? Can not we be allowed to believe what is said in plain words? Shall we not be allowed to know what we know? Must we accept the General Conference explanation of everything? If that be so, then what need have we of the Testimonies, the Bible, our own faculties and senses, or anything else than just the "General Conference" explanation?" [30] p. 15, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

Jones was so firmly tried to his concept of inspiration that when word came to him that Mrs. White asked him among others to write to her their perplexities concerning her writings so that she might explain them, Jones wrote her that upon that consideration he would not write because: p. 15, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

"Such a proposition in itself surrenders at once the whole ground of the claim in behalf of your writings as the word of God, or as given by inspiration of God. For if the writings were really the word of God -- a. They need no explanation. b. If the writings to be explained were not the word of God, then I would not want any explanation of them; for I would not care any more for them than for any other writings that were not the word of God." [31] p. 15, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

There are two points we want to touch on about the above; first, W. C. White was quite possibly fully informed about Jones' position, and would have created the letter alleged to be from Ellen; second, Jones makes this statement of faith, clearly making his point, and by so doing, exposes Daniells, Prescott and others, for just what they are.

We live amid the perils of the last days.

Another tendency present in both Jones and Kellogg was their tendency to state their conclusions in a rather absolute manner. Because Jones believed that the 1907 Sabbath School lessons on the covenants directly contradicted the conclusions resulting from the message of justification by faith that he was so completely involved with during the decade of the 1890's, he asserted: p. 15, Para. 4, [1919BIBL].

God's true church is, every one, eternally grateful that God is "rather absolute." As stated by another, "Did you notice he didn't call them the ten suggestions?" Present Truth for the Advent people is an anchor for the soul; one that can not be moved; because it is "rather absolute." More on this can be found on page 166, at the top, in the 1858 Great Controversy.

"In these Sabbath School lessons regularly produced by "the denomination," and used by the denomination for the religious and doctrinal instruction of the denomination, it stands indisputable that the Seventh-day Adventist "denomination" stands so committed to sheer legalism that they have involved in it the very universe of God.... So far as in their power lies, (the denomination) have actually committed the created universe and even the Creator Himself to that same covenant of bondage of selfrighteousness." p. 15, Para. 5, [1919BIBL].

Jones' absolutism did not permit him to accept explanation that the judgment of the Sabbath School Department in publishing the lessons or the author in writing them, did not commit the denomination to that position. He asserted that, if the Kellogg book, Living Temple, had been published by the Sabbath School Department and studied as quarterly lessons, "then it would be as certain as any thing can be, that the denomination would have been committed to the "LIVING TEMPLE" as a denominational book, and its teachings as denominational doctrine." [32] p. 15, Para. 6, [1919BIBL].

By the church's own admission, everything published by the church, with their imprint on it, is, in fact, an approved part of the church's position. "Seventh-Day Adventist publishing houses, built by denominational investment, were instituted not to publish whatever a worker may elect, but to produce the finest literature possible to give our basic message the widest consistent circulation in the most representative fashion.

“Our houses ... are partners in a threefold compact — they serve and protect the denomination itself, the denominational publisher, and the denominational author. They have both a denominational name to safeguard, and a publisher’s name and reputation to protect. They, therefore, have book committees to read, evaluate, and recommend specific action and improvements on manuscripts. They have boards to make final decision, skilled staffs to check, edit, and correct the copy, and put it into acceptable form....

“When the finished product carries the stamp of a standard publishing house, it bears denominational approval. It is then a denominational, not a private, publication. It has a measure of authority and dignity not otherwise possible.” Ministry, December, 1948, page 23, Review and Herald Publishing Association.

In further evidence, we remind you of the following item. Celeste Perrino-Walker, an editor employed by the church, wrote a book titled, “The Third Coming,” published by the church in 2006, and copyrighted by the church; meaning it is, in fact, a official church approved publication. But this book, publishes many gross errors, the worst of which is that probation will be granted after the second coming of Christ.

The same type of position seemed to be taken by Jones when the ninth volume of the Testimonies was published in 1909. Because of the intensity of his belief that the article "Sunday Labor" in that volume contradicted earlier Ellen White statements on the Sunday question, Jones issued a pamphlet entitled "The Ten Commandments for Sunday Observance," asserting that the "SDA Denomination and 'organized work' stands publicly committed to Sunday observance." He wrote Daniells: p. 16, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

Jones was right. In the authenticated Spirit of Prophecy we find these words, “And those who will not receive the mark of the beast and his image, when the decree goes forth, must have decision now to say, nay, we will not regard the institution of the beast. p. 29, Para. 2, [CEV].

"I cannot imagine what "the denomination' or "organized work" could now possibly do that would cause me to write or address anything more to Seventh-day Adventists or concerning them as distinct from any other Sunday keepers or worshippers of the beast and his image. Therefore from now on you can safely count that the Seventh-day Adventist "denomination" and "organized work," as distinct from any other church factions or Sunday keepers will be perfectly free from any "attacks" or "opposition" from me." [33] p. 16, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

The Jones and Kellogg position on the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy that minimized context and interpretation seemed to place them in a situation where a choice between only two alternatives was possible. They could totally reject the messages that they had been following for years or they could find some explanation that could deal with seemingly inconsistent messages. They followed the latter route and concluded that some of Mrs. White's testimonies were influenced by others. Thus not all that she wrote was to be considered inspired. Once they placed themselves into the position of having to decide which of the writings were inspired and which were not, it seemed merely a question of time before they no longer would feel comfortable in the church. When Daniells reminded Jones of his stance on the testimonies in the 1890's when Jones "used them with great force to wheel men and policies into line," Jones into line," Jones agreed that that was the case but continued: p. 16, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

This is a particularly telling paragraph. Bert has quite accurately delineated the game. To day, we believe the forensic evidence implicates both Uriah Smith and W. C. White. The only other, logical conclusion is to say that Willie was faithful and Ellen gave herself over to Satan; not a realistic assumption to make for one with her experience.

"Every soul knows that I never was partial in them, that I never used some with pile-driver force, while utterly ignoring or explaining away others just as plain and definite. The brethren, and the people, know well that whenever I was advocating a matter and some one produced a Testimony to the contrary, instead of explaining it away, I stopped instantly and changed my course accordingly. And that was because of my loyalty to the Testimonies. And that loyalty to the Testimonies was because I believed -- honestly and truly believed -- that everything that was written and sent out as Testimony was Testimony from the Lord. To that belief and that confidence I was as true as it is possible for a man to be. But that trust and that confidence have been betrayed. And by that betrayal I have been compelled--most reluctantly compelled, I assure you--

yet literally compelled to yield that position." [34] p. 17, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

Unfortunately, today, too many have the same loyalty — to the church, instead of to the truth. During their lifetime, opportunity will be given to the honest in heart to find the truth.

Ellen White considered that the Kellogg-Jones crisis was undermining the foundation pillars of the faith." She noticed the "misrepresentations and falsehoods" regarding the testimonies and warned that: p. 17, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

"Very adroitly some have been working to make of no effect the Testimonies of warning and reproof that have stood the test for half a century. At the same time, they deny doing any such thing." p. 17, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

We believe Bert has wrongly attributed the above to Ellen. It should have been Willie. But we would also place here, testimony from one who knows, **"Here is a work that has been subjected to the rigid criticisms, and the most violent persecutions for the long period of twenty years, and yet remains unchanged."** James W., Introduction to No. 26, 1876.

In considering the "undermining," Mrs. White frequently alluded to the question of the alleged human influence on the testimonies. She noted that many had gone into infidelity through the position "somebody has told Sister White." She pointed out: p. 17, Para. 4, [1919BIBL].

"Unless there is a breaking away from the influence that Satan has prepared, and a reviving of the testimonies that God has given, souls will perish in their delusion. They will accept fallacy after fallacy, and will thus keep us a disunion that will always exist until those who have been deceived take their stand on the right platform." [35] p. 17, Para. 5, [1919BIBL].

We see all such comments as coming from a Willie, seeking to fortify his position, which was becoming more and more threatened by the wider audience of readers, each seeking knowledge, but, finding confusion. This confusion just does not exist within the body of the authenticated Spirit of Prophecy.

The Kellogg-Jones crisis was only the beginning of the disunion over the spirit of prophecy that was to plague the denomination in the early years of the century. Other apostasies sprang from and operated in conjunction with or independently of the Battle Creek faction. The element that most had in common was their conclusion that portions of the spirit of prophecy writings could be taken as uninspired. p. 17, Para. 6, [1919BIBL].

Today, we pretty much draw that line at August 6, 1881. The date of James' death. Let's just say that it is a convenient peg.

THE "DAILY" p. 18, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

As the "daily" controversy erupted within the denomination the intensity of the Battle Creek crisis and the consequences of the attacks of other apostasies, served to solidify the contending views into two camps relative to the question of the nature of the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy. p. 18, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

Positions solidified according to interpretations of Dan. 8:11-13 and a statement made in Early Writings: p. 18, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

More and more you can expect this open warfare against the revealed will of God. This is why none of the wicked will be allowed into Heaven. Even after Satan repented, he was not allowed back; because he had learned genuine rebellion and was not safe to save. Many of the wicked have really learned the same from their master, Satan.

"Yea, he magnified himself even to the prince of the host, and by him the daily sacrifice was taken away,

and the place of his sanctuary was cast down. And an host was given him against the daily sacrifice by reason of transgression, and it cast down the truth to the ground; and it practised, and prospered. Then I heard one saint speaking, and another saint said unto that certain saint which spake, How long shall be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot?" (Dan. 8:11-13). p. 18, Para. 4, [1919BIBL].

"Then I saw in relation to the "daily" (Dan. 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." [36] p. 18, Para. 5, [1919BIBL].

The above can be found first published in "The Present Truth," No. 11, page 86. Yes, they, or, Willie, made some changes to the text and you might want to check it for yourself. Notably, the last sentence got butchered. Originally it starts out, "The Lord showed me..."

The "old view" or "pioneer position" of the "daily" interpreted it, as did almost all the Millerites, to refer to ancient Roman paganism, while the "new view" interpreted the term to refer to the taking away of the knowledge of Christ's priestly mediation in the heavenly sanctuary by instituting a false sanctuary system. One view depended primarily upon the literal reading of the Early Writings statement, while the other emphasized the contextual background to the statement. p. 18, Para. 6, [1919BIBL].

Some want to study this out for themselves. Here is some good advise: 1.) Decide if you believe that there is a God. 2.) Decide if you believe in the Bible as God's word. 3.) Decide if you are going to believe that Ellen was God's prophet. If the answer is NO to any of the three decisions, then you really should go and enjoy this life. Live out your "religion" and don't fake it any more. If the answer is YES to the three decisions, then you should ASK, SEEK and KNOCK, until you get the evidence God has prepared for you. It's most all here on this site.

And, I have one recommendation for you. **Limit your study to the things you know are proven by others and you can prove yourself. You will be glad you did.** If you have some questions, ask, ask me, I'll help you to understand. Be bold, just drop me a email.

STEPHEN HASKELL p. 19, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

In May of 1920, Stephen Haskell, at age 87, reflected upon the denominational events of the previous 15 years. By 1920 he saw within the church "two classes of critics of the sharpest kind." He observed that one-side criticized everything that did not seem in complete harmony with the spirit of prophecy, while the other exhibited a disposition "to show in some way [it] cannot be relied upon." He was amazed that certain people within these groups were so familiar with and had access to the unpublished letters of Ellen White. Haskell saw the camps preparing "for a battle of the fiercest kind." One group was preparing to "defend the old position" at all costs and the other seemed to be preparing, at all costs, to "improve" the positions to conform to the "present status of society." Haskell concluded: p. 19, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

This conforming "to the 'present status of society' is nothing more than conforming to the world. But that is what the church is about, even more so in these last days.

"One might think that the Controversy will in the end, be among Seventh-day Adventists whether [the spirit of prophecy] writings as given in the past will stand the test or not." p. 19, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

He informed W. C. White, "Of course you know where I stand." [37] p. 19, Para. 4, [1919BIBL].

Fourteen years earlier Haskell noted a crisis within the church and reacted to it by publishing an article in the Review designed to deal with the Kellogg-Jones issues. In relating himself to the question of human influence over the testimonies, he used the example of Paul's writings and questions raised during Bible times that intimated that Paul sometimes was influenced by others, and thus, whether there should be

distinctions drawn within his writings. Haskell 'pointed out' that it was the letters Paul received from the household of Chloe that informed him "that the state of things existed which he had seen in vision would exist." This brought Haskell to his conclusion: p. 19, Para. 5, [1919BIBL].

"God shows his prophets what will be, and then when circumstances arise, or the prophet has his attention called to it by private letters, he writes what he has seen. It is the same among the people of God today who have drifted away from the old landmarks, and who follow their own understanding.... It is thus demonstrated by the Bible alone that Testimonies, letters, symbolic actions, and verbal statements of a prophet are all of the same force." p. 19, Para. 6, [1919BIBL].

Haskell pointed out that he was not implying that everything a prophet stated was necessarily inspired of God, but he did fear that "the severest conflict ... that the people of God will pass through ... will be over the Testimonies of the spirit of prophecy." [38] p. 20, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

Too bad Haskell could not see this site today! He certainly would have an instant opinion I am sure.

Stephen Haskell, as did many who supported the "pioneer position" of the "daily," claimed a rich heritage and intense feeling because of the guidance of the spirit of prophecy in his experience. As a young minister in the 1860's, Stephen Haskell was given instruction by James White that called for him to his faith directly in God for guidance in his ministry and not to depend upon others to instruct him. James White told Haskell that God could instruct him by His spirit. From that time onward, Haskell understood and lived believing that God gave him his ministerial instructions by the spirit of prophecy. From that time onward, he wrote Mrs. White in 1909, "your testimonies as far as I have understood them have been my counsellors." [39] p. 20, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

In his discussions of the issues involved in the "daily" debate, Haskell frequently relegated the theological questions to an extremely minor position. Nevertheless, he pursued the subject with all the vigor at his disposal, believing that it was necessary "to save the cause of God and those who believe the old views on the teachings of the spirit of prophecy." Haskell stated that the question of the "daily" itself did not "amount to a hill of beans" and caused him shame that it consumed any of his time. He noted that he never had preached on the subject since embracing the truth in 1852-53. He alleged that if it was merely the question of the "daily" he would not have published anything on the subject. He wrote to C. C. Crisler: p. 20, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

We will note here that Haskell was not in all the messages, therefore he does not qualify as a true pioneer, one designated by God to set Present Truth. See "The Present Truth," No. 11, page 86.

"If God will forgive me for hating this correspondence over this daily I think I will never be caught in such a trap again. I will simply give the testimonies and let the issue go on that. And, 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." [40] p. 20, Para. 4, [1919BIBL].

Haskell believed that the vital question was the proper position for the spirit of prophecy to occupy within the church. He believed the question was not between him and the "daily," but rather between him "and the Early Writings." p. 21, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

At this time I don't know of those who may have stood up to defend the original writings in the early days when Willie started producing the counterfeit. I am sure some names will come to the surface one day.

He continued: p. 21, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

"It is the Early Writings that I would defend and as long as I believe they teach the view I take, and there are many others that believe the same, and if Sister White does not give any explanation in harmony with Prescott's idea to defend the Testimony for the sake of others I shall defend them. (sic) Must I be made to believe the testimonies teach a certain thing, contrary to my own judgment and the reading of the Writings,

when Sister White herself does not so explain it." [41] p. 21, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

The bottom line to all this, is the church will teach, and so will learn the sheep. We are right back to the Catholic form, everyone else is too stupid to understand, we, the learned, will just tell you what you need to know, just do what we say. I suppose that is why the .govs of the world hate the internet. It's a principle in action. It's freedom in vogue. Satan is soon to have his day, then the wicked will know who they have chosen.

Haskell believed that the "new view" lent support to those who claimed that the spirit of prophecy was manipulated to mean differently than what it read and also that it could be changed because of differing circumstances or varying influences upon Mrs. White. He believed that concept would destroy the credibility of the spirit of prophecy. "And right here is the worst affect of these new views on our people," wrote Haskell to Mrs. White. **He believed that once the leadership of the church accepted the position that the testimonies "do not mean what they say," the church would compromise away the spirit of prophecy.** [42] p. 21, Para. 4, [1919BIBL].

And so it has. Haskell probably never had a clue that Ellen likely never even saw that letter. **You can read all about that in Spalding and Magan, pages 466-476, where Willie, himself, admits he held back things from Ellen.** Many do not understand these things because they have not studied them out in depth. That is my purpose here, to show to the world, whosoever will, the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

Haskell had the firm conviction that the years of labor he and other pioneers wrought in the work gave them a special mission as the "latter days" approached. He thus placed emphasis upon the position of the living pioneers on the subject of the "daily." He seemed to sense a certain estrangement between himself and the General Conference leadership because he did not endorse their position on the "daily," and he believed it relevant, he pointed out to Mrs. White, that "not a single old Sabbath-keeper that has had experience in getting out the foundation principles of our faith ... believes in this 'new light.'" He again wrote her: p. 21, Para. 5, [1919BIBL].

I take umbrage with Mr. Bert over his decided bent of blind loyalty to the church, rather than being truly objective. In the writing of this article, he himself should have done some due diligence on the other side of the fence. But, when one is protecting his bread and butter, most anything goes.

Of course there would be some estrangement between the two sides. Again, it would be interesting to know just how many Jesuits were involved in GCSDA church matters.

"I see quite clearly there are breakers ahead. I also see there must be some who will give the Testimonies that you have given no uncertain sound. If not so, then the cause will be undermined by errors creeping in. They are coming in from all sides.... someone must be more familiar with your writings so, from the Bible, and from your testimonies, be prepared to defend the truth." p. 22, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

The next year he wrote Mrs. White concerning the "daily" debate: p. 22, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

"Every person who had an experience in the early days of the message do (sic) not wish to discuss this question. They feel that it is an insult to the Spirit of the Lord, to go to the Lord and pray for light on a matter that He has settled.... There is no hope of these old people who lived back in the early days of the Message being converted to this new light; even if (others) bring volumes of histories to prove it. Because they give more for one expression in your testimony than for all the histories you could stack between here and Calcutta." p. 22, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

Haskell had it right at this point. There are far too many who have "a supposed hope," (No. 4, p. 81) and nothing more. **Me thinks that after the close of probation there will be many more than commonly supposed, who will be searching out truth, from the north, even to the east; doomed not to find it, because of careless inattention to the voice of mercy.**

Haskell saw hope, he wrote Mrs. White, because such younger leaders as G. Irwin, I. H. Evans, Dr. Kress,

F. C. Gilbert, O. A. Johnson, and Leon Smith, did not accept the "new view." He believed that the main thrust of Satan's attack during the contemporary period was his attack upon the spirit of prophecy. He wrote W. C. White, "Your mother alone cannot give the straight testimony. There must be some raised up that will stand by what your mother has written. [43] p. 22, Para. 4, [1919BIBL].

I do not know what to think of those deceived ones, especially in the early days of the creation of the counterfeit SOP. It would have been extremely hard to have put the pieces together; God knows, he will judge righteous judgment.

In addition to his position of refusing to divide the spirit of prophecy into inspired and un-inspired parts, Haskell expressed himself upon other questions relating to the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy. While he did not believe Mrs. White was infallible, Haskell considered the writings inspired on the same basis as the Biblical writings. He considered Mrs. White as much a prophet as Biblical prophets and that the writings should be interpreted as would Biblical writings. Indeed, Haskell seemed to consider the spirit of prophecy as an extension of the Biblical writings. He wrote to Daniells in 1910 that he considered the "testimonies as the spirit of prophecy, precisely the same as is the book of Daniel, Revelation, or other books of the Bible." He also considers the Bible "as being so plain that, if a person will read it, and adhere to the reading, they will find the truth." He believed, that, just as the New Testament magnified the Old, so did the spirit of prophecy magnify the Bible. [44] p. 22, Para. 5, [1919BIBL].

We will issue a reminder here, in the form of a passage from No. 27, page 153. **"Bro. B--- would confuse the mind by seeking to make it appear that the light God has given through the Testimonies is an addition to the Word of God. But in this he presents it in a false light. God has seen fit in this manner to bring the minds of his people to his Word, to give them a more clear understanding of it." So we see that we must stop short of any claim that the authenticated Spirit of Prophecy is any part of the Bible; but, God is the author of it, just as he is the author of the Bible.**

Given this position, Haskell believed that a study of the spirit of prophecy writings would "settle nearly every point that people question at the present time concerning the message." While he believed that the foundation were established by Bible study, he also believed that those pillars were confirmed by the spirit of prophecy. He alleged that there was no question of interpreting the "daily" amongst the early SDA'S "for they took it for granted that the Early Writings settled it." Since Haskell believed that the "old view" of the "daily" had been established by a vision given to Mrs. White, he could not endorse a position that would, according to him, revise "a sentence, or paragraph" from those writings. [45] p. 23, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

It has now been almost one-hundred years since the Bible Conference, and yet, Haskell's position of firm faith in the (authentic) Spirit of Prophecy still holds true today. **"I was shown like this. The truth once got out now, will stand; for it is the truth for the last days, and it will live, and less need to be said upon the truth after it is out."** Supplement to CEV, page 14. What is interesting about all this is, that the subjects have not changed in the least; there are the same since William Miller's day.

Just as Haskell believed that only another prophet would be qualified to distinguish between inspired and un-inspired writings, so he emphasized that "none but inspiration can single out a clause and say it means different (sic) from the words used." He would thus accept no other evidence on the question of the "daily" than the words of Mrs. White stating that she did not mean to use the term "daily" in her statement in Early Writings. affirmed: p. 23, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

"If the whole United States, and Europe, Australia, and Africa should rise up and proclaim that view correct, it would make no difference to me, unless the testimony of Sister White should say so. There is no use in being like a leaf in the wind, swayed to and fro." [46] p. 23, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

Brothers and Sisters, steel yourselves, for the day is coming, and may even be upon us, that we will have to stand like the three Hebrews, and get thrown into the fire. Just like Haskell, make a decision, and stand by it.

Although Haskell opposed revising and even editing of the spirit of prophecy writings, he did so from the

standpoint of the credibility of the writings, not on the basis of their supposed verbal inspiration. He wrote Mrs. White in 1909 and expressed his hope that her words might be available "as they were written," since he believed that much of the "power and vitality," was removed by her assistants in making them "readable and" adapted to the "present condition of things and the people."

This might be a good place to wake up and take some notes. **We have here, first-hand testimony as to just what the excuses were that W. C. White was using to create the counterfeit. And let us remember, "This work is of God, or it is not. *God does nothing in partnership with Satan.*"** p. 129, Para. 1,[27OT]. **Small wonder then that the Holy Spirit is not present to teach through the counterfeit SOP.**

He reacted similarly, he said, to the revised version of the Bible. Haskell considered that James White, in his editing of the writings had a special ability in "editing them without taking you out of them." He reacted very negatively to substantive changes that seemed to be called for by those who believed the writings needed to be harmonized with history or made to accommodate new believers or varying conditions. He opposed L. M. Conradi's "modifications." He wrote W. C. White: p. 23, Para. 4, [1919BIBL].

This is a new one on me. I know nothing of "Conradi's 'modifications.'" I'll have to keep my eyes open for more information on this point.

"If you have had the experience that I have had in meeting this matter of dropping out and of changing your mother's writings, you never would allow one sentence to be dropped out, or changed, in her writings that have gone before the public. We have enemies of our faith that are watching just such points, and when they find one they make big capital of it." p. 24, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

Obviously referring to the Kellogg-Jones situation, Haskell continued: p. 24, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

"Obviously?" I think not. This is an assumption, based on a biased viewpoint. If Bert were committed to the original, authentic writing, he would doubtless be thinking in different terms as to who the "best brethren" really were.

"It is the dropping out of some of these things from what had been published in your mother's writings, and the changing of some things, that has (sic) been taken advantage of by the enemies of truth and today is the cause of some of our best brethren losing confidence in you; because they think you change your mother's writings and call it 'editing.'" [47] p. 24, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

Evidently the flack flying, in those days, toward Willie over his "work" was substantial. Which is why he felt he had to defend against "rubber stamp testimonies," as many called them.

Haskell affirmed that he could respond to every criticism he ever heard raised against the spirit of prophecy except the one woman who publicly asked, "Can you prove from the Bible that a prophet ever had sons that changed the prophet's testimony, and called it 'editing?'" His only response, Haskell stated, was that he could prove from the Bible "that prophets had sons that did not always do right, and their not doing right tested the people." He hoped that White would excuse his bluntness but, he said, it was a point upon which he was sensitive. [48] p. 24, Para. 4, [1919BIBL].

It is my contention that Willie was used by God, to fulfill his words, in No. 20, page 47, that the Testimonies would be removed "away from the people."

In 1918 Stephen Haskell recalled a conversation with Mrs. White some 40 years previous. According to Haskell, **Mrs. White predicted there would be a time when the testimonies would be in demand "just as they were originally given in order to meet objections before we got through.'** Two years later Haskell wrote that such a demand was called for "almost everywhere I go." The demand was based upon the attacks charging that the writings had been altered to suit circumstances. [49] p. 24, Para. 5, [1919BIBL].

While there may have been a demand in his day, it would pale in comparison to today, in proportion to how much nearer we are to the end.

Haskell seemed to be working toward a methodology that would satisfy this need and also to deal with the concept of progressive revelation, for he realized that the health question "like every other point of truth has developed," and Mrs. White "wrote more fully as the people were prepared to receive the light." He recalled that Mrs. White said that there was a time when it was right to eat flesh, but there would also be a time in the future when it would be unsafe. Haskell believed that science indicated that that time had "about come," in 1920. He thus believed that, while the earlier writings should not be altered, later spirit of prophecy statements that indicated how that truth had been magnified and developed should be included with the original statements. [50] p. 25, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

Unfortunately Haskell never understood the real effect of Willie's tampering with the words of God, spoken through Ellen. Later, in this document, we will come to a focus on this very question of meat eating, and grease, or, oil for cooking. The bottom line, after rejecting the word of God, "'Eat all the flesh you desire,'" as long as it was not pork." And so the murmuring for flesh was resolved. "... the divided heart will plead indulgence rather than denial." p. 144, Para. 1, [28OT].

Some three months before his death, S. N. Haskell sent to F. M. Wilcox his parting statement "in favor of the fundamental principles of present truth." The five-page statement reiterated his belief-in the nature of the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy. He believed that "every inspired writer points to God as its author, but it is written by human hands in the words of men." He recognized the fallibility of a prophet, but considered his testimony to be infallible. If God speaks through a prophet, "then his testimony is on par with that of every other prophet." He recognized that change in the individual or group to whom a testimony was directed could cause a change in the application of the testimony. The messages of a prophet might not be explained by human reasoning, but still were to be followed. No one was authorized to "sit in judgment" to determine what was inspired and uninspired "or in any way dissect any prophet's testimony." [51] p. 25, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

Divided hearts will plead, "degrees!," "critical thinking!," and "leadership!," forgetting that Christ declared that "all ye are brethren." And leaders are to be the servants of all; not striving for some top position not endorsed by New Testament Gospel Order.

While space limitations prevent such analysis here, a remarkable harmony of viewpoint could also be shown in two other major "pioneer" disputants on the question of the "daily," J. N. Loughborough and G. I. Butler. Both rejected the concept of verbal inspiration as well as the concept that certain of the spirit of prophecy were more authoritative than others, and both considered that the "new view" of the "daily" would be destructive to the spirit of prophecy. p. 26, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

I'll give Bert credit for bringing this point out, but it also points out the foundation upon which this faith was built, a foundation now being targeted for destruction by Daniells and Prescott.

That harmony of viewpoint likewise extended to a newer generation of Seventh-day Adventists that also claimed a rich heritage relative to the spirit of prophecy. Such participants in the debate as F. C. Gilbert, L. A. Smith, G. A. Irwin, and G. B. Starr all considered the spirit of prophecy to be under attack.

Because of the new form of church organization (Another whole topic, but one God is bringing out information on. Witness an article, just arrived on my desk, in the Battle Creek Daily, March 12, 1907, discussing the Adventist's of West End and their troubles, and the forming of a new corporation and bylaws.) **these voices of truth were sidelined, quieted, and made of none effect.**

A sense of strident urgency seemed to become prevalent with the presentations of some of these defenders of the "old view." The tendency to share the contents of personal testimonies, to publicly question the orthodoxy of church leaders, and to castigate opponents for past errors began to become a prominent feature of the debate on the "daily." p. 26, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

Things reached this crisis because of a neglect of the testimonies long before. Remember, in 1859 the

Laodicean message was applied to the church, which meant that Christ was outside

CLAUDE HOLMES p. 26, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

Claude E. Holmes, 1881-1953, linotype operator and Washington correspondent of Southern Watchman, was among the informal attendants at the 1919 Bible and History Teachers' Conference. Raised as an Adventist, Holmes grew up in the West Union, Iowa, church, most of whose congregation consisted of "pioneer" Adventists. Holmes declared that the spirit of prophecy "was the word of God to them." p. 26, Para. 4, [1919BIBL].

Just what you would expect from a properly educated SDA. But this problem is now, most all outside the church. All such believers have either removed themselves or been removed by the church; the separation is palatable.

He noted: p. 26, Para. 5, [1919BIBL].

"As I associated with these staunch old patriarchs Sabbath after Sabbath I imbibed some of their love and zeal for the truth.... Such an environment was not conducive to theoretical jangling over the authority and necessity for the spirit of prophecy; for to those brethren and sisters the testimony of Jesus was to be implicitly followed without question.... I spent whole winters studying the testimonies and studying Daniel and Revelation by Smith until I could almost repeat them by heart.... When I see men coming in who seek to discredit the sacred teachings of the spirit of prophecy my righteous indignation arises and I feel stirred to contend for the faith once given to the saints." [52] p. 26, Para. 6, [1919BIBL].

This is the exact operation of the Shaking, which God told us January 26, 1850, The Present Truth, No. 9, p. 72, had started. You might like to review the chapter titled "The Shaking" from the 1858 Great Controversy.

Holmes' extensive knowledge of the spirit of prophecy writings, gave him a reputation, in the days prior to available indexing, of being an authority on the writings. Review editors frequently called upon him to provide references and quotations from the writings. In addition to his memory and intense study of the writings, Holmes acquired probably the largest private collection of Ellen White writings, published and unpublished, within the denomination. Holmes' skill as a linotype operator enabled him to prepare a multitude of private spirit of prophecy compilations in type form and then pull proofs of the galleyed type at practically no expense. After W. A. Colcord left the church in 1914, Holmes borrowed and copied over 300 typewritten pages of unpublished testimonies from him. As A. G. Daniells' was travelling in the Far East in 1917, Holmes convinced someone that he had Daniells' permission to copy bound volumes of unpublished Ellen White testimonies housed in the General Conference vault. Although it resulted in his dismissal from the Review, he thereby attained possession of hundreds of personal testimonies. This access to some of the personal testimonies sent to Prescott and Daniells greatly inflamed relationships. [53] p. 27, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

Quite the story; I wonder just what happened to that private collection. Verne Bates tells me, that after the church discovered that he was the recipient of the Farnsworth collection, they send someone to his front door demanding he turn over all that material to the church. In God's providence Verne told the man NO! and so today we have available the original, authenticated Spirit of Prophecy materials. For which we are VERY grateful to God!

One of the reactions of Claude Holmes to the 1919 Bible Conference consisted of his publishing an open letter in pamphlet form. Holmes decried the statements he heard at the Conference, "again and again by a number of our Bible and history teachers that Sister White is not an authority on history." He considered that position as the ultimate evil since those views would be "poured into the receptive minds of our young people to undermine their faith in the spirit of prophecy."

Using education as a strong tool has been foundational to the Jesuit's work. It takes time, but, in this case, time really takes its toll. Death sweeps the faithful into the grave, "and also all that generation were gathered unto their fathers: and there arose another generation after them, which knew not the Lord, nor yet the works which he had done for

Israel.” Judges 2:10 And because all too often parents do not bind the hearts of the children to themselves and right, the evil grows, till today, we are far removed from the path, and it appears that a Laodicean church, clinging to the world will not be present in Heaven.

Holmes interpreted the positions taken in 1919 to mean that the Conference concluded that Mrs. White selected relevant historical materials just as any researcher would.

This view is promoted by the church, by its claim of a list of books found in Ellen’s personal library, which includes such history books. **But this lie, is just that. This claim was put forth by Satan before, and James met it with these words, “In her published works there are many things set forth which cannot be found in other books, and yet they are so clear and beautiful that the unprejudiced mind grasps them at once as truth. ... as Mrs. W. has written and spoken a hundred things, as truthful as they are beautiful and harmonious, which cannot be found in the writings of others, they are new to the most intelligent readers and hearers. And if they are not to be found in print, and are not brought out in sermons from the pulpit, where did Mrs. W. find them? From what source has she received the new and right thoughts which are to be found in her writings and oral addresses? She could not have learned them from books, from the fact that they do not contain such thoughts. &c.”** Life Sketches, page 328-329.

I would here submit to you the many claims of plagiarism that occurred, after the death of James; when Willie took over. We think many of them are valid, not against Ellen, but against Willie and his counterfeit SOP.

If the facts selected happened to be erroneous, they should be rejected. Holmes' view of the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy totally rejected that concept. He believed that Mrs. White selected from divergent historical sources those items that she recognized as truth and thereby those items became authoritatively and infallibly true. According to Holmes, everything dealt with by a prophet became authoritative. He believed that as much inspiration was required to distinguish truth from error as was required to present original truth. He continued: p. 27, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

While the above has the ring of truth, it is clear that Holmes was ignorant of Willie’s work. This testifies to the degree of secrecy about the operation.

"If her historical writings are to be discredited because she is not an "authority on history," then the logic of the situation forces us to the conclusion that all her writings must be thrown overboard, for historical facts are inextricably interwoven in all her messages.... One tells me her books are not in harmony with facts historically, another that she is wrong scientifically, still another disputes her claims theologically, and another questions her authorship, and others discredit her writings grammatically and rhetorically. Is there anything left? If these claims are all true, how much spirit of prophecy does the remnant church possess?" p. 28, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

Holmes concluded this 11-page open letter to J. S. Washburn by emphasizing his uncompromising stance on the absolute inspiration of the spirit of prophecy. He affirmed that he drew no line "between the so-called human and divine; they are all Scripture to me." [54] p. 28, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

While we understand Holmes stance, and sympathize with them, a caution is again repeated. **“Bro. B---- would confuse the mind by seeking to make it appear that the light God has given through the Testimonies is an addition to the Word of God. But in this he presents it in a false light. God has seen fit in this manner to bring the minds of his people to his Word, to give them a more clear understanding of it.”** p. 153, Para. 1, [27OT].

But, repetition of this caution in no way diminishes the fact that God is the true author of the authenticated Spirit of Prophecy.

Years later, Holmes again referred to the Conference in a protest he registered to the president of Emmanuel Missionary College, A. W. Johnson, and to E. R. Thiele, chairman of the Bible department. In his capacity as local elder of the West Central Church of Chicago, Holmes, in a round-table discussion in Berrien

Springs in 1948, opposed the "strange and conflicting views of the prophesies," that he believed were being taught to some of the members of that church.

Notice the use of the word, "believed," in the above. As used, it denigrates Holmes, as if the man can not, or, perhaps should not, think on his own. Yes, it is his belief, but no, the man is not any less than a policeman or soldier reporting facts, nor is he less than any one of the "leaders" of the church.

He asserted that "when Bible teachers present views contrary to, established positions, students and preachers are encouraged to do the 'same.'" He stated that the door that permitted such new views to be presented was opened during the 1919 Bible Conferences. [55] p. 28, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

Exactly, we agree with Holmes. And, we believe this document goes a long way to prove it.

An additional response of Holmes to the Conference consisted of his issuing a protest against the teachings of H. F. Albertsworth and H. C. Lacey, two of the three teachers from Washington Missionary College who attended the Conference. Besides issuing his own protest, Holmes advised certain students to do the same. Although the student protests initially involved only Professor Albertsworth, because of the alleged "light esteem" that he exhibited toward the spirit of prophecy, the upshot of the episode resulted in the severance, by mid-1920, of all three of the WMC representatives at the 1919 Conference and further problems between the General Conference and the Columbia Union. [56] p. 29, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

Oh, how sweet it would be if everyone would just "follow the leader!" Of course, when that "leader" is not Christ, they have no room to complain.

J. S. WASHBURN p. 29, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

J. S. Washburn, 1863-1955, wrote A. G. Daniells in 1912: p. 29, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

"Truly I have reason to regard you as one of the best friends I have on earth.... May God grant that nothing may ever sever the bonds of brotherly trust and confidence between us. An old friendship wrecked is worse than a funeral." p. 29, Para. 4, [1919BIBL].

Daniells responded: p. 29, Para. 5, [1919BIBL].

"All you say strikes a responsive chord in my heart. I have known you from a boy on the farm, and have always felt a sort of a brotherly feeling for you." p. 29, Para. 6, [1919BIBL].

Sin is an insane, inexcusable, unexplainable thing. It is interesting to note it's affect on one's life relationships. I had a "friend" once. I thought he was a good guy. I loaned him \$2,500.00. He never paid back one cent. Why? Sin. Satan had him, and used him to take funds from me that I should have used for God's work.

Daniells is no different. We have very clear direction from the New Testament on Gospel Order, but Daniells was, for some reason, determined to grasp the top roll. He was not to be trusted. There is much more to come out about church organization.

In 1922, in an open letter to the General Conference session in San Francisco, Washburn wrote the following to A. G. Daniells: p. 29, Para. 7, [1919BIBL].

'For years my confidence in you has been slowly dying until now it is dead beyond recall, beyond the hope of a resurrection. I am sadly forced to acknowledge that the astounding change in your attitude toward the spirit of prophecy and the message, and toward your most loyal friends and workers has so completely destroyed the trust I once had in you that it can never be restored, except by a direct miracle of God." [57] p. 29, Para. 8, [1919BIBL].

Here is the testimony to the betrayal of the trust of another. It is clear to me that some sin in the life of Daniells was

cherished till truth was dried up and blown away. Self became his all in all and Christ was forgotten; except, of course, when it was time for another sermon.

Washburn claimed a rich SDA heritage. He was converted by J. N. Andrews at 11, baptized by James White at 12 and began preaching Adventism at 21. In a state of confusion and dismay after the 1888 General Conference session that he attended,

It is my settled opinion that the focus on "the 1888 message," was, and still is, nothing more than a smokescreen to hide the details of church organizational change that was happening. Maybe a book will have to be written on that subject alone.

Washburn, who was a nephew of George Butler, had an interview with Mrs. White at Ottawa, Kansas. Washburn considered that interview a turning point in his life. From that time onward he maintained complete confidence in the inspiration of Mrs. White. He wrote Mrs. White in early 1915: p. 29, Para. 9, [1919BIBL].

I wonder what the date of that interview was?

"I truly believe it is the complete faith in the spirit of prophecy and the study and obedience to the Testimonies that will bring the latter rain. I believe the complete acceptance of the gifts of the spirit of prophecy is the key to the situation in the last great crisis, and I do pray God that the brethren in Washington and all over the world may be faithful to the great light that God has sent to His people through [the testimony] of Jesus Christ." p. 30, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

Interesting that Washburn should come to the same conclusion that a few others have reached; that the, now, authenticated, Spirit of Prophecy is, in fact, the Testimony of Jesus. We do not, however, believe that the latter rain waits for the items Washburn has listed. **No. 6, page 22, very clearly states that it is after Sunday is made a test that the "fearful warning" sounds.**

In addition to his intense study of the spirit of prophecy and desire to obtain "everything that Sister White wrote," Washburn's amazing memory enabled him to memorize much of the Bible and spirit of prophecy writings. By 1918 he claimed to have memorized Revelation, Romans, James and Second Peter. He noted that his memory improved "with the study of the Bible and spirit of prophecy." By 1948 he claimed to have memorized the New Testament and was working toward committing Isaiah to memory. [58] p. 30, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

Quite a testimony on the power of God to give wisdom to man; even to the improvement of his memory!

Although Washburn entered the debate on the "daily" somewhat humorously by writing S. N. Haskell that he was thinking of the "daily" "continually," in actuality he did not consider the "new view" at all amusing. He believed that it was ushering in the "greatest shaking our people have ever had," by causing doubt and disbelief in the spirit of prophecy and by moving the firm "prophetic framework" upon which the message was constructed. [59] p. 30, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

At the time, I probably would have agreed also, but now, I see the counterfeit SOP as that "strong delusion" sent by God on the church, because they will not receive a love of the truth, that they might be saved. They love their sins more, and want to be saved IN their sins. But the banqueting table in Heaven, is not spread with cake and ice cream.

Washburn heard Daniells present the "new view" at the 1910 Southern Union Conference meetings. In an all-night conversation shortly thereafter, Daniells raised some questions that to Washburn, indicated that the president of the General Conference was seeking to destroy the spirit of prophecy. Washburn asserted that he was "simply horrified," to hear Daniells assert that Ellen White's statement on the "daily," was an "imperfect statement," and also that she had made other statements that were accepted as testimonies that likewise were "imperfect."

Let's be clear. Attributing the work of God to Satan, is blasphemy. That is the position Daniells took; one of total rebellion against God. That Ellen was the mouthpiece of God, is established by much first-hand testimony. To reject this testimony is worse than Thomas, for we have Christ's warning to him, and all doubters.

Daniells also stated, according to Washburn, that Mrs. White had erred in sending letters encouraging J. E. White to accept tithe funds for his work in the South.

So often it comes down to following the money. Why? Because that is "worldliness" in a nutshell.

Washburn also bristled that Daniells allegedly considered A. T. Jones' attack on the "Sunday Labor" section of Volume 9 of the Testimonies as an attack that was the "hardest thing to answer" that the GC had to respond to. To Washburn, that assertion seemed to indicate that perhaps Mrs. White was in error. Washburn claimed that Daniells took the preceding positions specifically to avoid the need to accept the plain statement in Early Writings, concerning the "daily." He stated: p. 30, Para. 4, [1919BIBL].

I want to point out the use of the word "allegedly" and "claimed" in the above. When we quote from a trustworthy source, would say "testified," or similar, for such words carry import. **The words used are designed to denigrate and marginalize Washburn to something less than "trustworthy." With Washburn's experience of years, and the study of God's words, he was well qualified to define Daniells' actions.**

"I say brother White, in all sincerity, that the view which leads any one of our brethren to take such a position on the Testimonies is condemned by this attitude, if for no other reasons whatever, and is entirely unsafe to be held by the leaders of our work. To defend the "new view" of the "daily," he must destroy the spirit of prophecy." [60] p. 31, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

Not only is this the case with the "daily," but with a great many other subjects as well! Name one, and I'll guess there is testimony in the authenticated Spirit of Prophecy to prove the church's position today to be wrong.

J. S. Washburn saw the 1919 Bible Conference as the continuation of a "terrible controversy." In 1921 Washburn wrote F. M. Wilcox that he had lately feared that the latter was losing faith. He noted, "You were in that secret Bible Council which I believe was the most unfortunate thing out people ever did, and it seemed to me you were losing the simplicity of your faith." He also noted that Wilcox defended the three WMC representatives at the Conference when their teachings were brought into question before the College Board. He brought the issues of the "daily," Washington Missionary College teachers, and 1919 Bible Conference together in a 16-page open letter to Claude Holmes dated April 18, 1920. He implied that the consensus from the Conference considered that the spirit of prophecy was not inspired on history, while some considered the writings uninspired regarding theology and health reform. He alleged that the position led "inevitably to infidelity, as was demonstrated by Dr. Albertsworth, recently dismissed summarily from the faculty by the College Board of Washington College." p. 31, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

Here the shaking is manifested. The voice of truth crying out to be heard and the many warring against that voice. I submit to you that Obadiah 1:1 is an indictment of the GCSDA church; in that they are the rightful inheritors of great spiritual blessings associated with obedience to the Spirit of Prophecy, but like Esau they despise it, and sold it, for a mess of pottage.

Washburn published the information that the Columbia Union president, a year previous attempted to rid the college of the three "infidel" teachers, but that the General Conference came to their assistance and instead "forced out of office," that president. He noted that, although the three teachers differed in other beliefs, all three united in advocating "the new doctrine of the daily as taught by professor Prescott" and others. Washburn identified the denominational origins of the "new view" with E. J. Waggoner, A. T. Jones, and J. H. Kellogg, and thence to W. W. Prescott. He additionally attributed the decline in enrollment at WMC to the teaching of the "new view" there. He pictured that view as -- "besieging and threatening to

desolate and destroy the work of God's last message at its headquarters, at its very heart.... Here is a remnant of the new phase of the world-old apostasy at our headquarters and in our principal Bible School." p. 32, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

Today the church lives out that apostasy. Countless ways are members shocked through the years, at evil unchecked.

Washburn assured the readers of his pamphlet that the three teachers would not be teaching at the college the next year. The "Omega apostasy" had received a setback at Washington Missionary College, he affirmed. [61] p. 32, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

While the controversy intensified from that point onward, it was to reach a still more volatile point at the 1922 General Conference session. Washburn offered hints of his future intentions a year earlier in correspondence with F. M. Wilcox: p. 32, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

"You say again, "If you feel that the cause of truth is jeopardized by men occupying positions of responsibility, then it would be proper for you to state your convictions that the wrong may be righted." I do truly feel, I am certain that it is so, and I must say so at the proper time.... The time is surely coming soon when these questions will go before a wider tribunal than the General Conference Committee." [62] p. 32, Para. 4, [1919BIBL].

My father often wrote to the R&H and his letters to the editor were published, on something like five or six times a year; just a rough guess. Did it do any good? No. I really believe it's a part of the culture of the organization. **It makes people feel good that someone is voicing a note of warning, and perhaps dissent.** But this is a problem with humans in general, it seems, even more so when it involves spiritual things.

"What astonishing deception and fearful blindness had, like a dark cloud, covered Israel. This blindness and apostasy had not closed about them suddenly, but it had come upon them gradually, as they had not heeded the word of reproof and warning which the Lord had sent to them because of their pride and their sins. They, in this fearful crisis, [Elijah calling all Israel to Mt Carmel] in the presence of the idolatrous priests and the apostate king, remain neutral. If God abhors one sin above another, of which his people are guilty, it is doing nothing in a case of emergency. Indifference and neutrality in a religious crisis is regarded of God as a grievous crime, and equal to the very worst type of hostility against God." p. 40, Para. 3, [23OT].

Two open letters to A. G. Daniells, dated May 1, 1922, were among the items circulated to the delegates at the San Francisco General Conference session in 1922. Claude Holmes began his letter by recalling a previous sermon by Daniells where the latter denied the accusation that the leadership of the GC "did not believe and follow the spirit of prophecy." Holmes then listed 12 specific areas wherein he believed that Daniells ignored or subverted spirit of prophecy counsel. Holmes concluded: p. 32, Para. 5, [1919BIBL].

"I firmly believe that the deplorable conditions found in the church today are due largely to the course you have followed. In all seriousness I ask: Should men be leaders in our work year after year who neglect to follow God's counsel and persist in following their own way?" [63] p. 33, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

Again, we say, such events are the very outworking of the Shaking, just as God showed his people on January 26, 1850, and placed on page 184 of the 1858 Great Controversy.

Washburn's 36-page open letter was even more comprehensive in its accusations. He again accused Daniells of seeking to destroy the spirit of prophecy in order to uphold his teaching on the "daily." He recalled the all-night 1910 talk that shattered his faith in Daniells. Washburn stated that those "criticisms" were "burned into my very soul, and have been from that very moment and will be there till the day of judgment." The roots of the "daily" theology and the Washington Missionary College episode were discussed. He noted that, in his defense before the WMC Board one of the teachers considered that "he was teaching in harmony with the Bible Institute that had been held in Washington during the summer of 1919." That teacher, according to Washburn, stated that the Institute "taught that the spirit of prophecy was not inspired on history," while some at the Institute believed it also was not inspired on questions of health

reform or theology. Washburn considered the Conference as representing a meeting of "doubters": p. 33, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

Now it becomes necessary to de-construct this paragraph just a bit. **First, we have Washburn's testimony that it was Daniells who was teaching; and let's be clear, as the "boss man" of the corporation, what he said goes; the new view on the "Daily."** Next we have first hand testimony as to a teacher's position; **that he believed he was teaching in harmony with the Bible Conference, which he was.** Then the teacher gives testimony that the Conference taught that the SOP was not inspired on history, health reform or theology. **(So what is left!!! pray tell.)**

"Two of our best writers told me that articles on the Turkish question were kept out of our papers since that secret council had thrown doubt on that question and many others. So while Islam is gathering her millions for the last great fulfillment of the prophecy of Daniel 11th and 12th chapter, our papers, our ministers, our sentinels are chloroformed to sleep, are muzzled into silence by this Council of Darkness, this Diet of Doubts. Was not this secret council a crowning act in the program of doubt and darkness and criticism that has been enveloping Washington and the victorious life? And you and Professor Prescott were the leading figures in that Institute.

Now we have testimony that Daniells and Prescott were the "leading figures." Which means, in extension of the idea we posited at the beginning (top of page 2), that these men had an agenda, and what it was!

No doubt you found it impossible to agree with all the new chaotic theology of that council, but Elder Daniells, how could you permit such a dangerous parade of doubt, and preside over such a cloud of misty higher criticism? Did that institute cure the criticism you tell me is destroying our work? No, it multiplied it a hundred times. And you more than any other man are responsible." p. 33, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

Washburn concluded by appealing to the delegates for an investigation of all his charges. He stated that he was not fearful "that the representatives of our people will turn me down or out for standing for the original message and the spirit of prophecy." He was appealing, Washburn said, "not to any small committee or to a secret Council like that of the summer of 1919, but to the representatives of God's chosen people in open session assembled," [64] p. 34, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

Similar to Elijah on Mt Carmel, one day, long ago. But this time, no fire.

Washburn claimed that his "Open Letter" was largely instrumental in defeating Daniells opportunities for reelection to the GC presidency in 1922. Indeed, San Francisco newspaper accounts depicted Daniells emotionally defending his leadership, but decrying the bitter attacks against him and holding a "handful of written documents, which he said were the proofs of his charges of propaganda and vilification." [65] p. 34, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

The defeat of Daniells in 1922 did not end the basic alignments that had begun to solidify much earlier. The Bible versions controversy, the Columbia Union-General Conference friction, the reorganization battles over the 1931 Omaha Fall Council decisions, and even the manual used by the Young People's Missionary Volunteer Society, all resulted in conflict during the 1930's, and all directly related to a basic difference of interpretation over the spirit of prophecy.

An important point about these matters, often overlooked, is that we are living in midst of several processes. One of these is the great anti-typical Day of Atonement spiritual exercises. Crosier, in The Day-Star Extra, points out that the Holy place services were for individuals, **but the Most Holy place services were for the entire nation, and thus corporate in nature. From this we understand, that what ever the leadership does, the membership is entirely responsible for.**

Washing ourselves from the blood of others involves more than just warning them. **God requires his saints to separate from those who will not participate in the Day of Atonement spiritual exercises. Today the whole GCSDA church does not participate in these exercises. Especially the leadership.**

After the Omaha Council, Washburn identified another believer in the "new view" of the "daily" who apostatized: L. R. Conradi. p. 34, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

He noted: p. 34, Para. 4, [1919BIBL].

"Many who are counted leading men, writers and editors among us teach this same doctrine.... For many years the Columbia Union has been engaged in a great fight of faith, a fight to preserve the original teachings of our great Message and confidence in the guidance of the Holy Spirit through the spirit of prophecy.... Thank God for the spirit of prophecy." [66] p. 34, Para. 5, [1919BIBL].

By 1932, F. M. Wilcox noticed disastrous consequences from the alienation. He noted that entire churches were stirred up and that college students were lining up their teachers as to whether they were "fundamentalist" or "modernist." Wilcox wrote C. H. Watson, president of the General Conference, that he believed it was necessary for the General Conference to "re-establish itself in the confidence of our people against the onslaughts which have been made upon [it] ... by misguided individuals for a series of years." [67] p. 34, Para. 6, [1919BIBL].

Obviously these were "misguided individuals," when weighed in the balances of the preservation of the church; **but weighed in the balances of the Shaking, we are forced into a widely different conclusion.**

W. W. PRESCOTT p. 35, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

Somewhat facetiously, William Warren Prescott, 1855-1944, informed the delegates to the 1919 Bible and History Teachers' Conference: "I would like to be understood as being a conservative. I thought I would have to proclaim it to you myself." The stenographic notes of the Conference indicated that "laughter" followed the statement. [68] p. 35, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

Although the subject of the "daily" was not on the agenda to be discussed in 1919, and although, it was not formally discussed as a topic, the general philosophy and central conclusions of the "new view" were, in a sense, given during the 20 presentations of W. W. Prescott on "The Person of Christ," and "The Mediation of Christ," the title of his daily worship series. although he had not used the term "daily," because of his use of the Revised Version of the Bible that enabled an emphasis upon the term "continual," Prescott clearly presented the "new view." He emphasized: p. 35, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

By this time there should be no question as to Prescott's real intention. But this makes it clear. It is often said, "It's not what a man says that counts, it's what he does." In this particular case, his actions just happened to be what he said.

"Our message against the beast and his image centers right here, and that is to give Christ the place that belongs to him. When we are preaching the person of Christ, as we have been doing here, we are preaching against the papacy, even though we do not mention the papacy.... The vital thing is to give Christ his place as the living head of the church.... His priesthood is a continual priesthood. His sacrifice is a continual sacrifice. His ministry is a continual ministry. All growing out of the fact that he in his own person continued. Now if you take away this, you despoil Christianity.... Our continual experience is based upon his continual ministrations. Our ability to continue as Christians, our ability to continue personally is based upon the Person of Him who continues, and that is based upon his word in his continual service for us.... The continual sacrifice goes on. It is one sacrifice for sin continually, and we shall live because he gives himself to us continually.... So the whole question of our Christian experience, our ability to work for him, one thing it strikes at that which will demolish Christianity. And that is its purpose: to abolish Christianity and put a man in Christ's place.... We must restore the law of God as interpreted by Christ. We must restore the dealing with that law as revealed in the scriptures. We must restore to the people the means of obeying that law, or else we are not giving this message to the world." [69] p. 35, Para. 4, [1919BIBL].

How could a man who is in total darkness really know what it is to be "giving this message to the world?" Here is James W. with the correct answer. "The three messages symbolize the three parts of the genuine

movement. That which has appeared not symbolized by the three angels, though it be branded 'Adventism,' is spurious." This is simply another way of stating that the Advent people are walking in the light of the midnight cry on that strait and narrow path, all the way to the city. Prescott had an agenda.

As did other debaters on the "daily" question, Prescott believed he saw in the subject elements of truth that far transcended the immediate theological issue. As early as 1907 he stated that he believed his view of Daniel 8 established a "much more vital connection with the real heart of this message" than had been possible under the previous interpretation. He believed that the "new view" enabled a knowledge of the mediatorial work of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary that the denomination was especially called upon to present to the world just as the counterfeit mediatorial system was designed to encompass the world within its false system. He and others attached a special significance to the particular time in Adventist history when light was shining upon this view since it seemed to come at the time when Adventism was moving strongly into Roman Catholic countries. While the message exposed the false sanctuary, Prescott believed it also called the world to a restoration of the pure Word of God and supplied the power necessary for obedience to the law of God by faith in Christ's mediatorial work.[70] p. 36, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

We need to remember that the year was 1919. **These men, every one of them, were very well aware of the controversy surrounding W. C. White's "work." They all knew that the early Spirit of Prophecy contradicted the later. Prescott well knew he was in rebellion against God's testimony as to the truth in the matter of the "daily."** But like his father, Satan, he carries on to create a smokescreen of wordy ideas calculated to disorient the unwary. We have been living in the perils of the last days for some time now.

Through his pamphlet, "'The Daily': A Brief Reply to Two Leaflets on This Subject," through Protestant Magazine, of which he was editor from 1909 to 1916, through union conference sessions and ministerial institutes, through Sabbath School lessons that he prepared, and through correspondence with teachers and students, Prescott continued to espouse his views of the "daily." [71] p. 36, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

There are some who consider him to have been a Jesuit plant. Maneuvered into position to destroy the true Advent Faith. If he was or not, is irrelevant. He was a willing servant of Satan.

Prescott envisioned a somewhat different role for the spirit of prophecy within the church than those who supported the "old view" of the "daily." He considered that the Bible should be its own interpreter and that appeal should not be made to some other "visible authority" to interpret the Scriptures. p. 36, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

"We will not have this man to reign over us," is the language of his soul. Like Satan in Heaven, Prescott is restless at the restraint of the Testimony of Jesus; but in this he forgets that it is half of the distinguishing characteristics of the saints during the sealing time of the 144,000. Only those who overcome as Christ overcame, by being obedient, will be in the kingdom.

Such methodology, he affirmed, would eventually result in being led step by step to substituting other authority for that of the Bible. Such a condition, he believed, would enfeeble and render uncertain the Christian experience of the church membership. Prescott thus opposed submitting the question of the "daily" to Mrs. White for her decision, as others had suggested. While he favored any explanation she might offer as to what her vision concerning the "daily" encompassed, he asserted that he did not consider that it was Mrs. White's "province to act as judge in mere matters of historical or Biblical," interpretation. Prescott believed that there was danger in asserting too great a claim upon the spirit of prophecy for in so doing, he believed that when historical evidence clearly refuted interpretations of the gift, that the gift would then be discredited and lose its authority amongst the membership. Prescott placed great stress upon the study of the context of statements made by Mrs. White in arriving at a correct understanding of her message. [72] p. 37, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

Obviously Ellen (according to Prescott) could not arrive at a correct understanding of her own message! "I was shown like this. The truth once got out now, will stand; for it is the truth for the last days, and it will live, and less need to be said upon the truth after it is out. Numberless words need not be put upon paper to justify

what speaks for itself, and shines in its clearness. But it is not so with error. It is so winding and twisting that it needs a multitude of words to explain it in its crooked form. But truth is straight, plain, clear, and stands out boldly in its own defense. The cause of truth should not be hindered in its onward progress for want of means.” p. 14, Para. 2, [SUPCEV].

And so it is, we see the snakes tail at every twist and turn of certain people’s mouths. This is the battleground of the Great Controversy between Christ and Satan. We are reading a history document that traces the blood on the ground, the moaning of the wounded, the weapons, broken, scattered, Christ’s army in retreat, Satan’s men take the lead. By this time the counterfeit SOP is firmly entrenched. Willie has eighteen more years to live. He has created a niche for himself and is secure for life. Until God calls him forth from the grave. . . . “It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God.”

L. R. CONRADI p. 37, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

Louis R. Conradi, 1856-1939, leader of SDA work in Europe, likewise emphasized the Scriptures as its own expositor. He rejoiced at Mrs. White's counsel of August, 1910, that those engaged in the debate on the "daily" should refrain from using her writings to support their position since she had no clear light on the subject.

What is interesting about this sentence; no foot note, no reference for what Ellen allegedly said. Since we believe that Ellen was faithful all her life, and we have evidence on W. C. White’s position, he had to have authored the letter, “Ellen Dreams of James,” **we attribute this remark to Willie also. Ellen did have clear light on the matter. As a faithful prophet she made public what God told her; in The Present Truth, No. 11, p. 86.**

Conradi hoped that the counsel could be accepted as a general principle for the future. He decried the weakness of the position of the "pioneers" and their evidence in support of their views of the "daily," and stated: "No wonder that some of its defenders should clamor for 'an infallible interpreter of the Word of God' to give the lacking support." Conradi had espoused his "new view" of the "daily" as early as 1898, and considered that the denomination exposed a "terrible weakness" by allowing Uriah Smith's work to continue to be circulated with what he considered an "untenable position" on the "daily" in it. p. 37, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

Another servant of Satan. Look at how he puts the true pioneers down. What he really should be doing is starting his own church instead of riding on the back of other’s labor. Angel’s take good notes.

Conradi considered that "it shows the lack of backbone" within the denomination. He had successfully prevented Smith's books from being published in England unless they were revised and intended to continue to adhere to that policy, he wrote Daniells. "I believe that it is our duty as watchmen to see that the truth is proclaimed and written on every point," he wrote in 1910. [73] p. 38, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

It’s clear that the only “truth” he was interested in was what came out of the mouth of Satan.

Even as two varying positions on the question of the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy seemed to be solidified in the United States, so did such positions begin to develop in Europe. In 1910 a missionary to the Turkish mission, Z. G. Baharian informed W. C. White and W. A. Spicer of increasing doubts concerning the spirit of prophecy. These doubts, according to Baharian, came largely from L. R. Conradi and were also held by the superintendent of the Turkish Mission, H. H. Frauchiger. p. 38, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

Nice of Bert to do the research for us on this one. Testimony from the field that Conradi was working for Satan.

Baharian traced the roots of the differing positions to about 1898 when the question of health reform began to be introduced to Europe. He directly broached the question of the spirit of prophecy in a council meeting in Constantinople in October, 1910, at which Conradi was present. According to Baharian, Conradi spent some time seeking to prove that the Ellen White writings could be divided according to varying degrees of inspiration, consisting largely of two parts: testimonies which were largely revelations from God and other

works that, while the subject matter was guided by the Holy Spirit, the content could contain errors

How ridiculous! to state that the Holy Spirit is going to help the prophet of God write out error! Folks, this is pure blasphemy! Straight from their father, Satan.

and Conradi affirmed that he himself had corrected some of these "errors."

Oh proud, vain man; thou would set up thyself to correct God himself!

According to Baharian both Conradi and Frauchiger denied that the writings on health reform were inspired, Baharian thus concluded that that position indicated "that her writings are not a safe guide to us." He noted, "What an awful thing it is that one minister should teach one way and another minister another way. we have many battles yet to fight. May God pity His people." [74] p. 38, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

T. H. Bowen, GC office secretary, writing on behalf of the traveling W. A. Spicer, did not respond to the substantive questions raised by Baharian, but did note: p. 39, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

"This is a live question ... and affects not only your field, but affects others, and is really no new issue raised; for it is constantly up here as well as in Turkey." p. 39, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

So today, there are many who want all the stacks of papers and books; it makes them feel wealthy with resources; and one day, they just know it, they are going to find that magic statement that is going to make all the difference in their life and get them into Heaven. Good luck with that.

Because of the difficulties to deal with such a basic question by correspondence, W. C. White urged that Baharian meet with A. G. Daniells during a forthcoming meeting at Friedensau. He hoped that Daniells could bring Conradi, Fauchiger, and Baharian together for a discussion of the broad subject of the "authenticity and the use" of the spirit of prophecy as well as the proper manner of teaching the question of health reform "in a new field." [75] p. 39, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

Willie has to get involved to save his own skin and keep his position.

Although the opportunity for a meeting with Conradi at Friedensau did not occur because of the time factor and because Daniells feared Conradi would be "tired and nervous," Daniells did discuss issues in Constantinople with the members of the Turkish Mission. Daniells gained the impression that Baharian represented one extreme on the question while Frauchiger the opposite extreme. He refused to discuss Conradi's position on the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy since he feared such views might be misrepresented. Daniells believed his presentation of the subject served to caution Baharian "with reference to taking a radical position." He dealt with the "fundamental principles underlying the spirit of prophecy and its varied forms, as well as "quite fully with the question" of book revision. Daniells noted that "the interview was a very pleasant one, and they all expressed themselves as being very grateful and well satisfied." Daniells made the following observation to W. C. White: p. 39, Para. 4, [1919BIBL].

"I had a similar meeting with the brethren and sisters in Odessa. I find that there is an influence going out from this country [United States] to all those lands, to undermine confidence in the spirit of prophecy.

Like as if he, Daniells, had nothing to do with such a position.

The thing is in the air, and it must be dealt with promptly and wisely. Our leaders must take a consistent, Biblical position, one in harmony with both the Scriptures and the actual facts as they exist. Then I believe they can stand their ground and establish our people immovably upon this phase of our message and work." [76] p. 39, Para. 5, [1919BIBL].

Reading this, is like a bad dream. It's going to be interesting during the 1,000 years, going over the books; then we will see behind the veil that hides the evil in the man.

A. G. DANIELLS p. 40, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

A. G. Daniells, 1858-1935, considered the contextual relationship to spirit of prophecy statements to be vital.

We have an interesting point here. To my knowledge, no one takes this stance in relation to the Bible. It is widely recognized that the Bible is timeless. There are certain prophecies that apply to certain times, and they have since expired, and we know that prophecy is not to be repeated. God, working through Joseph Bates, a true pioneer, gave us an excellent essay on this point, "SECOND ADVENT WAY MARKS AND HIGH HEAPS OR A CONNECTED VIEW, OF THE FULFILMENT OF PROPHECY, BY GOD'S PECULIAR PEOPLE, From the year 1840 to 1847." (You gotta love those long titles!).

But in 1911 we have the appearance of, what has become, many person's favorite quote. "Regarding the testimonies, nothing is ignored; nothing is cast aside; but time and place must be considered." {PC 9.4} Oct. 10, 1911 Ms. 23--'11. **We think Daniells had something to do with the felt need on Willie's part, to create this statement. Most people use this to give themselves excuse to self-indulgence.**

In a two-day question-and-answer session on the spirit of prophecy at a Boulder, Colorado, camp meeting in 1906, Daniells had several occasions to deal with questions involving contextual relationships to the writings. A former church member wanted to know how it was possible for the administrator of the Boulder Sanitarium, who was an ordained minister, to continue in his position in view of the fact that Mrs. White, in a Review and Herald article spoke against ministers performing largely administrative duties. Daniells urged against "taking such a radical position as that." He believed that the health condition of the individual involved offered a logical exception to the general counsel. He applied that same principle to the statement that "no one man should be president of the General Conference." Daniells believed that A. T. Jones had stretched that statement to make it teach something entirely out of harmony with the obvious purpose for which the testimony was given. He urged that "it will not do to take a single statement and stretch it beyond its purpose and meaning." p. 40, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

The above quote from Daniells' letter is not a correct EGW quote. The correct one is, "It is not wise to choose one man as president of the General Conference." {SpTA08 28.4}. On the side, this paragraph ends with ellipsis, indicating that something was left out. Every next republication of that quote removes the ellipsis.

What the above does do, is bring to light the real conflict between Jones and Daniells, that of the creation of a kingly roll for the man, president of the GC.

Daniells addressed himself to the question of contextual considerations again when he responded to questions raised by a minister in Missouri concerning the apparent contradiction of the question of Sunday labor that appeared in Volume 9 of the Testimonies with what had appeared in earlier Testimonies. Daniells considered that the questions were fundamental in relation to the spirit of prophecy. He wrote W. C. White: p. 40, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

"Beyond all question there is at work now an underground current of influence that is undermining confidence in your mother's writings. And I believe that unless we take a consistent, defensible position we shall be driven into very hard places where the cause will suffer great loss. But I feel sure that if we claim only what your father and mother claimed in the beginning, and what you yourself believe regarding the spirit of prophecy, we shall be able to stand against all these influences, and make Sister White's writings of continued value and service to this cause." p. 41, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

Like Satan, Daniells is speaking out of both sides of his mouth. On the one hand, as we saw earlier, he is a strong promoter of the new view on the "daily." But now, he is claiming to support the SOP, as what James and Ellen "claimed in the beginning." **This is a lie.**

In responding to the minister, Daniells cautioned several times against "taking extreme positions" on the subject. He urged that the Testimonies, as well as the Bible should be studied as a whole to understand its component parts. [78] p. 41, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

This is the sophistry of Satan. There are two identifiable parts to the Spirit of Prophecy. The first part is the true, for it must appear first, then comes the counterfeit. I suggest you study the true Spirit of Prophecy with your Bible, before attempting to examine the counterfeit; for the subtleness of Satan is one hundred times greater than it was when he deceived the angels in Heaven. No. 23, p. 103.

He then presented the contextual background for the position taken in Vol. 9 regarding Sunday labor: the testimony was written concerning Sunday legislation in Australia at a time when the leadership there vitally needed such counsel. It was also written with the stern, unyielding position taken by the European leadership in an earlier crisis that resulted in authorities closing the Basle publishing house, selling its facilities to pay fines, and jailing the leader of the work in Europe. Believing that other areas of the world might need similar counsel, Mrs. White, according to Daniells, published that testimony in Volume 9. He continued: p. 41, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

The church leadership would have it's people not rock the boat, it disrupts the cash flow. I mean real money here. **Their biggest job, at each level, is to keep the money flowing.** But God's plan is different, and when that day does come, as it surly will, the church will split on the Sabbath vs Sunday issue. Those whose hearts have ever been with the world, will then be revealed for just what they are.

“And those who will not receive the mark of the beast and his image, when the decree goes forth, must have decision now to say, nay, we will not regard the institution of the beast.” p. 29, Para. 2, [CEV].

"I do not believe that the testimonies in Volume 9 contradict any former testimonies with regard to Sunday labor or any other points. We should bear in mind that Christian experience is progressive, and that the Testimonies have taught advanced principles year by year as the work has progressed and as the people have been prepared to receive new light. If you examine the first volume of the Testimonies, you will find that only the A B C of many principles and truths were at first presented. These have been developed from time to time since. One who is hunting for technicalities and trying to find a basis for doubts will have opportunity to find apparent discrepancies in the Testimonies. This might also be said of the Scriptures. The Lord has seen fit to present the truth in such a way that those who are inclined to doubt can always find a peg on which to hang their doubts. It is my conviction, however, that there is a beautiful harmony running through all the Testimonies." p. 41, Para. 4, [1919BIBL].

Having a conviction is much different than having a fact. Today, we have facts. Daniells, and so many others, would have us believe that the SOP is progressive. Daniells spells it out right here. Satan, speaking through Daniells, is whispering to many that the early Spirit of Prophecy has been superseded by the later; so forget the early.

In the words of Daniells, I am “one who is hunting for technicalities,” you bet I am!!!

“They [Adam and Eve] had experienced the bitter fruits of disobedience, and learned that every transgressor of God's commands will sooner or later learn that God means just what he says, and that he will surely punish the transgressor.” p. 52, Para. 2, [3SG].

“Those who have to do with God, who is infinite, who explicitly directs in regard to his own worship, should follow the exact course he has prescribed, and not feel at liberty to deviate in the smallest respect, because they think it will answer just as well. God will teach all his creatures that he means just what he says.” p. 14, Para. 2, [4SGa].

It is my experience to date that those who search for truth with the intent to be obedient to it, find it.

“...but the divided heart will plead indulgence rather than denial.” p. 144, Para. 1, [28OT].

When Daniells sent a copy of his response to W. C. White, the latter read it to A. T. Robinson, C. C. Crisler and Mrs. White and W. C. White noted that they said "Amen, to what you have written."

We are here assumed to take Willie's word for what happened. In the harsh light of reality, I doubt everything that

man touches.

White asked Daniells' permission to make copies of the letter to distribute to others. He wrote Haskell that he considered it a "clear and forceful defense of Testimony Vol. 9, and of Mother's work in general." He was sure Haskell would enjoy reading it. [79] p. 41, Para. 5, [1919BIBL].

We have to remember that in those days, few had even the opportunity to discover the counterfeit, as we do today.

Daniells was first exposed to the Prescott-Conradi position on the "daily" in traveling through Europe from Australia to the 1901 GC session. Although he did not immediately immerse himself in the subject, he eventually concluded that their position by "undeniable, indisputable facts" was correct.

A major Jesuit goal is to deflect angst against the Catholic church. Was Daniells a Jesuit? We do not know. What is important, is that we know Daniells true position.

As did almost everyone who engaged in the debate. Daniells believed that the real issues involved far transcended the question over whether or not the "daily" represented paganism and when it was taken away. If that was the only issue, said Daniells, "I would not waste much of my time arguing with men who persist in making claims utterly at variance with all the reliable history of the world." Daniells believed he received great blessing and deep insight into the glorious Biblical truths concerning the ministry of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary after having immersed himself in the study. Indeed, Daniells believed that the truth concerning the "efficacious work of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary" should well have accompanied the presentation of righteousness by faith in 1888. No wonder, Daniells asserted, that Satan instituted the false system that he had through the Papacy. Daniells saw a controversy "whether the enemy shall bring in the most stupendous counterfeit that he has ever foisted upon the human family, and put it in place [of] the vital, fundamental truth regarding man's salvation." [80] p. 42, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

The great question is no longer that of the deception of the whole world, for that is unquestionable. We have the messages of Revelation 14 and 18, that Babylon has corrupted the whole world. What is the focal point is those who profess the truth, but have not received the love of it. **They are ones who are receiving the strong delusion of the supremacy of the counterfeit SOP.**

Although the statement in Early Writings concerning the Millerite "correctness" on the question of the "daily" initially troubled Daniells, his study of the contextual and historical background to the statement resolved the question for him. He concluded that the central point of the vision given Mrs. White concerned the "time" of the ending of the 2300 days, not the specifics of the theology concerning the "daily." p. 42, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

What is missing in this discussion, is the passage in question. We provide it here. "Then I saw in relation to the "DAILY," 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** since 1844, in the confusion, **other views have been embraced, and darkness and confusion have followed.**" The Present Truth, No. 11, p. 86.

Oh, now we clearly see that the church is in "darkness and confusion," and Daniells is one of the main characters promoting it!

Given this interpretation, the spirit of prophecy harmonized with the Bible and with the historical evidences Daniells believed were connected with it. He believed that this position "puts the spirit of prophecy on the side of the Scriptures, and on the side of authentic history, and it does not do any violence to the meaning of the testimony itself." Daniells believed that those who so interpreted the statement in Early Writings were the "truest friends of the gift of prophecy" and that "short-sighted expositors" were forcing a situation that would place the writings in an "indefensible position." [81] p. 43, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

We believe it is W. C. White that has put "the writings in an 'indefensible position'!!"

As you have doubtless seen, the great majority of matter in this document is all about putting the SOP down, raising the reasoning of man, (but only those who have been to college, you understand I am sure), to be above God and his prophets. So we see that nothing has changed since the days of the very first true prophet of God.

Daniells believed himself justified in presenting his views of the "daily" at the seven union conference sessions of 1910 because of the L. A. Smith tract that alleged that those who held the "new view" did so in complete opposition to the spirit of prophecy teaching.

In testimony to the fulfillment of the chapter on "The Shaking" in the 1858 Great Controversy, we have another soldier of the cross revealed, one L. A. Smith. We now have a picture of "the straight testimony called forth by the counsel of the true Witness to the Laodiceans." And we also have a picture of Daniells, as, "The ministers and leading men were passing around in these different companies, fastening the cords stronger." Page 147 of the same book.

Daniells believed that the influence of the General Conference officials holding that view was thereby being destroyed and required a response.

Right here is a huge point, Daniells is holding up the leadership as the only ones to follow. This is exactly the position of the Catholic church. A. T. Jones said it earlier, "Must we accept the General Conference explanation of everything?" even "required to accept" their explanations?!

He likewise bristled at the "fierce, fighting, arbitrary attitude" some held that defended the "old view." He decried the access some seemed to have to "private testimonies" concerning others. Daniells believed that "shockingly indiscreet" use was made of some of those testimonies. He wondered how it was that certain men "seemed to have their pockets full of personal testimonies." [82] p. 43, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

In those days, it probably was true, but that time is long gone.

By the time that Mrs. White urged that "silence is eloquence" on the subject of the "daily," in August of 1910, Daniells considered that the issue had been virtually settled. While he intended not to continue the controversy, Daniells stated: p. 43, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

Here is the statement in question. **Notice the strong lie.**

"The true meaning of "the daily" is not to be made a test question. I now ask that my ministering brethren shall not make use of my writings in their arguments regarding this question ["the daily"]; for I have had no instruction on the point under discussion, and I see no need for the controversy. Regarding this matter under present conditions, silence is eloquence." Sanitarium, Calif., July 31, 1910. PH020 - A Call to the Watchmen (1910)

This statement is on par with the letter, "Ellen Dreams of James," for all are forced to make a clear decision. Either Ellen became unfaithful, or, Willie was writing material and putting her name to it. I maintain that Ellen was faithful her entire life. We know that she was faithful and perfect before God at the great disappointment; she, with others, reflected Christ's image. She had trial by fire, the fire of the deaths of children, the fiery slander of professed believers, the fire of her husband's early death, and she is supposed to have suddenly changed from a complete trust in God to no longer believing in him?! I believe she was faithful her entire life.

"Scores and hundreds of our brethren who have been giving the subject study, and have become thoroughly convinced that the new view is right, will go on with their investigation, and will become more firmly established as the days go by. I think every Bible teacher in our Colleges in this country believes in the new view, and will teach it this way, if they teach anything at all regarding the daily." [83] p. 43, Para. 4, [1919BIBL].

Making the appeal to peer pressure is a common tactic. Look again at the three Hebrews, standing alone, of all the

numbers of other Hebrews who had a similar test that day on the plain of Dura. They knew the statue was being built. They knew there was a test coming. They got ready.

Daniells will have a price to pay for the part he has had in these matters. Of course the employees did what the boss-man said to do; their paycheck was on the line and they knew it. You better go along to get along. So today, we have darkness and confusion in the church.

W. C. WHITE p. 44, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

Mrs. White, in reflecting upon the early period of denominational history noted that when a message from the Lord was given, she and her husband consulted with the "leading brethren" if they were present, "as to the best manner of bringing the instruction before the people."

Here is the pamphlet, not referenced, for the above. After looking it over, I have read portions of it before. It has some real gems of subterfuge.

PH116 - The Writing and Sending Out of the Testimonies to the Church (1913)

W. C. White, in his understanding of the nature of the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy, **likewise considered that a significant role pertaining to that gift was relegated to the church leadership.**

I have read many different statements from Willie, but this one ... it gives one cause to pause. **In the first place, aspersions are cast on anyone understanding inspiration the way the pioneers did; secondly, this is a first, claiming that the church leadership has any say is just ludicrous!, in the extreme! There is no precedent in the Bible for this at all. Usually, it is the church leadership that is the focus of the testimony. And in the authenticated Spirit of Prophecy, this is often the case as well.**

All true prophets of God get their instructions from God, not man.

He quoted his mother as saying, "I have done my part. I have written out what the Lord has revealed to me. Now it is for you to say how it shall be used."

This is exactly a big part of the problem; **Willie was at liberty to create whatever he wanted, to support whatever he felt needed support.** In the above pamphlet, there is even a place where Ellen, allegedly, tells the church that Willie has to be with her, doing her work, and not other church work. Convenient huh? You bet it is. Just like the first piece of real evidence we have on him, the letter, "Ellen Dreams of James." Willie went too far that day.

W. C. White considered this as entirely reasonable since the church leadership "were in contact with all the problems pertaining to the cause of present truth." He continued: p. 44, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

"It was a wise provision of heaven that they should share in the responsibility of saying how and in what manner the messages should be placed before whom they were intended to benefit." [84] p. 44, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

What this is doing is giving the church a free hand to do as they please with the SOP, because they have a part to play in this "wise provision of heaven."

I thank God that we have the true, original Spirit of Prophecy and the Bible to guide us through these last days. I would be lost without them.

Sometimes, according to W. C. White, Mrs. White herself could not, or would not, explain or interpret a certain testimony. W. C. White quoted her as saying, "I can not explain it; you should understand it better than I. If you do not understand it, pray to the Lord, and He will help you."

Like everything has to pass through his hand before it can go anywhere. Remember, we are here getting testimony from the fox that has been guarding the chickens; and he is explaining why some of the chickens are missing.

W. C. White cited an example where that methodology was not used and the leadership misapplied a testimony for "six or eight years" until the Lord gave another vision to Mrs. White. W. C. White believed that the gift of prophecy was not designed to inhibit the leadership or membership from exercising its responsibilities in "prayerfully carrying forward the work." He believed that because that responsibility was left with them "those who carried the responsibilities of leadership were ever made stronger in their work rather than dependent upon the Lord's messenger. [85] p. 44, Para. 4, [1919BIBL].

I wonder if this is what happened to B. B. Beach, and the whole General Conference leadership, when he gave that gold medallion to the man of sin. Someone is not paying attention here.

God's true church is ever dependent upon his prophets.

In responding to a statement written by R. A. Underwood on the spirit of prophecy in 1921, W. C. White outlined his concept of the relationship between the spirit of prophecy and the Bible. He emphasized that there was a marked difference between the Biblical writers and Mrs. White. White considered that the Bible was a "collection of inspired writings winnowed! He elaborated by stressing that the testimonies contained "many writings which correspond to the writings of prophets and scribes that were essential to the people of God when given but which did not find place in the cannon of scripture." White seems, in this draft of a response to Underwood to emphasize that the nature of the inspiration of Ellen White, while similar to that given certain Biblical prophets, is different in that it would have a more limited-application. Still, he affirmed, the Holy Spirit, after the close of the Scriptures, would continue to shed light not only upon Biblical teachings, but also in matters of "organization, policy, and activities, in the Closing work." The spirit of prophecy, according to White, could bring unity to the church because of the degree of authority it also maintained on questions of doctrine. [86] p. 45, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

Folks, be real careful reading this document. It is full of the whisperings of the devil. Make sure your anchor is firm in the truth of the proven authentic Spirit of Prophecy.

The relationship between the Bible and the true Spirit of Prophecy has been clearly laid out in No. 20, pages 42-49; and specifically this passage. **“Bro. B--- would confuse the mind by seeking to make it appear that the light God has given through the Testimonies is an addition to the Word of God. But in this he presents it in a false light. God has seen fit in this manner to bring the minds of his people to his Word, to give them a more clear understanding of it.”** p. 153, Para. 1, [27OT].

To say more, or, less, would be a mistake.

In the above, truth is mixed with error. I can not discover what is being referred to in the words, “the Holy Spirit, after the close of the Scriptures.” The only thing that makes any sense is a reference to the end of the Bible, as in Revelation. But it is not clear.

The unity the Spirit of Prophecy brings is that same unity the pioneers of this faith had; not based on some approval of some leader, but on truth. The counterfeit SOP can never bring a true unity to the church, but only a false unity based on following a human leader, and not a studying people.

In his consideration of the contextual relationships of the spirit of prophecy writings, such ingredients as the historical background, the status of denominational work at the time, the nature of the recipient of the testimony, and the possibilities to be given or withheld depending upon varying circumstances entered into the thinking of W. C. White. He noted that Mrs. White "often stated" that God had never commissioned her to write proverbs and thus her writings, "to be properly understood" had to be read in their contextual setting. According to W. C. White, his mother expressed concern over the dual problems of the unwise [use] we made of testimonies that no longer applied because of changed circumstances and the opposite difficulty of the church suffering if relevant counsel was not available in time of need.

Well, naturally this must be a reference to health reform, in part. Just wait til we get there, it's just around the corner.

W. C. White believed that the counsel contained in the tract "The Writing and Sending Out of the Testimonies to the Church" provided guidelines between both those extremes. [87] p. 45, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

This would be the one referenced above.

A major episode involving W. C. White occurred during the 1913 Fall Council and concerned the question of context as well as the problem of "inspired" and "uninspired" portions of the spirit of prophecy. The contextual aspect concerned the use of a testimony by James Edson White that was given under different circumstances than when he applied it. The question was also raised if that testimony should be considered inspired and if so should it be given the same authority as the testimonies published in Volume 9 with which it seemed to conflict. While W. C. White considered the testimony as authentic and thus inspired, his refusal to classify it or to give it the same status as the published testimonies caused widespread discussion. [88] p. 46, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

Concerning the disputed testimony, White wrote Daniells: p. 46, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

"It might be much easier to repudiate a few documents that perplex us, and say they were forgeries, but it is the truth that makes us free, and I do not know of any way in harmony with the law of God than to deal with these matters just as they are." p. 46, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

He asserted that he could not attempt to classify the spirit of prophecy writings and he believed that Daniells knew the reason why. W. C. White reminded Daniells of those times in the past when counsel came to the church leadership without any clear indication that it was based upon revelation. Often, however, it transpired that the leadership later learned that the counsel had, indeed, been based upon direct revelation or was later reinforced by direct revelation. White continued: p. 46, Para. 4, [1919BIBL].

A little bit too convenient, wouldn't you say? Willie creates a testimony and then, creates another document of some kind to back it up. And with Ellen's name on it, it's untouchable. But this kind of action is what gave rise to the cry of "rubber stamp testimonies."

"You know that if we had undertaken at any time in the past to draw a line between counsel based upon revelation and definite testimony regarding duty, that we should have been obliged to revise our opinion many times.

That's because it all passed under his hand! With the authentic Spirit of Prophecy these problems do not exist. But after August 6, 1881, all that changed.

It was with these facts in mind that I refused, at the Council, to express any opinion regarding the classification of the Watson letter. And yet it is reported that I said it was not testimony." [89] p. 46, Para. 5, [1919BIBL].

White believed that confusion resulted at the Council because some considered that only direct revelation constituted testimony. This was not W. C. White's understanding of the nature of the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy. He wrote Daniells in 1913: p. 47, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

"It has always seemed to me that in Mother's writings, as in the writings of Paul and other Bible writers, that there was a simple statement of history, a statement regarding Christian experience, arguments regarding Bible doctrine, and counsel to individuals and to churches; also the relation of revelations from God, and all these united constituted Paul's testimony to the church." p. 47, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

What is interesting here, the Bible does not have such a problem. It states in the clearest of words, **"All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness:"** 2 Tim. 3:16

It is the divided heart that has a problem understanding God's words. It is the divided heart that wants to change what the Bible clearly says. But God's dear saints, need no degree to understand his word; need no human leader to explain what is plain; need no sophistry from Satan to confuse the counsel. As God declares, **"But God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty;"** 1 Cor. 1:27

Praise his name!

White restated this again in 1915: p. 47, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

"I have sometimes said that I did not understand that all testimony was inspiration, and I referred to the writings of the apostle Paul. Some was history, some revelation, some exhortation, and some argument. He did not claim that all he wrote was the record of revelations from heaven; but all his writings together constituted his testimony to the church, and I have regarded Mother's writings in a similar way." p. 47, Para. 4, [1919BIBL].

In re-stating and re-stating the same point, the church is trying to convince people that Willie was right. It has been said that if a lie is repeated often enough, it becomes fact; this is similar to the big lie the government continues to tell about the events of September 11, 2001. It is a favorite tactic of Satan. I do not think that God's saints will buy into this lie. In the forensic research we have on-going, we have proved at least twice, that people are forced to choose between Willie or Ellen being the guilty party.

While White clearly differentiated between Ellen White speaking on personal matters and her writings that were sent out as testimonies, some at the 1913 Council believed that certain items had been sent as testimonies that were not to be so regarded. W. C. White did not agree to that, he asserted, "because I did not believe it." He also disputed the statement frequently attributed to him: "It is evident that there must be a line drawn somewhere in mother's writings," and asserted that he could not draw such lines "because I know not where to draw them." [90] p. 47, Para. 5, [1919BIBL].

W. C. White still looked back to the 1913 episode in 1921 and recalled that a union conference president inquired if the disputed testimony should be regarded the same as published testimonies. White noted that he said, "no," and would still say the same. He noted: p. 47, Para. 6, [1919BIBL].

It would be worth the time, for those who have questions about this, to go back and examine what transpired before James died, and how it was handled. In the introduction to No. 26, James states, **"Here is a work that has been subjected to the most rigid criticisms, and the most violent persecutions for the long period of twenty years, and yet remains unchanged."** Most church members relegate James to some back seat when it comes to Spirit of Prophecy matters, but this is not right. James was the house-band for Ellen and the protector of the truth.

In his day, the Spirit of Prophecy was not "sliced and diced," as is happening in this document, and "inspiration" re-defined, to cut out God.

"Many things that mother has written which are true she did not deem it advisable to publish.

Now here is a curious thing. Willie would have us believe that God is going to reveal some truth to his prophet, and the prophet is going to make the decision about revealing it to God's people. This is not the order of command. This is Willie paving his own road, making it convenient for himself. This is likely a huge source for the many "un-published manuscripts" the church has released of later years. **Upon reading them, there seems precious little excuse to have ever withheld them.**

There is a difference in the breadth of application. As a result of this conversation, the brother to whom I was speaking carried the word that I said that the letter was not testimony. In this he erred." [91] p. 47, Para. 7, [1919BIBL].

Not true, Willie erred; that brother was simply doing his own thinking, rightly, and coming to a logical

conclusion; but Willie would have all think as he wants us to think. It's time to buckle-up.

Amongst those dismayed by such reports was J. W. Watt, a minister for 34 years. According to Watt, a union conference president who conducted a canvassers' institute in Watt's area of Johnstown, Pennsylvania, drew a logical conclusion from the concept that "all that Mother had written was not testimony." That president informed the believer in Pennsylvania, reported Watt, that Mrs. White's statement on the meat question "was not testimony, but only her own opinion." **Watt wondered how "we small guns" could deal with the health reform question when higher officials recommended the membership to "eat all the flesh you desire," as long as it was not pork.** Watt also wondered about the testimony that indicated that cheese should not be used. The union president seemed able to handle that question by refusing to recommend the early volumes of the testimonies to the believers. The president also informed Watt that "if you take the position that the testimonies are inspired like the Bible you will bring the curse down upon you spoken of in the book of Revelation of adding to the word." [92] p. 48, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

Here it is, plain as day. **The portion of the SOP they are refusing to recommend is the very portion of the original, least changed, testimonies. Want proof of Satan's agent's hand? Right here it is. Testimonies Vol. 1-4 are the original testimonies, counterfeited; but that was not enough, they had to be buried under a mountain of "higher learning criticism," to keep the plebeians scared off them. This is proof positive of the war between Christ and Satan.**

In relating to questions concerning the spirit of prophecy and health reform, W. C. White consistently outlined the progressive experience of Mrs. White and the denomination and referred to the historical circumstances that related to the counsel given. Indeed, he applied this likewise to other areas. He wrote the following to F. M. Wilcox in 1921: p. 48, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

What is not being said here, is this: "God just didn't know the future, so Ellen had to change what was written, and that is why the early visions contradict the later visions." This is the lie of Satan so often repeated in this document. "God does change," is the lie. Don't you believe it for a second! Our God is the great Creator of the whole heavens and the earth and every other planet out there. But here, vain, arrogant and proud man has decided to follow Satan and reject God; and cloak it all behind a smile and words to deceive.

"You will remember that [Mrs. White] has been very emphatic in her condemnation of drugs, and when pressed for a definition as to what constituted drugs, she has said, "Poisonous drugs."

We have not said too much on this site, sopvindicated.org, about drugs. But here, Willie is promoting them, ah, in the hands of competent doctors, you understand.... **Well, let's put up a fact here. Fact: the drugs of today, are so much more poisonous than the drugs of yesteryear, arsenic, &c., that when the killing power of the two are compared, it takes several times more of the old drugs to kill, than the new drugs. And it is for this very reason that they are not safe and are greatly regulated and controlled; they ARE VERY poisonous.**

And, the warning is not from Ellen, she is just the messenger, delivering a message from God.

Mother has been emphatic in her condemnation of fiction, and when pressed to define what she referred to as fiction, she has always spoken of those works of fiction which lead the mind away from God. With these things in mind, I suppose we may understand her condemnation of fiction to refer to those works of fiction which lead the mind away from heavenly things. When we read what she has written about drugs, we may consider it as applying to poisonous drugs. When we read her condemnation of cheese, we may consider it as applying to unhealthful cheese. If there is any purely, strictly, and unmistakably healthful cheese, it may not come under this condemnation.... It seems to me that the food analysts and the doctors ought to lend a hand, if we are to attach some qualifying phrases to mother's condemnation of cheese." [93] p. 48, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

Vain man is here putting a question mark after what God has placed a period. No cheese has any fiber in it at all. Just based on that point alone, cheese is not good food. White flour has all the fiber removed; white flour is not good food. There are a very great many items "the food analysts and the doctors" consider safe to eat, that are put into

items called "food" today, but in this is the subtle workings of Satan the destroyer.

The mind is the great battlefield between Christ and Satan. The great object of health reform is to preserve the fine nerves of the brain to make possible clear spiritual thinking. Without fiber in the diet, the colon quickly creates pockets between the muscle strands designed to move digested food through the system. These pockets collect and hold matter that then decomposes, becomes poisonous and poisons the entire system. A great many people have no idea or experience about what real health feels like. They live their entire lives in a poisoned state.

Perhaps W. C. White's most detailed response to a question relating to health reform principles was given to a Loma Linda student who was preparing a paper on the consistency of the teachings in the testimonies on health reform. White noted that some considered the statements in Volume 3, p. 21, to be out of harmony with Volume 9 relative to the questions of butter, milk and eggs. White pointed out: p. 49, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

Do you know what the chicken ate that laid the egg you are eating? Probably ninety percent of the population in America do not know what a healthy egg looks like in the frying pan. Today they are called "premium" eggs by the professional culinary industry; largely, when the Testimony was published, 1870, this was the only egg available.

"That which mother wrote in Testimonies, Volume 9 was intended by her to present to the people **the best light she had on the subject**, after many years of experience and many years of study of the warnings which the Lord had given to her in the earlier years of her experience in the health reform." p. 49, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

Willie is saying that Ellen's visions did not come from God, but some other source. Those visions could not be counted on, so, Ellen, in order to promote health reform was forced to depend on man's expert advise. (!?!)

Willie was between a rock and a hard place because of his tampering with the Spirit of Prophecy. **He did the best he could, but his work shows the hand of man and not God. Thus, we call these writings, "the counterfeit" SOP.**

He emphasized such considerations in the early period as having to "choose the lesser of two evils," lack of sterilization techniques, non-examination of cattle for tuberculosis: "Therefore there existed in the milk and in the butter of those days much tuberculosis which was greatly endangering the health of the people who ate it." Under the circumstances of those days, Mrs. White, on occasion, recommended the use of meat to those having particular problems. p. 49, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

White noted: p. 49, Para. 4, [1919BIBL].

"In the later years, since our leading physicians have so fully studied this matter and so fully developed a system of diet that is a perfect substitute for meats, mother has never advised the use of meat, even though she was urged to do so by persons of large influence and of large information regarding medical affairs." [94] p. 49, Para. 5, [1919BIBL].

Again, Willie is here claiming that God's prophet is getting her information from man, not God. **"Our leading physicians" is not an excuse for changing the Testimonies, but to him it was. Willie was in total darkness. God is the one who does not change. He does not need to change. "God is light and in him is no darkness at all." Every word God speaks is truth. Every word God's prophet speaks at his command is truth. The authenticated Spirit of Prophecy is truth, perfect in it's harmony with all it's parts, there is none of this confusion of place and time, and explaining this and that, needed. It is a complete whole. Beautiful.**

It is the counterfeit that is ugly.

White explained the historical context to the statement in Volume 3, p. 21: "We bear positive testimony against ... butter." Compounding the problem of tuberculosis germs in butter, Adventists, in their efforts to avoid lard and other fats, turned to the use of butter and sugar and, in avoiding meats, adopted the practice of having from three to seven fried foods at a meal. Mrs. White received a vision concerning these practices

and she "bore a positive testimony against ... butter." White considered the statement as "a historical statement regarding the testimony which she was bearing in the churches east and west." He continued: p. 49, Para. 6, [1919BIBL].

"Still later on, when conscientious physicians testified that after very faithful investigation, and study, they had become satisfied that sterilized butter was a better fat for many people than any of the vegetable oils, mother accepted their work and their testimony, and did her best to present in her later writings the clearest and best light she had upon the subject. Personally, I feel free to walk in the light of these later counsels." [95] p. 50, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

Here is proof that man is foolish in his attempts to supplant God. This last paragraph tells the tale. **All the great and wise "conscientious physicians" of the world and all their vaunted wisdom and learning "testified that after very faithful investigation" that they know better than God.** Now, in 2012, it is fairly common knowledge that vegetable oils are far better than animal fat. But Willie would have us believe that Ellen "accepted their work and their testimony" in the place of God's word, or, as God's word.

The problem here is one. Either Ellen was God's prophet, or, she was not. Willie would have us follow him, not Christ.

F. M. Wilcox, in 1915, prepared a manuscript dealing with the spirit of prophecy. The manuscript, which was submitted to W. C. White for criticism, contained the observation, **"Sister White has not been set in this church as a historian or as a theologian."** White observed that the statement was "undoubtedly true" in the technical usage of terms, but feared that the statement might create an erroneous impression. He suggested the following substitute: p. 50, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

What Wilcox did here, was define the counterfeit, but knew not what he had done.

"Sister White, as a teacher of sacred truth, has not been led to a technical treatment of theological questions, but has given such views of the love of God and the plan of salvation, and of man's duty to God and to his fellow men, that when presented to the people, they arouse the conscience, and impress upon the hearer the saving truths of the Word of God. She says, "The written testimonies are not to give new light, but to impress vividly upon the heart the truths of inspiration already revealed." p. 50, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

Willie is misusing and misapplying the statement; plus, it has been altered from the original. Here is the passage in question. **"The written testimonies are not to give new light; but to impress with vividness upon the heart the truths of inspiration already revealed."** No. 20, p. 44. While Willie was covering for his own work, with Ellen's name attached, **we would point out that God through Ellen was giving to his church the correct interpretations of difficult texts.**

Yet in the face of that, many do not want to be led of God, notably Uriah Smith on the partial resurrection. The correct understanding of Daniel 12:2 is found in The Present Truth, No. 11, p. 86; and the 1851 Christian Experience and Views, p. 34.

"In the technical sense of the word, Sister White is not a historian. She has not been a systematic student of history and chronology, and she has never intended that her works should be used to settle controversies over historical dates. But as one who relates history, one 'in whose work the character and spirit of an age is exhibited in miniature,' she is a historian whose works teach valuable lessons from the past for the present and the future." p. 50, Para. 4, [1919BIBL].

White had reacted similarly several years earlier when a writer for Southern Watchman used Great Controversy as evidence to prove certain historical questions. W. C. White noted that Mrs. White objected to the use of her writings as authority "regarding the details of history or historical dates." [96] p. 50, Para. 5, [1919BIBL].

Willie well knew he had made some mistakes in the Great Controversy that were being closely examined by

others. His creation of the 1884GC was something of a disaster, which is why a major re-write was required; something that never was required of the authentic Spirit of Prophecy.

On the question of Mrs. White's use of historians, W. C. White asserted: p. 50, Para. 6, [1919BIBL].

"I have overwhelming evidence and conviction that [the writings] are the description and delineation of what God has revealed to her in vision, and where she has followed the description of historians or the exposition of Adventist writers, I believe that God has given her discernment to use that which is correct and in harmony with truth regarding all matters essential to salvation. If it should be found by faithful study that she has followed some expositions of prophecy which in some detail regarding dates we cannot harmonize with our understanding of secular history, it does not influence my confidence in her writings as a whole any more than my confidence in the Bible is influenced by the fact that I cannot harmonize many of the statements regarding chronology." p. 50, Para. 7, [1919BIBL].

Willie is describing ~~his~~ Ellen's work. He would have all understand that (s)he did the very best job possible. Tongue in cheek there. Willie is speaking out of the abundance of his heart.

White noted that the visions given Mrs. White concerning historical events usually contained no geographical or chronological setting. Not only did she obtain that perspective by reading historical works, but in so doing, said White, "there was brought vividly to her mind scenes presented clearly in vision, but which were through the lapse of years and her strenuous ministry, dimmed in her memory."

This is an outright lie. Here is the truth. "And here I would state that although I am as dependent upon the Spirit of the Lord in writing my views as I am in receiving them, yet the words I employ in describing what I have seen are my own, unless they be those spoken to be by an angel, which I always enclose in marks of quotation." R&H, October 8, 1867.

Now — the church generally has gotten a lot of mileage out of the last half of that passage. So, let's take a look at something. Here is Paul saying that he is using his own words. "I speak not by commandment, ..." 2 Corinthians 8:8. Paul only thought he was speaking on his own. **Here is the truth. "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: 2 Timothy 3:16.**

And here is the correct understanding of inspiration. "The scribes of God wrote as they were dictated by the Holy Spirit, having no control of the work themselves." No. 26, p. 5. Real inspiration means that neither Ellen, or Paul, nor any other of God's servants, could tell, in themselves, when they were being controlled by the Holy Spirit. This is so because that servant was so in tune with God.

He also noted that Mrs. White, aware of her lack of education, admired the presentation of others of "the scenes which God had presented to her in vision." He continued: p. 51, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

"She found it both a pleasure and a convenience and an economy of time to use their language fully or in part in presenting those things which she knew through revelation and which she wished to pass on to her readers." [97] p. 51, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

All through this document Willie is covering for his own acts; lying about his mother, Ellen, and generally leaving a pretty good paper trail. **James in "Life Sketches," 1880 edition, p. 328, tells us, it is unbelief that claims Ellen got information from other books, for what she wrote is not to be found in other books.** I suggest you read that section. But, this is the source of the charges of plagiarism — W. C. White.

White emphasized that his mother was not dependent upon historical research in writing the historical elements of her books. He stated: p. 51, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

"Of this you may be sure because I know whereof I speak. Her use of the language of the historians was not for the sake of bringing into the book something that had not been revealed to her but was an effort to utilize in the best language she could find, the description of scenes presented to her." p. 51, Para. 4,

[1919BIBL].

More of Willie trying to cover for his use of other historians works.

Thus White believed that (1) the basic framework of the historical works was established by vision, (2) her study of the Bible and histories enabled Mrs. White to fill in certain details, (3) the revelations given Mrs. White enabled her "to select and appropriate that which was true and to discard that which was erroneous or doubtful." [98] p. 51, Para. 5, [1919BIBL].

Although W. C. White recognized the fallibility of Mrs. White, even to the extent of her fallibility "in stating things revealed to her," **he seemed to studiously avoid stating that a specific published spirit of prophecy statement was in error.**

Notice the work of the snake here. Speaking out of both sides of his mouth at the same time! Willie's position of trying to create distance between himself and stating specifically that some quote was wrong, is a bit painfully obvious here; it has been mentioned several times.

He no doubt feared that some might conclude that the statement in question was thus not to be taken as inspired. Concerning the conflicting statements published between 1864 and 1874 dealing with the question of whether God or Eve mentioned death as the consequence of merely touching the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, White stated: p. 51, Para. 6, [1919BIBL].

"It is reasonable to suppose that the statement found in the later writings gives the most correct expression to the views opened up to Sister White in vision. In her earliest writings there are found a few statements which indicate that the vision was imperfectly understood, or imperfectly described." p. 52, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

We think it was the work of Uriah Smith, in 1874, with Willie covering for him, in this material Bert is quoting. Willie was born in 1854. He would have been only twenty at the time of the conflicting statement being published. I quite doubt Willie had that kind of input at that time. I think (opinion alert) a wide-eyed, wet behind the ears, Willie was enamored, wowed and wooed by Uriah, who was himself deceived by his own intelligence.

The statement, under consideration, was also published in Redemption No.2, and in the R&H February 24, 1874. Which came first? We do not know. It seems evident that the Redemption series was a project that got sidelined. No. 2, with the error, was published in 1874, while No. 1 was not published until 1877; and the rest after that. **Something is not right here.**

I wonder if James was N/A for some reason in 1874; long enough that Uriah felt comfortable publishing his view in two places. Research is on-going, trying to make sense of some of this. Fortunately God has preserved the originals of enough publications that we can prove authentic what we study and make available. Praise his holy Name!

Regarding the revision in Patriarchs and Prophets as to whether there were nine or seven generations living contemporaneously for hundreds of years, he noted: p. 52, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

"At one time mother's attention was called to the fact that there were nine generations contemporaneous, and many of the nine generations contemporaneous for hundreds of years, but not every one of the nine generations contemporaneous for so long a time. **Then she instructed us to change the statement to seven.** What circumstance led to the less accurate statement in the early editions of the book was never made known to me." p. 52, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

By using such terms as "most correct expression," or "less accurate statement," W. C. White seemed to purposely avoid the implications of the word "error." [99] p. 52, Para. 4, [1919BIBL].

Notice how Willie puts it all on Ellen. It was Ellen's attention that was called, not his; it was Ellen that ordered the correction, not him, &c.

In the statements relating to the 1911 revision of Great Controversy, neither Ellen White nor her son considered the revisions in the same light as did Prescott. Mrs. White stated: p. 52, Para. 5, [1919BIBL].

"When I learned that Great Controversy must be reset, I determined that we would have everything closely examined, to see if the truths it contained were stated in the very best manner, to convince those not of our faith that the Lord had guided and sustained me in the writing of its pages." p. 52, Para. 6, [1919BIBL].

"As a result of the thorough examination by our most experienced workers, some changing in the wording has been proposed. **These changes I have careful examined, and approved.**" p. 52, Para. 7, [1919BIBL].

On our site, sopvindicated.org, we do a chapter by chapter comparison between the 1884GC, **which, I believe, Willie created in corrupt harmony with Uriah Smith,** and the 1911GC, **and show plainly that the 1911 was way far and away, more than a few word changes.**

In discussing the revision, W. C. White referred to word changes because of availability of more accurate translations of historical sources, usage of more recent sources necessitated by an inability to locate and thus verify sources previously used,

Let's see here... humm... I am looking at our comparison, and in the 1884GC, on page 31, and in the 1911 it is page 29, and **we have a change that directly contradicts what Willie has just stated.** In the 1884GC Willie is quoting from Josephus, book 6, chapter 5, p. 582; this is the part about "A comet, resembling a flaming sword, for a year hung over the city."

So Willie had to have had access to Josephus, otherwise he could not have found the information. But in the 1911GC he changed it to a quote from Milman, and the comet got left behind. So his excuse in this instance holds no water.

changes of different expressions to avoid giving unnecessary offense. White noted, "In each of these places the more accurate form of expression has been duly considered and approved by the author."

We are rather partial to our recent find of the very words of Willie, written in Ellen's name, "Sister White is not the originator of these books." We think the sentence exactly accurate, just as it reads; though in context Willie would have you believe otherwise. Speaking of which, here is the clear statement, right from the church. We quote.

"In the absence of direct instruction from Ellen White, or clues in the materials themselves, Miss Davis consulted carefully prepared harmonies of the Gospels, and as the work progressed made considerable use of S. J. Andrews' "Life of Our Lord Upon the Earth," which as noted on the title page took into account "Historical, Chronological, and Geographical Relations."

"As the work [Desire of Ages] was thought to be nearing completion in 1896, Marian [Davis], working on the three general introductory chapters, "'God With Us," "The Chosen People," and "The Fullness of the Time,"" sought the counsel of Herbert Lacey of the Avondale school on the arrangement of the paragraphs." "The Australian Years," page 385.

Just looking this over, it doesn't look like Ellen is writing; no, it looks like Marian Davis is writing; which, of course, was part of the trouble in Willie's team; i. e. Marian laying claim to authorship.

In dealing with certain substantive changes, where certain statements in the original edition were strongly disputed by Roman Catholic scholars, W. C. White quoted his mother as follows: p. 52, Para. 8, [1919BIBL].

"What I have written regarding the arrogance and the assumptions of the papacy is true. Much historical evidence regarding these matters has been designedly destroyed; nevertheless, that the book may be of the greatest benefit to Catholics and others, and that needless controversies may be avoided, it is better to have all statements regarding the assumptions of the pope and the claims of the papacy stated so moderately as to

be easily and clearly proved from accepted histories that are within the reach of our ministers and students." [100] p. 53, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

I am sure readers of the Bible will be familiar with God, toning down testimonies he sent to people, because they might be offended. **NOT! God never does this; only man is guilty of such things.**

One can gain some understanding of the deep involvement of W. C. White with the denominational debate on the "daily" by merely totaling the pages of his letters to some of the participants. He wrote his brother a 20-page letter in June of 1909. The next year Daniells, P. T. Magan, and Washburn received letters of 11, 23, and 36 pages respectively. White believed the statement, in Early Writings pertained to the prophetic periods relating to the "daily" rather than to the character of the "daily" itself.

Time to insert that passage. **“Then I saw in relation to the “DAILY,” that the work “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 since 1844, in the confusion, other views have been embraced, and darkness and confusion has followed.”** The Present Truth, No. 11, page 86.

Now go back to the top of the paragraph and read Willie’s words again; it’s like a sick joke, he looks like a buffoon, when you put the passage from God next to what he is saying!

He arrived at this support of the "new view" because of his belief that an understanding of the contextual background of the statement was overwhelmingly vital to understanding it. He believed that that principle should generally be applied to his mother's writings. White considered it relevant that his mother had written much concerning the importance to the Advent movement, of the 2300-year prophecy, while the nature of the "daily" itself was "wholly ignored" in all her writings "except in this one sentence of 35 words, found in the midst of the argument that 'time has not been a test since 1844 and it will never again be a test.'" The context to the statement found in Early Writings to White seemed to involve the entire article in which the statement was originally written, the entire article in which the statement was originally written, the entire scope of the Ellen White writings on the subject, and the historical background to the original writing. [101] p. 53, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

Willie learned to think this way in college. It would be important to understand what E. A. Sutherland had to say, and why he published the book, “Studies in Christian Education.” The Catholic Jesuit order was instituted for the express purpose of counteracting the influence of the Protestant Reformation in education. That sentence should burn deeply into your mind.

Because of the departure of the GCSDA church from walking in the light of the Midnight Cry, they are off the path to the city, and can not find their way back onto that path; nor do they want to. They have embraced the Jesuit system of education, and thereby, the Jesuit method of thinking. Willie is here demonstrating that very method of thinking. It is a method of rebellion against God. I highly recommend you own a copy of that book, the original version, for this book has been counterfeited also, and read it.

White initially conceived of the study of the "daily" as a special opportunity to make a thorough study of Biblical and historical sources and eventually gain a clear understanding of the truth of the prophecy of Daniel 8. He concluded that such seemed to be God's will since the Lord had not chosen to settle the question through a revelation to Mrs. White.

Look at this bald-faced lie!!! This is the importance of knowing the truth. Truth will not set you free unless you know it. So few ever study these things, fewer go on to research the facts. Back up just a bit and re-read the passage in question. It is so clear and plain a child could follow the instruction. But rebellious man, no way! Groping about in total darkness and gross deception, “Ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth.” 2 Tim. 3:7

He seemed confirmed in that position as a wealth of historical evidence began to be uncovered that related

to the broad prophetic periods of Daniel. He was likewise convinced because of the strengthening of the positions relative to the papacy. [102] p. 54, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

I wonder if Bert is here referring to how much stronger the SDA's position is to the church of Rome???....

Although White saw positive gains that could be achieved by a search for new light on the "daily," much as had occurred during the searching for truth encouraged by Mrs. White during the 1888 to 1890 period, he also made comparisons to that earlier period that had negative implications. White noted that during that period most believers were not so concerned with the supposed detrimental effect a change of position would have on the denominational influence. White also recalled: p. 54, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

"They did not regard the new doctrine itself as of such serious importance, but they believed that the old positions had been sanctioned by the Testimonies, and to make a change would unsettle the confidence of our people everywhere in the Testimonies; and this they regarded as the most serious feature of the whole question." [103] p. 54, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

While W. C. White tried to maintain objectivity relative to the "pioneer view," he clearly considered those representing that position as the primary aggressors in the debate.

Obadiah 1:1, **“Arise ye, and let us rise up against her in battle.”** And so it was, as it has always been. Only a few seek out the truth for the purpose of being obedient to it. No wonder it's only 144,000.

He objected to attempts to prevent publication of Conradi's book on Daniel in the Danish-Norwegian and in the United States, he opposed circulating of the O. A. Johnson and L. A. Smith pamphlets at the 1909 GC session, and he opposed the methods used in discrediting the views held by those supporting the "new view." He noted: p. 54, Para. 4, [1919BIBL].

"Some are so anxious that they keep passing their questions and misgivings on to Mother, and many of these questions are like a snake that has swallowed a rabbit, it bulges out with a great complaint or accusation. The complaints and accusations that have been poured in upon Mother have many of them been presented in such an (sic) one-sided way that "if it were possible" they were 'deceive the very elect.'" [104] p. 55, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

Satan's agents are often throwing the accusations on others, of which they themselves are guilty. Willie and company has literally deceived a whole church. **I believe that the counterfeit SOP is that “strong delusion” which causes the whole church to believe a lie; simply because they will not receive a “love of the truth, that they might be saved,” because they “had pleasure in unrighteousness.”**

After the issuance of the L. A. Smith pamphlet that seemed so strongly to discredit the holders of the "new view," W. C. White believed that the Daniells-Prescott response was appropriate. The General Conference officials had been discredited in terms of their influence and their attitudes toward the spirit of prophecy had been seriously questioned. It seemed as though there was no alternative but to respond. White maintained that attitude until a testimony urging silence on the subject of the "daily" reversed his opinion. [105] p. 55, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

I can only surmise that Willie grew tired of the debate and issued a “cease and desist” order in the form of a testimony. Or, perhaps he had other goals.

As White analyzed the debate on the "daily" he, as others, looked beyond the theological dispute itself, and hope that the debate might afford opportunity to resolve certain larger questions. One such question involved the continued circulation of Daniel and Revelation. Even though White was convinced that the historical sources that were uncovered as a consequence of the investigations over the "daily" refuted certain of the teachings in that book, he still favored what he termed a "literal, open door policy," relative to its circulation. He believed that a book "so valuable in most of its features" should continue to be circulated 'until something better should take its place.' Conversely, he likewise favored the circulation of Conradi's

book, although it took a completely different position on the "daily." [106] p. 55, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

This is the first time I have found that Willie actually endorsed Uriah's book. (I have lots of reading to do myself!) **I consider this to be further evidence of a bond between the two. The first evidence was the publication of the 1884GC with the error of the partial resurrection of the wicked, in complete rebellion of plain biblical instruction; Revelation 20:5.**

W. C. White considered two other questions of even greater importance, however. He wrote Daniells in March of 1910: p. 55, Para. 4, [1919BIBL].

"I have told some of our brethren that I thought there were two questions connected with this ["daily"] matter that were of more importance than the decision which shall be made as to which is most nearly correct, the old or the new view regarding the "daily." The first is, How shall we deal with one another when there is difference of opinion? Second, How shall we deal with Mother's writings in our effort to settle doctrinal questions?" p. 55, Para. 5, [1919BIBL].

White hoped that a meeting between the main disputants on the "daily" might resolve not only the "daily" question, but also work toward resolving the larger questions. [107] p. 56, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

Although the meeting proposed by White never occurred, two significant testimonies were sent four months after his proposal to the central figures in the debate: Butler, Loughborough, Haskell, Smith, Gilbert, Prescott, and Daniells. **Mrs. White requested that her writings "not be used as the leading argument to settle questions over which there is now so much controversy."** In noting that **she had no specific instruction from the Lord on the "point under discussion,"** she again urged that her writings not be used in the debate.

I find these lies just ridiculous. No. 20, pages 42-49, specifically state exactly the opposite. Especially is this true regarding the subject at hand, for God has already made the meaning very clear, in The Present Truth, No.11, p. 86. It is the explicit purpose of the testimony of Jesus to bring a clear understanding of the Bible to his church. What we have here are rebellious Israel, fighting against God. **These agents of Satan would ruin the unwary. Study, study, study, "to show thyself approved unto God."**

The testimony, dated July 31, 1910, was significantly entitled "Our Attitude Toward Doctrinal Controversy." Since Mrs. White ordinarily placed no titles upon testimonies, it seems quite possible that W. C. White placed that significant title on the testimony.

How convenient; a testimony with just the right title. I believe Bert got this one right; at least about the title. It looks like the name of the author was wrong, Ellen wrote much more consistently, Willie should have had a stamp with his signature on it.

The same testimony urged that "important books that have been in print for years" and that had been influential in bringing others into the church, should not be discredited over relatively minor matters. Questions of correction and revision should be referred to those ordinarily in charge of such matters. [108] p. 56, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

We have a perfect example, here, of a created testimony used to back up and support a W. C. White opinion and counsel. And the last sentence endorsing his position as chief of "corrections and revisions."

The second testimony, dated August 3, 1910, contained the following relevant statement: p. 56, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

"We must blend together in the bonds of Christlike unity; then our labors will not be in vain. Draw in even cords, and let no contentions be brought in. Reveal the unifying power of truth, and this will make a powerful impression on human minds. In unity there is strength." p. 56, Para. 4, [1919BIBL].

What is implied is that one must be in harmony with the church leadership, or else! And make no mistake, that “or else” was made use of. When M. L. Andreasen published his “Letters to the Churches,” the GCSDA leadership cut off his retirement. But in God’s providence, worldly powers stepped in and the funds were restored. This is serious business to deal with the wicked in the church.

This counsel, unfortunately was not applied in the controversy over the "daily." [109] p. 56, Para. 5, [1919BIBL].

It seems apparent that W. C. White during the controversy over the "daily" hoped to find some way of harmonizing the divergent positions. Indeed, he believed that the consequences of a failure could be disastrous to the influence of the spirit of prophecy writings. He urged his brothers: p. 56, Para. 6, [1919BIBL].

More posturing, trying to appear to protect the SOP, while at the same time destroying it in the creating of the counterfeit.

"Let us avoid taking such a position as to encourage men in urging upon their brethren personal views of the meaning of certain passages in the Testimonies in a way to cast censure and reproach upon their brethren who do not fully agree with them, and in a way that seems to obstruct the search for truth." p. 57, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

"If we fail to stand firmly for correct principles, we may soon be plunged into a condition of things wherein many earnest and radical minds will feel free to select a passage here and a passage there from the Testimonies, and without proper regard to the context and to the teaching of the Bible and other passages in the Testimonies, proceed to teach a mixture of truth and error that is unprofitable to the truth." p. 57, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

"Let us avoid giving sanction to any man, or group of men, who take a disputed passage in the Testimonies, and putting their view of what it means in the strongest possible light, say that "persons of influence in the denomination" who do not agree with them, "contend that it does not mean what it says," and that their view squarely contradicts the spirit of prophecy. Surely we can not give our approval to such methods of dealing with the Testimonies, and with the brethren." p. 57, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

Notice the “air time” given to the views that agree with the church’s position. It’s clear Bert has an agenda to work from.

White deeply regretted that O. A. Johnson, L. A. Smith, Haskell and Gilbert were engaged so actively in "promulgating the doctrine that confidence in the Testimonies must rise or fall, according to the belief of our brethren in the old or the new "view" of the "daily." [110] p. 57, Para. 4, [1919BIBL].

This paragraph tells the tale. Here is Willie’s true position. Something in Willie just hated the original Spirit of Prophecy. There had to have been some idol sin he was cherishing; something gave Satan all the foothold he needed, and Willie was his willing servant. **“Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey; whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness?”** Romans 6:16

White made several unsuccessful attempts to have a "brotherly meeting" to deal with the questions. He observed to J. S. Washburn that he believed God permitted such differences to occur to enable a more thorough investigation of truth, and that if such occurred "and if we treat our brethren in Christ's own way, we shall get great good where the enemy hoped to bring in bitterness and division." White, unfortunately, had to inform Stephen Haskell in late 1910: p. 57, Para. 5, [1919BIBL].

"To this, as to former appeals for our brethren to get together for study and prayer over this matter, there was no favorable response, and the controversy although less open than formerly, has gone steadily forward." [111] p. 57, Para. 6, [1919BIBL].

Not being acknowledged here, is the response of a like spirit of rebellion against a like spirit of rebellion. Willie would certainly deny this, as would church leadership, even today; but it is nevertheless true, for we have the evidence; first in the letter, Ellen Dreams of James, other things as well, and now, notably, this paper.

"One might inquire whether we still live in the shadow of the 'daily.'" p. 57, Para. 7, [1919BIBL].

No contest there! The church has left the strait and narrow path to the city, long ago. About the only work left, is to rescue the few honest in heart, the Rahabs, found trembling at the gates.

CONCLUSION p. 58, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

The drum of compromise is loud and long beat in these next few lines, but don't you believe it! "I have reserved to myself seven thousand men, who have not bowed the knee to the image of Baal." Romans 11:4

F. M. Wilcox enunciated a relevant truth in 1915. That truth had perhaps an even greater pertinence in 1928 when he again expressed it: p. 58, Para. 2, [1919BIBL].

Some in the church of God, today as in every age, are inclined to be too fast. Others are inclined to be too slow. God in his providence links the impulsive Peter with those who are more staid and conservative. In the providence of God there are found in the Seventh-day Adventist Church today these varying natures and elements.... God permits these various temperaments to be associated in order that each may learn from the other, that the lack of one may be supplied by the abundance of the other. [112] p. 58, Para. 3, [1919BIBL].

W. W. Prescott, whom many placed in the "too fast" category, observed at the Bible Conference: p. 58, Para. 4, [1919BIBL].

Truth and error lie right close, side by side,

He stated a truth. But like the counterfeit, truth comes first; it is the rejection of truth that takes us into error. Present Truth, pure and clean, from the throne of God, was a wall of light surrounding God's true church in the beginning of this faith. It is the rejection of that truth that caused the light of the Midnight Cry to go dark, the darkness of error.

and the reason why error comes up so near is to make us afraid of the truth. Now when error makes us afraid of the truth we back off from the truth and lose it. Now if we can have wisdom enough to have the full benefit of the truth and not swing off over into the error, we are in advance of our position. [113] p. 58, Para. 5, [1919BIBL].

Man's only hope is in cherishing the truth, the faith once delivered to the saints. It is the faith of the church of Philadelphia, not Laodicea, that will see us through; for Laodicea never opens the door.

The consequences of individuals searching for truth relative to the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy without the benefit of the perspectives of the denominational community might be seen in the cases of A. T. Jones, J. H. Kellogg, E. J. Waggoner, A. F. Ballenger, L. R. Conradi, W. A. Colcord, and others. It is tragically relevant that all those mentioned answered the basic question posed by C. L. Benson at the Bible Conference by deciding that the spirit of prophecy could be divided into "inspired" and "uninspired" portions. It seems relevant that, in most cases, those who began to make such determinations eventually lost confidence in the spirit of prophecy. It also seems relevant that the apostasies sprang from both viewpoints relative to the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy. p. 58, Para. 6, [1919BIBL].

Bert is here pleading the case of the church being the only one in the light of truth, but this is not right. There can only be one truth, one way to Heaven, one Lord, one Master. In spite of the fact that these men lived through and saw the beginning of the counterfeit, they had a duty to defend the original when deviation from

it, raised its ugly head. And only those who did defend the original as being what it was, God's communications to man, were in the right; no matter who or how many were on the many different sides.

Is it not possible that a fruitful dialogue between the two major positions could have answered the Benson question differently than did Jones and Conradi? The "pioneer position" urged that the writings could not be divided into "inspired" and "uninspired" sections, but seemed to have no real means of dealing with apparent discrepancies.

From our vantage point of the then, distant future, it seems Ellen should have been called to a public meeting, the discrepancies presented for her personal answer. **But, let us remember, No. 20, pages 42-49, God was clearly in the process of removing the original Testimonies from the GCSDA church; because they had rejected them.**

The "new view" position, with its emphasis upon context, offered a means of explaining those apparent discrepancies. Each side seemed to have additional concepts that could have been useful to the other. Sufficient opportunity for a dialogue seemed to be present. Such a dialogue might have refuted the dire prophecy made by J. S. Washburn in 1931: p. 58, Para. 7, [1919BIBL].

"I do not think the old guard will die now and I am sure it will never surrender, never cease to stand where it has stood for years in this message.... They may seem to be in the minority. They may seem to lack the official standing of those modernists who do not dare to go as far as L. R. Conradi -- that is openly and apparently -- and may even sign his condemnation papers, but in heart are far down the same road, and agree with his fundamentals, and are heading fast to his ultimate theological destination. Nevertheless the truth must win an eternal victory. Let the issue come, and the sooner the better. There is no compromise or modification or any possibility of fusion of these elements. Between them is an ever widening distance." [114] p. 59, Para. 1, [1919BIBL].

And how wide that distance is today. With each passing year, fewer and fewer are the voices willing to raise the alarm. We see the Shaking, documented in this paper. Every word of the 1858 Great Controversy, in the chapter titled "The Shaking," has, is and will be fulfilled to the very letter, for God is the author. Its view now spans 162 years and three months, and no part of it has fallen to the ground.

God's word lives. It is timeless. The 1885 Great Controversy is not an addition to the Bible; no, it points us to the correct understanding of the Bible, and an embracing of its light causes us to become rooted and grounded in the faith once delivered to the saints. God be praised.

Note: If you want the footnotes, download the article.