

THE TRUTH-concerning Mrs. E. G. White, Uriah Smith, and The King of The North.

LOUIS WERE

A Reply to Misleading Addresses.

The purpose of this booklet is not a criticism of a person but a vindication of truth.

CHAPTER ONE--MRS. E. G. WHITE AND THE KING OF THE NORTH

Did she rebuke Pastor James White for teaching that the Papacy is the King of the North?

Answer: Most certainly not. She certainly would not rebuke her husband or anyone else for teaching what she indicated she also believed. She was associated with Pastor James White in the early publication "A Word to the 'Little Flock'", in which was taught the belief that the king of the north (Dan. 11: 45) is the persecutor of the true church, the beast power of Rev. 13 (see pages 8, 9). What Mrs. E. G. White wrote in "The Great Controversy" also, as we will show, enables us to observe the application she made of the prophecy of Daniel eleven. In this prophecy we are given the characteristics and work of the king of the north. In verse 36 we read: "And *the king* shall do *according to his will*; and he shall exalt himself, and magnify himself above every god. Paul's application of this prophecy to the Papacy-see 2 Thess. 2: 3, 4-is well-known. The (General Conference) study group appointed by the Committee on Biblical Study and Research presented their "Report on the Eleventh Chapter of Daniel, With Particular Reference to Verses 36-39", in "The Ministry", March, 1954. Definitely the report states: "Therefore, from the foregoing, we conclude that verses 36-39 of Daniel I I accurately set forth in prophetic language the work and history of papal Rome."

In "The Great Controversy", p- 50, the Lord's messenger undoubtedly refers to Daniel 11: 36, saying: "This compromise between paganism and Christianity resulted in the development of the 'man of sin' foretold in prophecy as opposing and exalting himself above God. That gigantic system of false religion is a masterpiece of Satan's power-a monument of his efforts to seat himself upon the throne to rule the earth *according to his will*." Daniel declared that "*the king shall do according to his will*" that is, the king of the north, for "the king" as shown by the context is "the king of the north". The Study group referred to above, in its report concerning the subsequent verses in Daniel eleven, says: "Without doubt the Papacy, if it is the power of Daniel 11: 36-39, must also play a part in the historical fulfilment of these verses, for the pronoun 'him' in verse 40 must refer to the power brought to view in verses 36-39."

Thus "the king" of 36 is undoubtedly "the king of the north" mentioned in Dan. 11: 40-45. By applying v. 36 to the Papacy, Mrs. E. G. White disagreed with Uriah Smith's application of Dan. 11: 36 to the French Revolution.

CHAPTER TWO -MRS. E. G. WHITE AND URIAH SMITH

Here we should state that Uriah Smith in some of his other beliefs differed from Mrs. E. G. White's teachings. This becomes For instance apparent to anyone who compares their writings.

We refer to Uriah Smith's teaching concerning the Person and work of our Lord Jesus. We quote a statement made by Pastor W. E. Howell, Chairman of the "Daniel and the Revelation Revision Committee", reported in "The Ministry", May, 1945:"It is a matter of record that Uriah Smith once believed that Christ was a created being, see *Thoughts on the Revelation* (1865), p. 91. But later he revised his belief and teaching to the effect that Christ was begotten sometime back in eternity before the creation of the world. Since his day, later books of the Spirit of Prophecy, such as *Desire of Ages*, came out in the nineties and later on, making clear, with the support of the Scriptures, that Christ is co-eternal with the Father-

In his book, "*Looking Unto Jesus*", pp. 10-17, Foreword written in July, 1898, Uriah Smith again made statements indicating that the fullness of the truth taught in the Spirit of Prophecy concerning the eternity of Christ, had not been understood by him. He said:-*God alone is without beginning*. At the earliest epoch when a beginning could be-a period so remote that to finite minds it... is essentially eternity-appeared *the Word ...His beginning...*The son of God *appeared* . . . With the Son, *the evolution of deity*, as

deity, ceased *In point of existence* He was thus before them all. And then began creation, of which He was the 'beginner'." (Emphasis mine.)

Thus it may be seen that Uriah Smith had not understood the Spirit of Prophecy teaching concerning the eternity of Christ. For a fuller consideration of the vital theme of our Lord's unlimited Divinity and His inherent, underived, eternal life and infinite power, wisdom and right as the second Person of the Godhead, the reader is referred to "*The Woman and the resurrected Beast. The Mysteries of Revelation 17 solved*" (see advertisement on the back page of this pamphlet).

Briefly stated, the Spirit of Prophecy teaching on this most important revelation is as follows:-

"In Christ is life, *original*, unborrowed, underived. 'He that hath the Son hath life'. The divinity of Christ is the believer's assurance of eternal life" (DA. 530).

"Christ is the pre-existent, *self-existent* Son of God" (*Signs of the Times*, Aug. 29, 1900).

"With solemn dignity Jesus answered, 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I AM'. Silence fell upon the vast assembly. The name of God, given to Moses to express the idea of the eternal presence, had been claimed as His own by this Galilean rabbi. He had announced Himself to be *the self-existent* One, he Who had been promised to Israel, 'Whose goings forth have been from of old, from *the days of eternity*'" (DA. 469, 470).

When Jesus declared, "Before Abraham was I AM", He claimed more than pre-existence-He claimed self-subsistence. He claimed that His existence was neither derived nor attained. It was His by right. This is the meaning of the title "I AM"-*"the self-existent One"* (DA. 470). Thus Jesus unhesitatingly claimed to be the eternal, living God Whose existence was derived from no one. "From the days of *eternity* the Lord was one with the Father" (DA. 19). "He was equal with God" (2T. 200). "The Lord Jesus Christ, the divine Son of God, *existed from eternity*, a distinct person, yet one with the Father" (Rev. and Her. April 5, 1906). "In speaking of His pre-existence, Christ carries the mind back through the dateless ages. He assures, us that there *never was a time* when He was not in close fellowship with the Father" (*Signs of the Times*, Aug. 29, 1900).

In contrast to the quotations from the Spirit of Prophecy given above, observe Uriah Smith's notes on Rev. 1: 4 ("*Daniel and the Revelation*," edition 1891):

"From Him which is, and which was, and which is to come, or is to be-an expression which signifies complete eternity, past and future, and *can be applicable to God the Father only*. This language, we believe, is *never applied to Christ*." (Emphasis mine.)

In the light of what is taught in the Spirit of Prophecy, the revisers of "*Daniel and Revelation*" have naturally deleted from the revised book this declaration concerning the non-eternity of Christ. In his comments upon Rev. 1: 8, Uriah Smith's conception of the non-eternity of Christ caused him to apply these words *exclusively* to the Father. Rev. 1: 8 reads: "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty." Uriah Smith's comment is:

"Who is it who here speaks must be determined, therefore, by the terms used. Here we again have the expression, 'Which is, and which was, and which is to come, which has already been noticed as referring *exclusively* to God. But it may be asked, Does not the word Lord denote that it was Christ?"

In his endeavour to read this verse according to his conception of the non-eternity of Christ, he suggests that God might be substituted for the word Lord. However, the *revised* edition of "*Daniel and Revelation*" rightly deletes the old comments and applies v. 8, as it should be applied, to Christ. Thus we read: "In declaring who He is, He uses t o of the same characterizations,

'Alpha and Omega', 'the beginning and the ending', as are found in Revelation 22: 13, where according to verses 12 and 16 of that chapter, it is *plainly Christ* who is speaking. We conclude, then, that *it is Christ who is speaking in verse 8*." (Emphasis mine.)

CHAPTER THREE— THE SPIRIT OF PROPHECY AND URIAH SMITH'S EXPOSITIONS

The attitude of the Spirit of Prophecy toward Uriah Smith's expositions should be made clear. The most authoritative way to do this would seem to be that of quoting from a paper prepared by Arthur L. White, Secretary of the E. G. White Publications. He says: "Periodically, inquiry is made as to Mrs. E. G.

White's attitude toward *Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation*, some asking if somewhere she has stated or at least implied that it is an inspired book ...

"Nowhere in Mrs. White's writings, published or unpublished, do we find reference to an angel standing by the side of Uriah Smith while he wrote. And certainly we find no indication that Mrs. White ever considered *Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation* to be an inspired book, thus inerrant in all its expositions ...

"Even though she spoke commendably of the volume, there are statements penned by Mrs. White which have a negative bearing on the inspiration of *Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation*. Speaking, in the nineties, of Elder Smith's books, one of the leaders in our colporteur work asked Mrs. White, 'You believe they are inspired, do you not?' *Indicative of her recognition of the folly of the question*, she replied, 'You may answer that question, I shall not'-E. G. White Letter 15, 1895. At another time she was asked a similar question

"Sister White, do you think we must understand the truth for ourselves? Why can we not take the truths that others have gathered together and believe them because they have investigated the subjects, and then we shall be free to go on without taxing of the powers of the mind in the investigation of all these subjects? Do you not think that these men who have brought out the truth in the past were inspired of God?"

"(Answer) 'I dare not say they were not led of God, for Christ leads into all truth; but when it comes to inspiration in the fullest sense, I answer, No. I believe that God has given them a work to do, but if they are not fully consecrated to God at all times, *they will weave self* and their peculiar *traits of character into what they are doing, and will put their mold upon the work*.'"-E. G. White, *Review and Herald*, March 25, 1890. (Emphasis mine.)

(Unfortunately Uriah Smith, through introducing among us the teaching that Turkey is the king of the north, did place "his mold upon the work", and some today are so restricted by this "mold" that they find it difficult to move with the rest of God's people who have returned to the early denominational teaching that the Papacy is the king of the north.)

Arthur L. White, Secretary of the E. G. White Publications, continues:

"Two decades later, in writing regarding an interpretation of prophecy, given in *Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation*, over which there had arisen some controversy, Mrs. White spoke against 'magnifying the importance of the difference in the views held', and further said: 'In some of our important books that have been in print for years, and which have brought many to a knowledge of the truth, there may be found matters of minor importance that call for careful study and correction.'-E. G. White, Ms. 11, 1910.

"At another time she wrote: "There is no excuse for anyone in taking the position that there is no more truth to be revealed, and that all our expositions of Scripture are without error. The fact that certain doctrines have been held as truth for many years by our people, is not proof that our ideas are infallible. Age will not make error into truth, and truth can afford to be fair. No true doctrine will lose anything by close investigation.-*Review and Herald*, December 20, 1892 ...

"It was but natural that as time advanced, some points became more clear and some errors which had been embodied in his earlier work were seen. This led the author [Uriah Smith] from time to time to make a number of corrections and adjustments in his former statements. Of one such revision, W. C. White wrote in 1910: 'In 1886, 1887, and 1888 there was considerable controversy over some of the expositions in *Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation*. There was quite a group of men, including myself, who became convinced that there were some errors in this most excellent book that ought to be corrected. But finally a number of corrections were made, if I remember correctly, about thirty.'-W. C. White, *Letter to A. F. Harrison*, June 26, 1910. For reasons similar to the foregoing, *Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation* has recently undergone a most careful revision."

Uriah Smith's teaching on the Atonement (see "*Looking Unto Jesus*", p. 237) differed from Mrs. E. G. White's statements found in 6T. 354; E.W. 260.

CHAPTER FOUR--URIAH SMITH'S ATTITUDE TOWARD THE SPIRIT OF PROPHECY IN THE 1888 CRISIS

Uriah Smith was prominent in the opposition to the presentation of Righteousness by Faith by Elders Waggoner and Jones, men of whom the Spirit of Prophecy declared: "The Lord in His great mercy sent a most precious message to His people through Elders Waggoner and Jones . . . I would speak in warning to those who have stood for years resisting light and cherishing the spirit of opposition. How long will you hate and despise the messengers of God's righteousness? God has given them His message. They bear the word of the Lord . . . Light and power from on high have been shed abundantly in the midst of you. Here was evidence, that all might discern whom the L, recognized as His servants. But there are those who despised the men and the message they bore" (TM. 91-97).

"God has committed to His servants a message for this time; but this message does not in every particular coincide with the ideas of all the leading men, and some criticize the message and the messengers. They dare even to reject the words of reproof sent to them from God through His Holy Spirit. What reserve power has the Lord with which to reach those who have cast aside His warnings and reproofs, and have accredited the testimonies of the Spirit of God to no higher source than human wisdom" (TM. 465, 466).

Mrs. White herself, with all her respected experience and age, and conscious of her exalted position as special messenger of the Lord, felt it an honour to support the work of Brethren Jones and Waggoner during that period: 'I have traveled from place to place attending meetings where the message of the righteousness of Christ was preached. I considered it a privilege to stand by the side of the brethren and give my testimony with the message for the time' " (R. and H., March 18, 1890)-"1888 *Re-examined*."

Uriah Smith's incomplete knowledge of the theme of righteousness by faith caused him at that time to be heedless of the definite stand taken by Mrs. E. G. White in supporting Waggoner and Jones in their presentation of this vital Christian teaching, and by his opposition he showed that he, and others, accredited the testimonies of the Spirit of God to no higher source than human wisdom".

In an editorial (R.&H.) published May 10, 1892, Uriah Smith "takes issue" with the teachings of Jones and Waggoner (and Mrs. E. G. White). His editorial was entitled "*A Wretched Christian*". He enquires: "in what condition was the apostle when he penned these words? Was this his condition of mind all through his Christian life, or was this only one feature of a condition in which he found himself while passing by the process of conversion from a state of bondage to sin to a state of liberty in Christ Jesus?" He then continues:

"We raise these queries because there are some who do not think that the apostle in the seventh of Romans was describing his own conversion and picturing a condition which when he had reached the advanced state of Christian attainment, was with him *a past experience*; but that he is here setting forth the usual experience of the believer all *his life*, until his Christian course is ended . . . With such a view we take issue."

That Uriah Smith's exposition of the seventh of Romans as a past Christian experience differed from Mrs. E. G. White's teaching that Romans 7 becomes more meaningful as life continues, may be seen from the following quotation. The Lord's inspired messenger declares:

"At every step in Christian experience our repentance will deepen. It is to those whom the Lord has forgiven, to those whom He acknowledges as His people, that He says: 'Then shall ye remember your own evil ways, and your doings that were not good, and shall loathe yourselves in your own sight' (Ezek. 36: 31)...Then our lips will not be opened in self-glorification. We shall know that our sufficiency is in Christ alone. We shall make the apostle's confession our own, 'I know that in me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing' (Rom. 7: 18)."-C.O.L. 160, 161.

"Sanctification is not the work of a moment, an hour, a day, but of *a lifetime* the result of *constantly dying to sin*, and constantly living for Christ . . . *a continual*, earnest, heart-breaking confession of sin and humbling of the heart before Him. *At every advance step* in our Christian experience, our repentance will deepen. We shall know that our sufficiency is in Christ alone, and shall make the apostle's confession our own 'I know that in me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing' (Rom. 7: 18) (A.A. 560, 561).

Uriah Smith, in the editorial referred to above, proceeded to state his view which was in direct opposition to the very heart of the message of Jones and Waggoner concerning daily crucifixion of self. He wrote:

"Paul is describing a condition through which he passed in conversion, and which was with him when he had reached the liberty of the Gospel, an experience past and gone, and which need never be repeated ... The old man does not lie down and die a voluntary death. He struggles hard and dies with many a convulsion . . . The Christian . . . is not always to be in the deplorable conflict described in Chapter 7 . . . Let no man say, therefore, that Paul does not describe a higher state of Christian attainment in Rom. 8 than he does in Rom. 7, and that that which is described in Chapter 7 was not to him, after he had reached the condition of Chapter 8 a *past* experience."

Thus was the Editor of the *Review* (Uriah Smith) ready to show in just what way "he differed" with Pastors Jones and Waggoner at the time Mrs. E. G. White wrote him a letter in a tone of warning and counsel, saying:

"Some of our brethren . . . are full of jealousy and evil surmising and are ever ready to show in just what way they differ with Elders Jones and Waggoner. The same spirit that was manifested in the past manifests itself on every opportunity; but this is not from the impulse of the Spirit of God . . . The message given us by A. T. Jones and E. J. Waggoner is the message of God to the Laodicean church, and woe be unto any who professes to believe the truth, and yet does not reflect to others the God-given rays" (Ms. 24, 1892).

This letter was an oblique rebuke to Uriah Smith for taking positions in his paper that were III disguised thrusts at the teaching of Jones and Waggoner. Mrs. White plainly declared her belief that the latter had a much clearer idea of things than had Uriah Smith.

CHAPTER FIVE-- RIGHTEOUSNESS BY FAITH, AND THE FINAL CONFLICT

Two very important themes are inseparable: righteousness by faith and the final conflict. A right understanding of the former enables one to understand the Scriptures describing the latter. The Lord's servant couples these two themes as inseparables, saying:- "Clad in the armor of Christ's righteousness, the church is to enter upon her final conflict" (PK. 725).

"...they were clothed with an armor from their head to their feet. They moved in exact order, like a company of soldiers . . . I heard those clothed with the armor speak forth the truth with great power . . . Great power was with these chosen ones. Said the angel, 'Look ye!' My attention was turned to the wicked, or unbelievers. They were all astir. The zeal and power with the people of God had aroused them . . . I saw measures taken against the company who had the light and power of God . . . I heard them crying unto God . . . Deliver us from the heathen [nations] around us'" (EW. 271, 272).

In the Spirit of Prophecy, the final conflict is always between the powers of earth and God's people who through faith are clad in the armour of Christ's righteousness".

Uriah Smith's teachings concerning Armageddon (the military, Palestinian interpretation), the final conflict, differed from the clear teachings of the Spirit of Prophecy that "the Sabbath question [the "Sign" of righteousness] is to be *the issue* [not Turkey, etc.] in the great final conflict in which all the world will act a part" (6T. 352). In R. and H. May 13, 1902; G.C. pp. 562, 582, 623, 656, 640; 6T. 410; TM. 465, etc., the Lord's servant quotes or refers to Rev. 16: 14.-16 and makes it definitely clear that "the final conflict" will be between the forces of good and evil over loyalty to the Commandments of God. Those who have learned from experience the teaching of righteousness by faith- how to obtain power from our Lord Jesus, the power-imparting King-priest-will be attacked by those who have not been freed from the tyranny of the prince of darkness. It is this conflict which all last-day prophecies depict-not a military conflict associated with the ending of Turkey or nations adjacent to the Euphrates.

Uriah Smith's failure to grasp the full significance of righteousness imparted and received by faith (by a constant dying to self and a continual looking unto Jesus, by daily self-crucifixion and daily resurrection through the power imparted by our High Priest) caused him to misunderstand the prophecies depicting "the final conflict", And all will suffer from a similar blindness who continue along the same lines of thought as did Uriah Smith, understanding fully either righteousness imparted by faith or the final conflict. *The secret of the understanding of these themes is inherent in the prophecies depicting the final*

conflict. By the false, military interpretation, Satan prevents those who are thus led from understanding these two very important themes.

Significantly, the Lord's messenger refers to Rev. 16: 14 in TM. 465 (compare especially with Weymouth's trans.) in a testimony in which the opposition to the teaching of righteousness by faith is also mentioned. She wrote: "The true religion . . . that advocates righteousness by the faith of the Son of God, has been slighted, spoken against, ridiculed, and rejected . . . When we are united in the unity for which Christ prayed, this long controversy that has been kept up through satanic agency will end, and we shall not see men framing plans after the order of the world because they have not spiritual eyesight to discern spiritual things . . . I know that a work must be done for our people, or many will not be prepared to receive the light of the angel sent down from heaven to Lighten the whole earth with his glory" (TM. 468).

"The prejudices and opinions that prevailed at Minneapolis [1888 conference when Jones and Waggoner presented their teachings on righteousness by faith] are not dead by any means; the seeds sown there in some hearts are ready to spring into life and bear a like harvest" (TM. 467).

It is in this testimony that the Lord's messenger referred to the Revelator's description of the final conflict, saying: "The enmity of Satan against good, will be manifested more and more, as he brings his forces into activity in his last work of *rebellion*; and every soul that is not fully surrendered to God, and kept by divine power, will form an alliance with Satan against heaven, and join in *battle against the Ruler of the universe*" (TM. 465).

Thus the Spirit of Prophecy's application of the battle described in Rev. 16: 14-16 to the spiritual conflict is clear and decisive, and conclusively shows (as in all other statements referring to this final conflict *where the same unwavering teaching is found*) that by this presentation Uriah Smith's ideas-concerning Turkey and a military battle-on this subject are completely ruled out.

As taught in this extract, the Lord's messenger declares that the conflict described in Rev. 16: 14 concerns "*every soul*" (an individual, spiritual matter), that we are either on the side of Satan's "rebellion" joining "in battle against the Ruler of the Universe" or "fully surrendered to God" and kept by divine power". That is, either "clad in the armor of Christ's righteousness", or we are in the ranks of Satan's "rebellion" joining "in battle against the Ruler of the Universe".

We have to choose between the Spirit of Prophecy teaching on the final conflict and be "clad in the armor of Christ's righteousness", or accept Uriah Smith's presentation of the final conflict and fail to understand fully the teachings of righteousness by faith.

Though the Lord's servant thus plainly taught the truth and in so doing made apparent to the studious reader where she differed from Uriah Smith, yet she did not attack Uriah Smith's presentation or draw attention to the fact that these errors were being taught by Uriah Smith. It is, therefore, unwise and incorrect to deduct from the fact that Mrs. E. G. White did not openly attack Uriah Smith's errors that this indicated her approval of them.

Sister White did all possible to encourage Uriah Smith and especially when he wrote anything worthy of commendation. Some have taken- these comments of encouragement as an overall endorsement of everything he wrote and did. But surely the fact that so many alterations have been necessary when revising *Daniel and the Revelation* to bring it into harmony with the Spirit of Prophecy and for other reasons should convince all of the possibility of other mistakes. The Lord's messenger repeatedly declared that clearer, fuller light would come to the people of God out of the books of Daniel and Revelation. For instance, observe the following statements: "*When we as a people understand what this book [Revelation] means to us, there will be seen among us a great revival.*"

We do not understand fully the lessons that it teaches notwithstanding the injunction given us to search and study it ... *When the books of Daniel and Revelation are better understood, believers will have an entirely different religious experience* (TM. 113, 114).

Though Uriah Smith's books on *Daniel and the Revelation* were widely known yet the Lord's servant declared that we had not understood fully the lessons that they teach; further, she declared that there would come a time *when* these books would be better understood. And she explained what important feature would be brought to light as the result of this better understanding of these books. She wrote: "One thing will certainly be understood from the study of Revelation-that *the connection between God and His people is close and decided*" (TM. 114).

This important and thrilling knowledge for God's -people to experience from the better understanding of the books of Daniel and Revelation comes when one understands the truth on such subjects as the king of the north (being the Papal-led forces-the enemies of God's people in the final conflict) and Armageddon the battle in which God intervenes to save His people from destruction at the hands of their enemies. It is this knowledge that reveals the closeness of God's presence to save His people, and this comforting truth is discerned when one turns from Uriah Smith's teaching that Turkey is the king of the north.

CHAPTER SIX-- MRS. E. G. WHITE WROTE A NUMBER OF TESTIMONIES CONCERNING URIAH SMITH

Though Mrs. E. G. White did not expose the fallacies of some of Uriah Smith's teachings, she did faithfully warn him on a number of occasions that he was going contrary to the Leading of the Spirit of God. The "Important Testimony", presented in Vol. 5, pp. 45-62, is addressed to "Dear Brother Smith", and there she plainly states: "I am pained to find you, my much esteemed brother, involved in this matter, on the wrong side, with those whom I know God is not leading." (Emphasis mine.)

In "*The Testimonies Slighted*" (5T. 62-84) the Lord's messenger wrote: "I understand that the testimony [footnote: Reference is here made to the preceding article] which I sent to Brother Smith, with the request that it be read to the church, was withheld from you for several weeks after it was received by him."

It would weary the reader were we to quote all the testimonies that the Lord's messenger wrote concerning Uriah Smith. She had a deep burden for him, and sought to win him for the eternal kingdom. She taught the truth concerning those things wherein she differed from Uriah Smith but was careful not to make any thrusts at his viewpoints, though she wrote very plainly of Uriah Smith's wrong attitude at various times. She wrote:

"After I wrote you the long letter which has been belittled by Elder Smith as merely an expression of my opinion, while at the southern California camp-meeting ... Had Elder Smith, and those united with him, been standing in the light, they would have recognized the voice of warning and reproof; but he calls it a human work, and casts it aside. The work he is doing he will wish undone ere long. He is weaving a net around himself that he cannot easily break. This is not my opinion" (*Testimonies for the Battle Creek Church*, 1882).

"I am sorry that Elder Smith . . . is for some unexplainable reason found on the side of the accuser . . . I cannot say to Brother Smith, God speed you in this work, for it is wrong. He must meet its results hereafter. His position of trust and his long experience, render him more accountable for this state of things than any other one in the church. Had he been right, he could have prevented the disgrace and the sin. Brother Smith, the stand which you have taken in this case proves you responsible for all your past neglect of duty in the church and in the office. You have shown that you can be firm, decided, and severe, even when it is uncalled for ... You have encouraged in the students a spirit of criticism, which God's spirit has sought to repress Yet your influence encouraged ingratitude, and has led students to despise the things that they should cherish" (id).

"Knowing that you were involving yourselves in the snares of Satan, I felt that the danger was too great for me to keep silent. Hence I wrote to you as I did; but Elder Smith felt at liberty to withhold the testimony from the church for weeks. If God was leading him and those who united with him and counseled him in this act, He was not leading me; the burden which moved me to write was a false burden, imposed by another spirit. Further than this, Elder Smith questioned the propriety of bringing the testimony before the church at all. Thus he takes the responsibility of standing between God's word of reproof and the people . . . But . . . was it the prerogative of Elder Smith, or of those whom he took into his counsel, to even question the matter? Shall he sit in judgment upon my work or on my letters of warning to the church? This man, who has long avoided disagreeable responsibilities; who has let matters drift whichever way they were disposed to go, rather than brace himself for duty, and with moral courage reprove and rebuke wrong; who shunned so many duties belonging to him in his position of trust-has now ventured to act in a new character, and to assume responsibilities which God hath not given him. He has placed himself and his influence in direct opposition to my work . . .

"Oct. 23, 1879, the Lord gave me a most impressive testimony in regard to the church in Battle Creek, especially in reference to Eld. Smith. Now he is found, firm, persistent, stubborn, on the wrong side. He is not led by the Spirit of God in his decisions. The Lord has laid no such burden upon him. Human influences have molded his judgment" (id. 42, 43).

"In rejecting this testimony, Eld. Smith, you have virtually rejected all the testimonies. You must know this is the case. This testimony bears the same evidence of its character that all others have borne for the last thirty-six years. But it condemns certain wrongs which you have committed, and which God condemns. The reason why you cannot see it, is because you have been cherishing feelings wholly opposed to the Spirit of God. Your actions stand registered in the books of heaven.

"Elder Smith, I was more grieved than I can express to find you again working on the side of the enemy. You pronounce my work human, and not actuated by the Spirit of God. On this point you have had great light; for this you are responsible . . . In this long letter I spoke of many facts which I distinctly stated that I had been shown. I wrote you, saying that I had seen what course you would pursue, to what length you would go, unless you heeded the light which God sent you in reproofs, in counsel, and warnings. Will you do despite to the Spirit of grace?" (id. pp. 46, 47).

We quote from R. J. Hammond's *"The Life and Work of Uriah Smith"* (thesis, 1944, SDA Theological Seminary), pp. 112, 113:

"Among the older ministers who opposed Mrs. White in this reformation (of 1888) was Uriah Smith, and one of the hardest trials that ever came to Smith resulted from his opposition on the issue fought out at that time. Not only during- this meeting but afterwards, he was out of harmony with the counsel Mrs. White had given on this subject . . . He probably did not realize it, but he had been warned of the potential danger of unbelief as far back as 1871 (Testimony to the Church at Battle Creek, 1872). At times he found it hard to yield his opinions. Notwithstanding the testimony of rebuke in 1882 which censured him while it upheld the work of Professor Bell, Elder Smith had been slow to reconcile himself to the testimony . . . That had not been pleasant. But that was not all. Mrs. White found it necessary to rebuke him for his stand at the Minneapolis Conference. Evidently his reaction was unfavorable, and she saw that he had drifted further than he realized. She sensed the dangerous course he had taken and was considerably burdened for him. On Oct. 1, 1890, she wrote a letter to Elder O. A. Olsen . . . declaring that 'Brother Smith is ensnared by the enemy and cannot in his present state give the trumpet a certain sound . . . the displeasure of God is upon them both (Smith and Butler), yet Elder Smith is placed in position as teacher to mold and fashion the minds of the students, when it is a well known fact he is not standing in the light. He is not working in God's order. He is sowing seeds of unbelief that spring up and bear fruit for some souls to harvest . . . Elder Smith will not receive the light God has given to correct (him), and he has not a spirit to correct by confession any wrong course he has pursued in the past. I hear everywhere I go, objections to the testimonies quoting Elders Smith and Butler. They do not believe the testimonies. They do not accept that which Sister White has had in reproof in their course . . . I have been shown that as he stands, Satan has prepared his temptations to close about his soul . . .'"

One of our American ministers has written a richly documented survey of the presentation of the theme of righteousness by faith by Pastors Jones and Waggoner at and subsequent to the Minneapolis Conference of 1888. This survey, entitled "1888 Re-examined", constructively presents the circumstances of those times and names those persons who figured prominently in opposing the 1888 message. From it we quote the following statements:

"The Testimony of Our History"

"It is common knowledge that Elder Uriah Smith was one of the most persistent opposers of the 1888 message. In his position as editor of the *Review and Herald* and with his well earned prestige as a prominent author, he was able to exert perhaps the most powerful influence of any of the leading workers for or against the message. Did we but know, 'what might have been', we would see what God could have done with the author of *Thoughts on Daniel and Revelation* had his heart and keen mind joined in the work to which Jones and Waggoner were called . . . The able and lovable brother wielded the mightiest pen in Battle Creek and could have aided in the work of enlightening this earth with the heavenly glory and maturely developed truth. He chose not to. He considered the gracious message to be merely an over emphasized 'doctrine', and maintained that we had always believed it. Mrs. White's efforts to help him only aggravated his stubbornness and he tried to clear himself by sitting on a spiritual fence, which in truth did not exist. He that was not for the message of Christ's Righteousness was against it. No 'sober

reflection' brought him to any different view. Two whole years is a long time for a man to stubbornly maintain an attitude of unbelief when that man occupied a place with every possible advantage above all that dwelt upon the earth to see the heavenly light clearly; and when the light to be seen was the brightest light the world had ever beheld. In March, 1890, Mrs. White wrote: 'You could not make the people of South Lancaster believe that it was not a message of light that came to them ... I have tried to present the message to you as I have understood it, but how will those at the head of the work keep themselves aloof? . . . For nearly two years we have been urging people to come up and accept the light and the truth concerning the Righteousness of Christ, and they do not know whether to come and take hold of this precious truth or not ... I can speak to the ear, but I cannot speak to the heart. Shall we not arise and get out of the position of unbelief' (*Rev. and Her.*, March 18, 1890).

"Finally, after being 'under obligation to believe' (TM. 466), Elder Smith was drifting helplessly into a derelict condition of darkness of soul and was in danger of becoming lost: 'Brother Smith is ensnared by the enemy and cannot in his present state give the trumpet a certain sound . . . yet ... is placed in position as teacher to mould and fashion the minds of the students when it is a well known fact he is not standing in the light. He is not working in God's order. He is sowing seeds of unbelief that spring up and bear fruit for some souls to harvest . . . Elder Smith will not receive the light God has given to correct him, and he has not a spirit to correct by confession any wrong course he has pursued in the past ... I have been shown that as he now stands, Satan has prepared his temptations to close about his soul'. (*E. G. White, letter to O. A. Olsen, Oct. 7, 1890*).

"Whether the following words were spoken or not, his condition was accurately described: 'My mind is troubled continually I have great sorrow of heart. I know that Satan is seeking for the mastery over men. Such men as Elder . . . will harden their hearts lest they shall see and be converted. There are those who are looking to Elder ... thinking that a man who has been given such great light will be able to see when good cometh, and will acknowledge the truth. But I have been shown that in Elder ...'s character there is pride and stubbornness that has never been fully brought into subjection to the Spirit of God. Again and again his religious experience has been marred by his determination not to confess his wrongs, but to pass along and forget them. Men may cherish this sin until there is no forgiveness for them' (*E. G. White, Diary 10, 1890, Battle Creek*).

"Certainly the following words fit the unfortunate case of *the Review* editor: 'There are many, many who are mere spectators ... Why do they not rise and shine, because their light has come, and the glory of the Lord has risen upon them? . . . Men may have talent and education, but of what avail is this if the love of God does not abide in their hearts . . . They will be false guides . . . If your brethren have a knowledge of your errors, if your position has given wideness to your influence, it is all the more necessary that you make a full confession' (*Ibid*, Feb. 3, 4).

"Alas, that love of *self* should fasten a man in such a place! The longer stubbornness is indulged the bigger and more powerful self becomes, and more difficult to bring to the cross. We should pity Elder Smith, but we ought not to pity ourselves! Finally, after the turn of the New Year, 1891, he made confession to his brethren, and asked the pardon of Mrs. White for his erroneous course' (*R. J. Hammond, The Life and Work of Uriah Smith*, p. 113, SDA. Theological Seminary Thesis').

"Elder Smith had formerly had several experiences quite similar. In the Spring of 1873 after a disagreement with James White he had left the Review office to go into private business for himself as a wood engraver. After the subsequent reconciliation, he 'made some very impressive remarks, proposing that the pen, the ink-stand, and the paper to which they had attached their names, should be laid up together as a memorial before God' (*Spec. Testimonies to Review and Herald Office*, pp. 16, 17). His faith in the work of Mrs. White was not what it ought to have been. Perhaps only the final judgment will reveal how much of a baneful influence his unbelief had been in encouraging D. M. Canright to go into apostasy. (See R. J. Hammond op. cit. pp. 112, 113) . . . Was Elder Smith's repentance of early 1891 thorough and permanent? Mrs. White hoped so, and it could well have been. The Lord was willing: Speaking to the Review and Herald Office, Mrs. White said: 'The Lord will blot out the transgressions of those who since that time have repented with a sincere repentance (Then adds that if that spirit should ever awaken again, those individuals whose repentance was thus insincere or temporary would have to answer before the judgment). But by 1893 something had miscarried, spiritually: N. F. Pease remarks in his thesis: 'It will be recalled that several leaders made definite confessions early in 1891. During. 1893 a letter was written by Mrs. White indicating that one of these very men was still maintaining an attitude contrary to the spirit of the revival movement' (*N. F. Pease, op cit.*).

"Speaking in 1901 Mrs. White intimated that there had been an influence in the Review and Herald Office that tended to say 'I go sir', but went not: 'The brethren assented to the light that God had given but there were those connected with our institutions, especially the *Review and Herald* Office, and the conference, who brought in elements of unbelief, so that the light given was not acted upon' (Gen. Conf. Bulletin, 1901, p. 23).

After his confession, Mrs. White had a burden to encourage him to look upon things in the right light. She sensed his trouble and knew he was not giving the trumpet a certain sound in the *Review and Herald*. More than a year after his I confessions', she wrote him in a tone of warning and counsel ...

"Repeatedly the misguided brother notably followed a Line of thought diametrically opposed to the present truth, that of Christ's righteousness sounding forth in- the beginning of the Loud Cry. Dramatically enough, his opposition was' sometimes neatly met by articles by Sister White or others, which came as apparent coincidences. We find him writing in the *Review* in May 18, 1892, giving the trumpet a very uncertain sound. Over twenty-four times in the space of a brief editorial we read him emphasizing the thought that the church must not be disturbed about present excitement, the 'Loud Cry' is yet future...

"Only one week later appeared an article by Mrs. White, again with the burden of Minneapolis and its improper reception, entitled, '*The Work o God to Believe on Christ*'. This article met the spirit of Elder Smith's muddled editorial. A few months later, she wrote from Australia: 'The Loud Cry of the third angel *has already begun* in the revelation of the righteousness of Christ, the sin-pardoning Redeemer. This is the beginning of the light of the angel whose glory shall fill the whole earth' (R. and H., Nov. 22, 1892).

"It was concerning like blindness to recognize the work of God, that Mrs. White wrote: 'May the Lord forgive our brethren for thus interpreting the very message for this time . . . Too often the leader has stood hesitating, seeming to say: "Let us not be in too great haste, there may be a mistake" Thus he virtually denies the messages sent from God; and the warning which was designed to stir the churches, falls to do its work. The trumpet of the watchmen gives no certain sound, and the people do not prepare for the battle' (5T. 715, 716).

"Such an editorial policy, and such a set of mind and heart, forces the unwelcome conclusion that Elder Smith returned to his spirit of stubborn Opposition and non-committal blindness after the emotional effects of his confessions were overcome ...

"Unpleasant as in this recital of stubborn opposition to the Spirit of Prophecy statements, one more phase of Elder Smith's failure to walk in the light after this confession must be noted...

Enough has been presented to enable the reader to discern the folly of clinging to some interpretation of prophecy propounded by Uriah Smith which differs from the Spirit of Prophecy. Unless wholly under the leadership of the Holy Spirit, we will all misinterpret the Bible; and at times, as we have shown, Uriah Smith walked contrary to the light given through Spirit of Prophecy. his presentation that Turkey is the king of the north (Dan. II) and that, Armageddon refers to a military battle in Palestine is a part of the Jesuit-fostered system of interpretation-the counterfeit of the Spirit of Prophecy teaching concerning "the final conflict".

Uriah Smith did valuable work in completing the *Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation*, and credit should be given where it is due. But it is unwise to cling tenaciously, blindly, to ideas in a book in which so many corrections and revisions have had to be made to harmonize with the Scriptures and with the Spirit of Prophecy. Many pages of the original book written concerning Turkey have since been shown to be completely wrong.

The most wonderful teaching that our Lord Jesus is preciously near to the Christian in his struggles with the powers of darkness, giving him victory now and in the final conflict, is hidden from those who believe that Turkey is the king of the north and that Armageddon (Rev. 16: 12-16) refers to a military war. It is beyond the scope of this booklet to enlarge upon this vital fact. This most important truth God has placed in these last-day prophecies, but such especially-imparted revelations are rendered meaningless when these prophecies are interpreted in connection with military wars associated with the ending of Turkey!

In the light of the foregoing it is sad to see today, when so much light shines upon the interpretation of last-day prophecies, including the king of the north, some in the work who still follow the teaching of Uriah Smith regarding the king of the north even though now it is known that it was he who led

away from the belief of the Pioneers of our Movement and our early denominational teaching that the Papacy is the king of the north.

Uriah Smith, having changed his view of the king of the north from that of Rome to Turkey by 1871, was confirmed in his newer belief at the time of the 1888 crisis concerning the theme of righteousness by faith. His belief obviously did not provide him with the spiritual discernment and strength- to discern and receive the message the Lord sent His people at that time. The worldly interpretation he espoused would blind him to the full import of the message of righteousness by faith, and it would foster the spirit of human pride and stubbornness he manifested during those testing times. It is significant that in October 7, 1890, God's inspired servant wrote:

"Brother Smith is ensnared by the enemy and cannot in his present state give the trumpet a certain sound . . . it is a well known fact he is not standing in the light ... He is sowing seeds of unbelief . . . Elder Smith will not receive the light God has given him to correct him and he has not a spirit to correct by confession any wrong course he has pursued in the past . . . I have been shown that as he now stands Satan has prepared his temptations to close about his soul" (*E. G. White, Letter to O. A. Olsen, Oct. 7, 1890*).

Less than a month later ("November 3, 1890"-date given in T.M. 460), the Lord's messenger was given a vision which is presented in Test. to Min. pp. 460-471, in the Testimony entitled: "*Danger in Adopting Worldly Policy in the Work of God*". In this Testimony two things are coupled together: righteousness by faith and the final conflict. The opposition to the presentation of righteousness by faith (in which Uriah Smith took a leading part-"the virtual leader of the opposition"-1888 Reexamined") is coupled with the opposition some will exert against the proclamation of that same message in the Loud Cry. That is, some in the final scenes will exert their talents and influence against the message to be proclaimed in the Loud Cry as Uriah Smith and others did against the message of righteousness by faith presented in 1888.

Observe how these two crises-the past and the future-in our work are mentioned on the same page (TM. 468): "The true religion...that advocates righteousness by the faith of the Son of God, has been slighted, spoken against, ridiculed, and rejected ... I know that a work must be done for the people, or many will not be prepared to receive the light of the angel sent down from heaven to enlighten the whole earth With his glory."

That same year the Lord's inspired messenger wrote: "The third angel's Message will not be comprehended, the light which will lighten the earth with its glory *will be called false light*, by those who refuse to walk in its advancing glory" (*Rev. and Her., May 27, 1890*).

Later, she again foretold the opposition that will come to the Loud Cry by those stubbornly refusing to walk in the increasing light. She wrote: "There is to be in the churches a wonderful manifestation of the power of God, but it will not move upon those who have not humbled themselves before the Lord, and -opened the door of their hearts by confession and repentance. In the manifestation of that power which lightens the earth with the glory of God they will see something which will arouse their fears, and they will *brace themselves to resist It*. Because the Lord does not work according to their expectations and ideas *They will oppose the work*. 'Why,' they say, 'should we not know the Spirit of God when we have been in the work for so many years?'" (*Bible Training School, May, 1907*).

The future crisis will be a test just as the crisis of 1888 was a test. The Spirit of Prophecy declares: "The time of test is just upon us, for the Loud Cry of the third angel has already begun in the revelation of the righteousness of Christ, the sin-pardoning Redeemer. This is the beginning of the light of the angel whose glory shall fill the whole earth" (*Rev. and Her., Nov. 22, 1892*).

We refer again to the Testimony of "November 3, 1890" (TM. 460-471) in which the opposition manifested to the presentation of righteousness by faith in 1888 is coupled with opposition to be given to that same message in the Loud Cry. *It is in this connection that the Lord's servant explains that the "battle against the Ruler of the universe"-which is undoubtedly referring to Rev. 16: 14, see Weymouth's Translation-is one which concerns "every soul": we are either with Satan in his "rebellion", or "fully surrendered to God and kept by divine power" (TM. 465).*

"Mrs. White did not hesitate to apply the word rebellion to the attitude of the opposing brethren after Minneapolis (R. and H., June 21, 1890), and likened their attitude to the rebellion of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram: 'Men who are entrusted with weighty responsibilities, but who have no living connection with God have been and are doing despite to His Holy Spirit. They are indulging the very same spirit as did Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, and as did the Jews in the days of Christ . . . if God spares their lives, and they

nourish the same spirit that marked their course of action both before and after the Minneapolis meeting, they will fill up to the full the deeds of those whom Christ condemned when He was upon the earth ... They began this satanic work at Minneapolis" (TM. 78-80).-"1888 Reexamined."

"On many occasions the Holy Spirit did work; but those who, resisted the Spirit of God at Minneapolis were waiting to travel over the same ground again and again ... They stood like a rock; the waves of mercy were flowing upon and around them, but were beaten back by their hard and wicked hearts, which resisted the Holy Spirit's working" (Spec. Test. Series A, No. 6, 20).

The Spirit of Prophecy significantly, in TM. 465-468, I coupled the true interpretation -the non-military or spiritual application-of the Revelator's description of the final conflict in Rev. 16: 14 with the rebellion manifested in connection with the presentation of the teaching of righteousness by faith in 1888 and the same rebellion to be repeated in the time of the Loud Cry. And the present writer (basing his judgment upon much data) is firmly of the opinion that that opposition to the message of righteousness by faith to be proclaimed in the Loud Cry, will come from those who will refuse to accept the truth concerning the final conflict as taught in the Spirit of Prophecy, namely, a battle in which "every soul" must be "fully surrendered to God, and kept by divine power" or "form an alliance with Satan against heaven, and join in battle against the Ruler of the universe They will stubbornly follow Uriah Smith's teaching concerning Turkey being the king of the north and Armageddon a battle between the nations, and "will brace themselves to resist" the spread of the true light, and "will oppose the work", as. declared by the Spirit of Prophecy.

The reader who has followed us this far, may desire to study further concerning the real essence of the teaching of righteousness by faith that occasioned such hostility in 1888 and which hostility is prophesied to recur when that same theme looms large in the Loud Cry. Surely there must be far more to it than some mere slight difference of opinion.

Pastor A. G. Daniells, writing of the message of righteousness by faith presented at the Minneapolis Conference (1888), says: "The message was not received alike by all who attended the Conference; in fact, there was serious differences of opinion concerning it among the leaders. How sad, how deeply regrettable, it is that this message of righteousness in Christ should, at the time of its coming, have met with opposition on the part of earnest, well-meaning men in the cause of God!" (*Christ Our Righteousness*, pp. 56, 63).

The Spirit of Prophecy declares: "There is not one in one hundred who understands for himself the Bible truth on this subject that is so necessary to our present and eternal welfare" (R. and H., Sept. 3, 1889).

It is the present writer's burden to write a book dealing more fully with the essence of righteousness by faith as taught in the Bible and in the Spirit of Prophecy, but he lacks the finance to print it. Should the reader desire to help further the publication of this proposed book, donations would be gratefully received for that purpose.

CHAPTER SEVEN - URIAH SMITH, AFTER SIXTEEN YEARS TEACHING THE PIONEERS' BELIEF-THE PAPAL KING OF THE NORTH-CHANGED TO TURKEY

In "*A Word to the 'Little Flock'*", the old Pioneers' belief, including that of Mrs. White's, is expressed: "Michael is to stand up at the time that the last power in Chap. 11 comes to his end, and none to help him. This power is the last that treads down the true church of God: and as the true church is still trodden and cast out by Christendom, it follows that the last oppressive power has not 'come to his end'; and Michael has not stood up. This last power that treads down the saints is brought to view in Rev. 13: 11-18. His number is 666."

The Seventh-day Adventist denomination unanimously held for "the first third of the century since 1844" the belief that the Papacy was the king of the north.

Dr. Leroy E. Froom, in "*The Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers*", p. 11 16, says: "For the first sixteen years of his editorial connection with the *Review*, Uriah Smith held this power [Dan. 11: 45] to be the Papacy ... But in 1871, in his 'Thoughts on Daniel' articles, he changed his view to that of Turkey."

In his paper "*The Pioneers on Daniel Eleven and Armageddon*", Pastor Raymond F. Cottrell says:

"James White in the *Review* of November 29, 1877, some years after Uriah Smith had shifted from his own original position, substituting Turkey for Rome ... wrote advising caution in the interpretation of unfulfilled prophecy and found Uriah Smith 'removing the landmarks fully established in the Advent Movement'. This article leaves no doubt that the position making Rome the power of Daniel 11: 45 and Revelation 16: 12 had been 'fully established' as a 'landmark' in the Advent Movement prior to that time, and that it was held by the pioneers of this message, without exception, from the days of William Miller down to at least 1863."

CHAPTER EIGHT-A MODERN PREACHER MISREPRESENTS THE FACTS

The above facts show how impossible is the suggestion that Mrs. White rebuked her husband for promulgating the old teaching (not "new light"!) that the Papacy was the king of the north, or that she could have approved of Uriah Smith's innovation in bringing into the Advent Movement from outside sources the belief that Turkey is the king of the north of Daniel 11. Yet an ordained minister in our work recently sought to bolster up his wrong ideas concerning Turkey being the king of the north, by making inaccurate statements concerning James White's belief on the Papacy as the king of the north. This minister gave a wrong impression concerning the Spirit of Prophecy's attitude toward this teaching, leaving the distinct impression that Pastor James White did not accept the counsel given by the Spirit of Prophecy. We believe that this misrepresentation of the facts (whether wittingly or unwittingly done) should be corrected for the sake of those who would gather from the statements made that the Spirit of Prophecy frowned upon the belief that the Papacy is the king of the north.

The exact words employed by the minister referred to are as follows:
"Now I have here in my hand a book, '*Counsels to Writers and Editors*', and I want to show you how Sister White long ago dealt with those who professed to have new light, and among them her own husband." [Our comment: Far from being NEW light, the position maintained by James White was one of the landmarks fully established in the Advent Movement-James White's editorial in the *Review*, November 29, 1877.] The speaker continued, saying: "Now this came very close home. You all know that James White held some views that were different from the denominational views. [Our comment: James White held on to the old denominational view!] For instance, James White agitated for a number of years that the King of the North is the Papacy. [James White consistently held to the old denominational view.]

At the same time Uriah Smith, the writer of the book 'Daniel and Revelation', taught that the king of the north was the Turk. During all the years that Sister White lived she never rebuked Uriah Smith for teaching that the king of the north was the Turk. [Our comment: Uriah Smith taught a number of things which differed from Mrs. E. G. White and she did not rebuke him for teaching them. She left it for God-fearing readers of her writings to see where her writings differed from those of Uriah Smith's.] She never gave any contrary teaching in that direction [which, as we have shown) is not true], but James White tried to break in [a very incorrect statement for James White, far from breaking in, was already 'in' with the old teaching protesting against Uriah Smith's breaking in with his new ideas which he had borrowed from the outside world of theology] and tried to emphasize that the king of the north was the Papacy and tried to agitate so aggressively that she rebuked him on three occasions for doing that." This statement is not only untrue but it also misrepresents Pastor James White's relationship to the Spirit of Prophecy: it suggests that Pastor White, out worthy pioneer, refused to accept counsel given him through the Spirit of Prophecy, which is decidedly untrue and reflects upon his integrity as a leader in the Cause of Christ. This misrepresentation of the character and work of Pastor White in an address stressing the teaching that it is the ministry that has rulership in the Church" is not only contradictory but is also most reprehensible. To employ such propaganda when attacking the old Pioneers' teaching that the Papacy is the king of the north, in order to give credence to the discredited teaching that Turkey is the king of the north, shows how superficial indeed is that unscriptural belief. And as the majority of our Bible scholars and teachers today believe that the Papacy is the king of the north, as did James White and others of our pioneers, the statements made in the address under review are a sad commentary revealing the amazing inaccuracies, inconsistencies and absurdities employed to bolster up the now largely discarded teaching that Turkey is the king of the north.

Referring once more to the propaganda-packed presentation by our misinformed pastor, we quote: "Now when you come to page 77 [*Counsels to Writers and Editors*] you notice what she says about her own husband: 'My husband had some ideas on some points differing from the views taken by his brethren. I was shown that however true his views were (and she did not say they were true, however true his views were), God did not call for him to put them in front before his brethren and create differences of ideas' Now you will find a lot of people who pick up some little thing of unfulfilled Prophecy and they make that the great centre around which they build all their arguments, and they try to throw the whole church into confusion by agitating, agitating, agitating that little minor point of unfulfilled prophecy. Now James White was doing just that, and he was daggers drawn with Uriah Smith on this question of the king of the north and Sister White just calmly told her husband to be silent ... Now she urged on three occasions that her husband do not agitate those minor things that would bring about dissension."

We believe that this misguided preacher will be unable to produce the statements verifying his assertion that Mrs. E. G. White "on three occasions" "rebuked" her husband concerning this matter. Such was Pastor White's belief in the Spirit of Prophecy that this champion of truth would have needed but one "rebuke" from one who he believed was divinely inspired in giving such counsel. Such a statement also reflects upon the integrity of the large number of our Bible scholars and leaders who today believe that James White was quite right in his belief that the king of the north is the Papacy. To emphasise this feature in an address purporting to stress the need of unity in the church and the dignity and authority of the ministry, reveals an unbalanced zeal which strove to protect the preacher's personal viewpoint that Turkey is the king of the north. But to obstinately maintain that position by misrepresenting James White, our God fearing pioneer, is surely carrying things too far.

CHAPTER NINE: WHY MRS. E. G. WHITE COUNSELED HER HUSBAND AT THAT TIME

All among us who are keenly interested in the promulgation of truth should know the circumstances which occasioned Mrs. E.G. White giving her husband the counsel which is to be found on page 77 of "*Counsels to Writers and Editors*". Uriah Smith's new belief that Turkey was the king of the north had been discredited by "the Congress of Berlin". Events had not occurred as predicted by Uriah Smith. In the words of Raymond F.Cottrell:

"The supposed fulfilment of Daniel II: 45-the expulsion of Turkey from Europe and the establishment of its capital at Jerusalem in perhaps 'but a few months' (Uriah Smith, *Thoughts on Daniel*, 1873 edition, pp. 343, 344)-did not occur as so confidently predicted', and nothing happened which might be pointed to in confirmation of the advent message. Instead, events actually vindicated 'the landmarks fully established in the Advent message' and gave emphasis to the validity of the I anxious question raised by Elder White.

"Remarkably enough, however, the new position was as confidently maintained as before. Despite the fact that the major premise had been forfeited by default-the expected event did not occur (and now cannot occur as then expected)-the conclusion based upon it was nevertheless retained. Evidence of this appears in an editorial by James White entitled 'Where are We?' in the *Review* a few months later, in which he is, as it were, asking proponents of the new view what they propose to do about the situation. Here he reiterates the parallel character of the four major prophecies of Daniel, asserting that:

"If the same field and distance are covered by these four prophetic chains, then *the last power of the eleventh chapter*, which is to 'Come to his end and none shall help him', is Rome' (James White, *The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald*, Oct. 3,1878. PP. 116, 117).

"Again he appeals to the consistency of Scripture; and the article concludes with a notice that it will be continued-he has more to say on the matter and proposes to deal the new view a telling blow, since events substantiated his position and left his opponents stranded. The following evening he repeated the same line of reasoning at the close of an address by Uriah Smith in which reference was made to the Eastern question, before delegates assembled at the seventeenth session of the General Conference.

"That James White should thus differ publicly with Uriah Smith at the close of a sermon whose main emphasis had been the nearness of Christ's coming indicated an imminent crisis which might have resulted in schism within the church, Bitter feelings were apparently taking the place of brotherly love and something was urgently needed to save a dangerous situation from further deterioration. It seems that Sister White counselled her husband after that evening meeting to the effect that his taking public issue with Elder Smith was a mistake. Regardless of the respective merits of the views presented his course was

clearly in error and it was wise to let the matter drop, at least for the time being. Of this experience Sister White later wrote:

'My husband had some ideas on some points differing from the views taken by his brethren. I was shown that however true his views were God did not call for him to put them in front before the brethren and create differences of ideas . . .' (E. G. White, *Counsels to Writers and Editors*, pp. 76, 77, which is considered by trustees of the Ellen G. White estate to refer to this incident). As a result of this timely counsel the editorial of the preceding day was never continued', and the sick man of the East was permitted to slumber-so far as the *Review* was concerned-for nearly a quarter of a century. It is clear, however, that Elder White did not understand the restriction either to apply to the position he had taken or to be permanently binding, for two years later he expressed the same view in an article in the *Signs of the Times*. Once more he spoke of

".. four distinct lines of prophecy. These are given in chapters two, seven, eight, and eleven. The eleventh chapter of Daniel closes with the close of the fourth monarchy . . . the Roman Empire which comes to its end at the second coming of Christ' James White, 'Time of the End', an editorial in *The Signs of the Times*, July 22, 1880, p. 330).

"This is the last statement to appear in the official literature of the church in defense of the 'landmarks' of pioneer days with regard to the king of the north or Armageddon. *Whatever counsel may have been given Elder White, then, applied only to the particular delicate situation obtaining at the General Conference then in session*, and was designed to keep the men there assembled from coming to an open break . . .

"Evidently the counsel applied to the spirit in which Elder White had spoken rather than to the views he had expressed; for if anything Sister White may have said was of the nature of a pronouncement on the subject under discussion Elder White would certainly have accepted it. *The wording of the quotation given would seem to infer that Sister White approved of Elder White's point of view but considered it unwise to press the matter*" (Raymond F. Cottrell, in his *Pioneer Views on Daniel Eleven and Armageddon*). (Emphasis mine.)

Today our Godly scholars revere the memory of Pastor James White for, after years of research and weighing all the evidence, the majority accept the truth maintained by him that the Papacy is indeed the king of the north.

CHAPTER TEN- RETURN TO THE PIONEERS' TEACHING

We conclude by again quoting from Raymond F. Cottrell's outline in his "Summary", pp. 21-23, he says: "the view making Rome the power of the last verses of Daniel eleven and the battle of Armageddon the last conflict of the great Controversy between Christ and Satan was held unanimously by the pioneers of the Advent message to the year 1863, and may therefore be designated appropriately the 'Pioneer View'. More than a third of a century after 1844 it was spoken of in the *Review* as one of the 'landmarks' of the Advent message...The view emphasizing Turkey in Daniel 11 and in Armageddon has no valid claim either to being original with Seventh-day Adventists or to being the view of the pioneers. But was borrowed directly and exclusively from non- Adventist sources...The *Return to the Pioneer View* . . . Finding that neither Turkey nor an East-West conflict could be established upon the evidence of inspiration, they [our Bible teachers] abandoned the Traditional View and ere long discovered that their 'new view' was in reality the position of the early pioneers. At the present time, the Bible teachers in every college of North America have, individually and by personal Bible study, become convinced that the view of the pioneers is in reality the correct one and have accepted it without reservation. The chairman of the recent revision committee for *Daniel and the Revelation* personally concurred in this, as do many of our ablest evangelists and other experienced and consecrated men in all lines of activity from the General Conference down through all ranks of workers."

James White today stands vindicated and honored by our scholarly Bible teachers, and his belief that the Papacy is the King of the North is now believed by great numbers of our thinkers in all departments of our Movement.