

The Desolations of Jerusalem 04

From a Presentation by Duane Dewey 11, 2011

Transcription by Sister Grace

Minor editing for readability by P G Temple

We are going to continue our study on Biblical hermeneutics and unity in the church, the Desolation of Jerusalem. Please kneel with me in prayer.

Loving Father in heaven, I am thinking of the text that You know the end from the beginning and You teach it that way, its Your signature on the events that are to transpire just before the Second Advent that what has taken place in the past will be repeated, and dear Lord we hope that we can see by these histories that You are speaking to the church in every age and You never change. Thank you dear Lord for Your loving, constant, witness, Your patience, Your love, Your devotion to Your people. Only if we understood what John wrote, he said it best: "For God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever should believeth in Him should not perish but everlasting life." Thank you dear Lord that Jesus is in the message of the First, the Second, and the Third Angel, and that through Him, dear Lord, we might have an abundant entrance into Thy kingdom and that we have through Him life eternal. Lord we pray that through His Spirit, we will learn the things that we must trace in history to show us where we are, and that dear Lord, You will abundantly bless the church, the leadership, the lay members, all...that they might give the Third Angel's message in power and glory and bring honor and glory to Your holy name, and that we will see the Church Triumphant, without spot or wrinkle, and that we will give You all the glory. Bless us to these ends we pray in Jesus name. Amen.

So we understand now that these men were involved in many things within the lives of really three generations of Adventism. Now he says again:

"Generally speaking, Nichol, Neufeld, and I found the positions set forth in their final form reasonably acceptable, but we knew that many Adventists would not. Fifteen years later, with the stock of QOD nearly exhausted (*this is around the time when I became a Seventh-day Adventist; so friends, as I was tracing this history, my heart broke to learn the truth, that when I became a Seventh-day Adventist, I wasn't really a Seventh-day Adventist. Do you understand what I mean?*), it became my unhappy task as Review and Herald book editor to recommend that it be discontinued and out of print--which the R&H Board voted. My hope was that this would abate the continuing storm of criticism (but it has not)." {The Role of Biblical Hermeneutics in Preserving Unity in the Church, pg.10}

"Again, the fundamental problem was differences of opinion arising from differing biblical hermeneutics--whether the modern reader is to understand the Bible from his modern perspective of what the words mean, or from the meaning the inspired writer intended his words to convey, from his perspective of salvation history." {Ibid, pg.10}

For this man, all those on the wrong side of the issue was because they were not trained Bible theologians and if you weren't trained, then to him the difference was like the difference between night and day, complete opposites. Indeed they are, he is correct on that front, yes. But his endeavour was to bring you over to his side of the issue, and our endeavour is to have people understand the truth, irrespective of issues, irrespective of what men think or what men do or what men say, we must follow the truth and where it leads, and we believe that the truth was brought out in this history, and it has not changed and it will not change. Truth never changes. Now it says:

"The Revision of Bible Readings, and the "Daniel Committee" {Ibid, pg.11 }

Now here, you going to read...maybe you have heard rumours in the past but here you are going to have evidence as to what this all led to from 1935 to 1960. When the introduction to the historical method which Cottrell has already told us in early portions of this document that the majority of all our Bible teachers are now following and using and he is right about that, they are. He says:

“Soon after the last volume of the Bible Commentary was off the press in the late autumn of 1957, and printing plates for the old classic Bible Readings were worn out, the Review assigned Don Neufeld and me the task of revising it, *(so thy did the commentary and now they are going to do the ‘Bible Readings for the Home Circle’)* as necessary, to be in agreement with the Commentary. *(So now the ‘Bible Readings for the Home Circle’ is going to be revised to be in agreement with the Commentary Set. Now in 1971 when they gave me that book to read, when they had told me this, I wouldn’t have known what they were talking about. Even if they had told me, it would have been Greek to me, but now I understand it. This book should have never come off the press, but nevertheless...)* **Quite by accident** *(He says this open facedly)* my half of the book included the prophecies of Daniel and Revelation.” {Ibid, pg.11}

He *(Raymond Cottrell)* also wrote the chapters of Dan 8 & 9 for the Commentary Series.

“With our recent experience in editing the Book of Daniel vividly in mind I set out resolutely to find a way to reconcile our sanctuary doctrine with sound biblical hermeneutics *(he means the historical method)*--and failed miserably. *(What he is telling you is that with his brand of hermeneutics, you cannot prove the sanctuary doctrine)* Upon the recommendation of senior editor Nichol, I sent a brief questionnaire to the head of each college Bible department in North America and to every teacher versed in Hebrew. All 27 of them were personal friends of mine *(what that means is that they were all members of the Bible Research Fellowship, they were all members of the Biblical Research Committee – these people were all his friends and colleagues, and birds of a feather flock together)*. All replied, and without exception they took the position that there is no linguistic or contextual basis for our sanctuary-in-heaven-investigative-judgment interpretation of Daniel 8:14. 25” {Ibid, pg.11}

Now there it is. On the face of it, these men are not Seventh-day Adventists!

“When the results of this poll (sans names) came to the attention of GC president R. R. Figuhr, he and his officers appointed a committee they named Committee on Problems in the Book of Daniel *(did you know that such committee ever existed?)*, which deliberated inconclusively for five years and issued no formal report. The committee finally voted an informal report that reaffirmed the traditional interpretation but was silent as to any "problems." *(What he means is, the problems were those that he and his friends presented with the linguistics and contextual basis, based on the ancient Hebrew, that would disprove the sanctuary doctrine of the Seventh-day Adventist church. That’s the problems that he says they never mention in their report)* Again the problem was one of biblical hermeneutics. It was impossible to reconcile the traditional interpretation *(of William Miller)* with sound principles of biblical interpretation *(He calls it traditional interpretation, the one’s that Father Miller used, the one Sister White recommends. Proof text method is not recommended he says, and it could not be reconciled with his brand of biblical interpretation)*. Few, even in the General Conference, ever heard about this committee, and at the Glacier View conference of the Sanctuary Review Committee in August 1980, Neal Wilson commented that he knew nothing about it prior to that time.” {Ibid, pg.11}

“Inasmuch as I have been asked to speak on the Glacier View conference in Sydney next Sabbath afternoon *(I would have liked to have gone to that)*, I will refrain from commenting further regarding it today. *(He gave this talk in San Diego to a forum of Spectrum in 1996)* Suffice it to say that the fundamental issue there was also one of how to understand the Bible.” {Ibid, pg.11}

You know Spectrum is very progressively liberal, and I wasn't there at this talk, but I assume that most of the people that were listening to him on this talk were in sympathy with his positions. That's my assumption. I hope some were awakened maybe.

“Official Adventist Hermeneutical Policy, 1969-1979” {Ibid, pg.12}

Now here is where Elder Pierson is really the... you have heard of the phrase, they threw the monkey wrench into the wheels and the car could not move anymore. Well that is what happens, listen...

“The years 1969 to 1979 witnessed a major reorientation of the corporate, official hermeneutical processes of the church (*Cottrell saw his principle as a process being brought into the church and it was progressively getting stronger and stronger, and it was going to dominate the church. From the 1930's to the 1960's it did. But now in 1969, three years after, Pierson is in his office as the president of the General Conference.*) The changes that took place during those years earned for them the title, Decade of Obscurantism...” {Ibid, pg.12}

That means that they were obstructing the goals of the Bible Research Fellowship Committee. This tension that had gone on between the bible students and the seminary and the teachers over the historical method. Now there is a champion of the proof-text method within, he is in the presidency of the General Conference, and he is finally going to put a stop at what he sees as an open apostasy in the denomination. Cottrell sees it as being a decade of obscurantism, it means that you are going to obstruct, you're going to stand in the way, you're going to not be in agreement and you're going to make a fight.

Continues... “A review of those changes is essential to an accurate understanding of the biblical-theological-doctrinal climate in the church from 1979 to the present.” {Ibid, pg.12}

“In conducting such a review it is important to bear in mind a clear distinction between the two basic methods of reading and understanding the Bible: (1) the proof-text method, with what its words mean to the modern reader from his perspective in time, as normative for interpretation, and (2) the historical method, with the meaning the inspired writer, guided by the Holy Spirit, intended his words to convey, as normative.” {Ibid, pg.12}

Now this all sounds real good but the second method denies the truths on this chart (1850 chart), hands down, denied every single one of them. Cottrell has a statement that he denies the 1290, 538, he denies 1260, 2300 days, he doesn't even mention the 2520. But he translates them all as literal; Antiochus Epiphanies is the anti-Christ, according to Raymond Cottrell. Now he has this revealed in an unpublished document that he produced. It was originally a 1300 page document on the eschatology on the book of Daniel, later he shrank it down to 700 pages.

I met this man in 1995. I first encountered him in a little church in Forest Falls, CA, and I didn't know any of this. I was only a year back in the church, from a long time out of the church, and he was there presenting a sermon. That's when I found out that his family goes back into the 1600's as being Sabbatarian Baptists. He gave us a brief history of his family, and I was thrilled to meet this man because I thought this guy really knew something, and he did. He does know many things, he is gone now. So he told all of us that day about this book that he wrote on the book of Daniel, and I was thrilled, I wanted to read it. So at the pot luck table I sat down next to him and I began to bend his ear. I complimented him on his talk and how I thought how great it is to be so long connected to the Great Advent Movement and your family going back all those years as Sabbath keepers. I was thrilled to meet him, and so I then ask him very politely “Brother Cottrell is there any chance that I can read your book on Daniel?” Then his whole attitude changed, and he looked at me and said “What do you want to read it for?” I looked at him and I thought, well what is wrong with you? He refused to let me read it. I am probably never going

to look at it but I am going to go ahead and tell this story. I have spoken to his daughter about six weeks ago and she has given me permission to look at all of his material but if she see's these videos, she probably won't let me. But the book he told me I could not read, I have now been given permission to read by his daughter.

"A review of events during the decade of obscurantism would not be possible or intelligible without mentioning the names of the persons involved. Would it be possible to give a meaningful account of World War II without mentioning such names?" {Ibid, pg.12}

I agree with him, we need to mention some names in these histories, one of them is Raymond Cottrell and a few others, so he gives this little example of why we need to name names; he says:

"As we proceed with this review let us remember that those who played key roles in the decade of obscurantism were dedicated Seventh-day Adventists who loved the Lord as much as we do and whose sincere convictions led them to act as they did. (*He is giving them the benefit of the doubt*) Three of the four are now awaiting the return of the Lifegiver, and it will be our privilege, if faithful, to meet them in that better land." {Ibid, pg.12}

"God loves sinners but hates the sin. However dim a view we may take of our fellow Christians' opinions and the way they may implement them, let us respect their integrity and consider them friends (*Now I agree with that*). At least two of the four who played key roles were esteemed personal friends of mine. The following very brief review of the decade of obscurantism proceeds with charity for all and malice toward none." {Ibid, pg.12}

"The decade of obscurantism began three years after Robert H. Pierson became president of the General Conference. The administration of his predecessor Reuben R. Figuhr, from 1954 to 1966 (*that is a long presidency*), was a model of wise, balanced leadership, of openness, and of mutual respect and confidence between administrators and the Bible scholars of the church..." {Ibid, pg.12-13}

What he is saying is, under the leadership of Brother Figuhr, the Bible Research Fellowship had an open field to work in. They weren't being objected to. Whether or not brother Figuhr was privy to what we know now from this document, whether he was on his side or not, who knows? But according to Cottrell, he says that under his leadership, an openness was allowed to exist within the confines of the denomination, but only in the Judgment are we going to know the truth

Continues... "Like a falling barometer, however, that decade introduced a climate of mutual suspicion, alienation, and witch-hunting." {Ibid, pg.12-13}

He means the decade of 69 through to 79

"Robert H. Pierson was a gracious person, a dedicated Christian, a gentleman in every respect. Despite the conviction then and now that his policy with respect to the biblical-theological-doctrinal processes of the church at the General Conference level was seriously flawed, our conversations and correspondence on the subject were always on the high level of mutual respect, and constructive in tone. In his August 29, 1982 letter to me, upon reading my white paper "Architects of Crisis: a Decade of Obscurantism" (which I had invited him to critique), he wrote: "Through the years that we served together in Washington I always considered you a friend. Although there may have been areas of differing opinions I had a warm feeling for you personally." (*I should say that Elder Cottrell was a very friendly man, that's why I was very thrilled to meet him that day at Forest Falls, but when I asked to read his book, he wasn't so friendly. But nevertheless, he was a friendly man.*) My reply reciprocated: "I have the highest personal regard for you as a kind, gracious, Christian gentleman. I esteem you as a friend." His next letter expressed appreciation for my frankness and characterized my letter as "a beautiful example of true Christian courtesy and grace, in dealing with a matter on which you and I seem to have

varying views.” Our relationship was a prime example of two people who disagreed radically on a subject of major importance to both of us and to the church, yet with Christian respect and full confidence in each other's integrity.” {Ibid, pg.13}

Now friends, Jeremiah loved king Zedekiah, with all his heart; you can read it in ‘Prophets and Kings’. He wept when he tried to express to Zedekiah what he needed to do in obeying the counsel of the Lord. But Zedekiah went against it, and so Jerusalem was destroyed by fire by the armies by Nebuchadnezzar; but Jeremiah wept. But Jeremiah wouldn’t talk in such words as the integrity of the king and all that stuff. Ellen White says it clear that he destroyed his manhood (Zedekiah) and he had no integrity left, that’s the truth. All this talk about integrity is a smoke screen. Men who deny the truth invariably, Sister White says, are destroying their own manhood – Prophets and Kings, you can read it in the story of Zedekiah.

“Elder Pierson graduated from Southern Junior College in 1933 and entered the ministry in the Georgia-Cumberland Conference (*I thought that this was very interesting*). In 1936 he responded to a call to service overseas and served with distinction in India, the Caribbean, and South Africa. (*The Lord called him into distant lands. When the last apostasy was being brought into the church, Elder Pierson was out of country*). At the time of his election to the presidency of the General Conference thirty years later, in 1966, he had more than fulfilled the unwritten requirement of significant overseas service. But his lifetime of service overseas proved to be a severe handicap when he returned to General Conference headquarters (*Brother Cottrell saw it as a handicap*). For most of his life out of touch with the church in North America (*Praise the Lord*), he experienced considerable difficulty in understanding and relating to, changes that had taken place during his absence (*meaning the introduction of the historical method*), in several important areas of the life and work of the church. This was especially true with respect to the corporate biblical-theological-doctrinal processes of the church at the General Conference level, (*This man (Cottrell) was deceived*) which he considered it his duty to restore to the way they were when he went overseas in 1936. (*So Brother Pierson was going to put the church back on its proper footing*) What changes?” {Ibid, pg.13}

“Prior to 1936 the church was following the proof-text method of Bible study, and administrators were the “brethren of experience” in those processes. But during Elder Pierson's absence church administrators had come to rely on a new generation of trained and experienced Bible scholars as their brethren of experience in such matters, and he very sincerely believed that the Bible scholars, with their historical method of Bible study, were leading the church astray! (*You did not know this did you? Well you do now. Cottrell is telling you that this is what Pierson saw to be the problem within the confides of the General Conference, that the historical method was leading the church astray*) Repeatedly he expressed it to be his conviction and policy that administrators, and not Bible scholars, should conduct the corporate biblical-theological process at the General Conference level.” {Ibid, pg.14}

He was going to make a distinction between the man who had been off to the universities and studied in the schools of Babylon and he was going to put a stop to their influence within the theological confides of the Seventh-day Adventist church. This was a very wise General Conference President, probably the only one next to him would be James White, because James was also once a defender of the faith once delivered to the saints, and so was Brother Pierson. Both men had their problems but these really deserve credit where credit is due.

Continues... “It was his implementation of that policy that, to this day, has made it difficult for church administrators and Bible scholars to work together in a spirit of mutual understanding and confidence, as they had been doing prior to his administration.” {Ibid, pg.14}

In my home church, Brother Darrio Taylor is giving a talk on Ephraim and Judah and how Ephraim envied Judah and Judah vexed Ephraim, and this is the very point in modern times where Ephraim represented

by men on the wrong side of eternal truth are envying those in Judah and Judah is vexing Ephraim. But I believe that there is going to be a climate produced by this, through sound Bible study and faith in the Third Angel's Message behind me, (charts) that will unite Ephraim and Judah into one stick and we are going to give the Loud Cry of the Third Angel's Message. There is a saying in the world that's kind of crude: 'It's not over till the fat lady sings' and I believe that the fat lady is about to sing, and we are going to see the Church Triumphant

"Aware of the direction affairs were taking, three months after Pierson became president in 1966 (*notice on how he was aware of this*) I presented him with a carefully crafted thirty-page document reviewing the recent course of our corporate biblical process on the General Conference level and proposing that the Biblical Research Committee be reconstituted as the Biblical Research Institute." {Ibid, pg. 14}

To head off the implications of what Pierson would intend to do, now he suggests in his wisdom to take the Biblical Research Committee within the confines of the General Conference Committee now, and now he wants to make it an official institute within the General Conference. Now why do you suppose he was doing that? For good will? Oh no! he wants to make sure that this method that he has been training people to use has power, it has authority.

Continues... "Repeatedly over the twelve years of his presidency, sometimes at my initiative and sometimes his, we discussed these matters together at some length. The last time was a long discussion aboard our charter return flight from the 1975 General Conference in Vienna. Our conversations were always positive and constructive in tone, but he never seemed to understand." {Ibid, pg.14}

"Implementing his policy, Elder Pierson appointed two administrators without training or experience in Bible study on the research level to be in charge of the GC office of Biblical Research and the Biblical Research Committee (*So according to Cottrell, these two men were not experienced Bible scholars*) --GC vice president Willis J. Hackett, and Gordon Hyde (*These were the two men*). Both shared his convictions in such matters and conscientiously proceeded to implement them. On April 3, 1969 the Spring Meeting of the General Conference removed the Bible scholars en masse from the Biblical Research Committee and staffed it with administrators (*They were thrown out and I would say, rightly so*). A vigorous protest by the Seminary faculty forestalled implementation of the plan, but a similar effect was achieved a few months later by adding a large number of administrators and other non-scholars to the existing committee." {Ibid, pg. 14}

So what he saying is that Pierson stacked the deck against him, to achieve his result, well maybe he did but I would say, Praise the Lord!

"In no sense a Bible scholar himself, Gordon Hyde selected Gerhard F. Hasel as his mentor and authority on biblical-theological-doctrinal matters, and consistently presented Hasel's views as his own (*This was Gordon Hyde that selected Gerhard F. Hasel*). Hasel had recently come to the Seminary from Southern Adventist College, (*That's the one that Pierson had graduated from*) and was completing a degree in Old Testament studies at Vanderbilt University. While there he had formulated a hybrid proof-text/historical method of interpreting the Bible that consisted of historical method procedures under the control of proof-text method principles." {Ibid, pg. 14-15}

So what he's telling you now is that there is another group within our groups now that have combined the two methods and there are the ones now in charge of the Biblical Research Institute to this very day. But with it they have put a stumbling block in the way of these men that were using the historical method, which is a service to the church. But yet there are some men within the Biblical Research Institute today, that still have issues with the histories on these two charts. The things are still not resolved as they should be, and the only thing that is going to resolve this for the church, unfortunately,

probably for most, is going to be the introduction of the Sunday law in the United States. We are on a moment here—we have a window of opportunity that is small but God can do great things with small things according to the testimony of Zerubbabel, if you understand what I mean by that. They despised the day of small things in the story of Zerubbabel, the rebuilding of the temple in his day, because it wasn't as glorious as the temple that Solomon had built, but God said that He would have His glory revealed in that very place. The Desire of Ages and the Bible tells us that it was revealed when Christ walked the sacred courts. We are soon to witness Christ walking the courts of Jerusalem, that means that He is going to walk in your life and in mine. We will see it; we are the Last Generation. He is going to put the cap stone on the work that He began, right here, in this (Millerite) history, the building of the temple.

“This hybrid hermeneutic appears—to the uninitiated—to provide scholarly proof for traditional proof-text conclusions. His phenomenal ability to assemble masses of scholarly data was impressive, (*He is talking about Elder Hasel*) especially to persons unfamiliar with hermeneutical principles. (*In other words, if you are ignorant then this method appears to be quite profound*). He repeatedly stated that a person must not attempt to be objective in his study of the Bible (*This is Hasel now, Cottrell is telling you that Hasel is saying that a person must not be objective in his study of the Bible*). As a result, his subjective presuppositions controlled his evaluation of evidence and his conclusions.” {Ibid, pg.14-15}

What he is saying is that one of the things that Brother Hasel does believe is that 457 BC is the beginning of the 2300 days which are really 2300 years leading down to October 22nd 1844. Those are some of what Cottrell calls, ‘subjective presuppositions that controlled his evaluation of the evidence’. We call that Pillars of our Foundation, Cottrell calls it subjective presuppositions controlled by his evaluation of evidence that would be his conclusions.

Continues... “which often made his conclusions non-sequitur to the evidence he surveyed. He prescinded from verbal inspiration in the revelatory process, but treated the Bible as if it were verbally inspired.” {Ibid, pg.14-15}

“With the full support of Elder Pierson during the 1970 is Gordon Hyde, as director of the General Conference office of Biblical Research and chair of the Biblical Research Committee (since 1975, Institute), promoted Hasel as the dean of Adventist Bible scholars, and made his hermeneutic normative in the biblical-theological-doctrinal processes of the church. This was particularly noticeable in the series of North American Bible Conferences in 1974 and the attempt to make him dean of the Theological Seminary earlier that year.” {Ibid, pg.15}

“Hyde and Hasel both targeted anyone who did not subscribe to Hasel’s hybrid hermeneutic, as a dangerous liberal, and warned administrators to beware of them. Several friends in the General Conference, including Elder Pierson, told me this. Later, as dean of the Seminary during the 1980’s, Hasel froze a number of dedicated, competent teachers out of the Seminary—such as Larry Geraty...” {Ibid, pg.15}

He was president of La Sierra University just recently, he is doing something else now, he is no longer there now in that position. Under Geraty’s watch they brought in the study of the subject of evolution at La Sierra. But these men were classified as liberals by Hasel and Hyde according to brother Cottrell. He mentions here...

Continues... “(now president of Loma Linda University) (*At the time, La Sierra was a part of the Loma Linda university system and he was at La Sierra and he mentions another one at La Sierra who I knew. I knew both these men, I took one year at La Sierra*), Fritz Guy (*Now I can personally tell you that Fritz, I don’t know if it’s still going on but when I was there in 98, he required that every theological major would write for him in his class a paper on why God was a woman – that’s right. Now Fritz Guy is also*

mentioned here as a liberal), Ivan Blazen, Sakae Kubo, and others. As head of the religion department at Southern College in the early 1980's, Hyde and others purged the department of three able and dedicated teachers whose only fault was that they did not subscribe to Hasel's hermeneutic..." {ibid, pg. 15}

See, what this document is doing is making this difference between hermeneutics. He flowers it up and says that he has a lot of respect and integrity for these men, but at the same time he is telling you that these men were putting the dagger in the backs of his friends. Now I am sorry, you cannot have it both ways; you either respect these men's integrity or you don't, and I think he doesn't.

But anyways, these are not pleasant facts and I can say that reading this, none of this has been pleasant, but they are facts, and demonstrate the tactics that made the years from 1969 to 1979 a decade of obscurantism, and set the stage for the two doctrinal fire storms that tormented the church in 1979 and 1980.

What he is talking about is Desmond Ford. To him, this was a decimation of the church, to reject the Ford doctrine that the Investigative Judgment is not sound Biblical hermeneutics, to him was a terrible thing that would take place within the confines of the Seventh-day Adventist church. To remove from Desmond Ford his credentials and throw him out, was to this man a terrible crime, all based on a difference in Biblical hermeneutics.

So when we read the document that we read earlier by Sister White in Portland Maine and she describes the great blessings that she received from the Lord himself, her work in that time period related to this history and we read that she was once again in Portland forty years later, able to give the same messages that brought the people out of the churches, again in her home town, following the hermeneutics of Father Miller. We need to [notice and compare] match wits with what she is telling us, with what this man is saying, and what has taken place in the church for the last fifty years.

Jerusalem is in desolation and we don't even know it. We are completely blind to the issues, and we call ourselves Seventh-day Adventists nevertheless. You know this same thing, I prayed earlier that Jesus would teach us the end from the beginning and Sister White says that we are repeating the history of the Jews. The same things that brought the armies of Nebuchadnezzar in 606 BC to destroy the city for the first time, and the same things that brought Nebuchadnezzar to attack and finally destroy the city completely in two more sets, which would take Zedekiah in chains and iron, with his eyes plucked out by Babylon. Notice that he was blinded as he went. This is the history of the church, and the church is not Babylon, but friends, the King of the North is coming, and his name is the papacy, and he has those cruel iron hooks to put in our noses, and he is going to gouge out our eyes so that we cannot see. But the God of heaven is asking us today to reflect upon these histories, and if we will do so, we will plead with the God of heaven—the Dirt-brush Man—that's who He is; and He will sweep out all the rubbish and the chaff and we will be the Church Victorious.

You cannot take my word for this, you have to read this and decide for yourselves what is in this document. Now, I am going to make a transition, we are going to go back in the past now to the 1919 Bible Conference, and we are going to look at some issues regarding those things.

Before we go there, let me share something with you out of Elder Pippins' book. The first time I got this book was a long time ago. It first came out I believe in 95/96 something like that. I got it and didn't read it, because I had other things that seemed to be more important at the time; but once my wife found this document and I read it, and then I saw what this was really telling me. I had a problem with understanding the terms that this man (Cottrell) was using—Historical Method, Historical Method; I didn't understand what it meant. I knew that coming in, the foundations of Adventism were based on

the **historicist** method; meaning that prophecy and history had to agree. I knew that this 'Historical Method' was not that; but I didn't understand what it was.

Even though I didn't quite grasp it all, I called Jeff on the phone and explained to him what this document was revealing of what I could understand about it. After I had spoken to him, I guess Daniel was reading this (Pippin's) book; Daniel reflected something to Jeff and Jeff told me that there was something in this book that I need to have in my quiver to do these talks. So I rushed into my library and I had to dig this out, it took me about thirty minutes to find it, and I did not know where to start. I said, "Lord I don't know where Daniel has been reading." At first was impressed to call you, but I decided to take a look and see what is in here.

I got to chapter 4 called 'Quarrelling Over the Word'. This chapter is the subject of this paper, but the writer here keeps using the phrase 'Historical Critical Method', he is not using the same phrase that Cottrell used, Historical Method, but Historical Critical Method. So I am a little disappointed as I am reading on, but I decided to keep on, maybe I will learn something because I knew that this was extremely important to myself and to others. I almost read the whole chapter and I come to this same phraseology that this man was using, so I am thinking that this is not going to lead me anywhere. So finally I come to the spot in this book:

"Liberal Approach in Adventist Scholarship" {Receiving the word, pg. 55}

Cottrell would call himself a progressive, but he is actually a liberal, the two words liberal and progressive are synonyms for the same thing. Cottrell did not see himself as a liberal, he saw himself as somebody who is benefitting the church and progressively moving forward in the right direction. That is why he called himself a progressive, but they were very liberal, because they were denying these foundational truths. So this man says:

"Liberal Approach in Adventist Scholarship. Contrary to the recent assertions that "No Adventist Bible scholar subscribes to that [historical-critical] method (*he has been discussing the historical critical method for several pages, now he says*), or to its presuppositions or conclusions, (*this is the same lingo that we see in this book—'presuppositions or conclusions'*). *Immediately I recognized it as Raymond Cottrell, and sure enough, the footnote points you to Raymond. Then it says:*) "the evidence points in a different direction. Even before 1974 and 1986..." {Ibid, pg.55}

It was 74 and 86 that the church began to warn the lay members against anybody using the Historical Critical Method. There was a warning given in 74 and 86 and in Rio de Janeiro at the General Conference in that year in 86, they put out a document strictly forbidding any of our teachers to use the Historical Critical Method, Amen! And so Cottrell would write a document later called 'Blame it on Rio' which I have in my possession, and then in doing the research to get that, in the same magazine that the article 'Blame it on Rio' appeared, we got a wonderful document, just by providence. It's called 'Does 1844 have a Pagan Foundation'—and it's on the 'Daily'—which is a really wonderful document but anyway he goes on to say:

Continues... "the evidence points in a different direction. Even before 1974 and 1986, the years in which the Biblical Research Institute of the General Conference and the world field leaders at Annual Council spoke out against this approach (*meaning the historical critical method*), some Adventist Bible scholars were already using versions of the Historical-Critical Method and recommending it to others." {Ibid, pg. 55}

Now my antennas went up when I read this, because I know now that he is going to try to explain to me what I needed to understand over here. There were some already using this historical critical method he says:

“In fact, the author of the above denial (*which was Raymond Cottrell, he is the author that he is referring to*) had himself, eight years earlier, asserted: "During the late 1930s Seventh-day Adventist Bible scholars began using these historical-critical principles and procedures in their study; and today [1987], half a century later, all but a few do so routinely." (*foot note 15*) {Ibid, pg. 55}

When I read this, I decided to give this talk in Arkansas; this is what convinced me that the Lord had led us to these things. If this wasn't convincing enough, this foot note here sealed the deal. Notice what this write says.

“Cottrell, "Blame It On Rio," p. 33” {Ibid, pg. 66}

He is recommending you to go to that document and read it, but now this next statement is not from the document ‘Blame it on Rio’, he is now informing you of another document:

“Since at least 1977 Cottrell has employed the euphemism, (*or he has coined the phrase*) "Historical Method, (*now the historical critical method and the historical method are brought together on the same page. Now when Raymond Cottrell wrote this, he knew that but he never used the phrase Historical Critical Method. He used this phrase that he coined in 1977 and he calls it the Historical Method. Now I know that I am on the right track and Jeff was right, I needed to read this book.*)" to refer to the Historical-Critical Method. He argues that it is a method employed by conservatives, liberals, and Ellen White. (*He even accuses Sister White of following this method and it says...*) (see Cottrell, "Smoothing the Way to Consensus," {Ibid, pg. 66}

Now I don't have time to show you all of this, but I have all these documents that are being mentioned. I went to Andrews on the internet and a very good research person there helped me to get these and so the one is called; ‘Blame it on Rio’ and the other; ‘Smoothing the Way to Consensus’ *Review and Herald*, March 31, 1977, p. 18; "The Historical Method of Interpretation," *Review and Herald*, April 7, 1977, pp. 17-18; "A Subtle Danger in the Historical Method," *Review and Herald*, April 14, 1977, p. 12.

These articles are all in defence of Raymond Cottrell and the Biblical Research Fellowship/Institute, whatever you want to call it, in their defence of why they are using the historical method, and in 1977 he renames it—rather than calling it the ‘Historical Critical Method’, he coined the phrase, ‘Historical Method’ in these three documents and in the *Review and Herald*. What this book is explaining is the introduction of all this method in the confides of our theology. So he goes on to say:

“His recent article uses the terms "Historical Method of research" or "Historical Method" to describe his Historical-Critical approach. (see Cottrell, "A Guide to Reliable Interpretation," *The Welcome Table*, pp. 80, 84).” {Ibid, pg. 66}

I also have that document and I have read it. This is the document, ‘*The Welcome Table*’ book that is the underlying issue of why he wrote this book, because they voted down woman's ordination in the North American Division in 1995. And at La Sierra University, a group of scholars, some of them were my professors at La Sierra the year I was there, they got together with brother Cottrell and they wrote a book called the ‘Welcome table’. Cottrell's contribution to the book is on women's ordination and biblical hermeneutics and in it he reveals a guide to reliable interpretation.

“Jerry Gladson correctly observed that Cottrell's "Historical" Method, which is essentially the same as his own, is actually a modified use of the Historical-Critical Method. See Jerry Gladson, "Taming Historical Criticism (*And I also have that document*): Ancient Bible Scholarship in the Land of the Giants," *Spectrum Magazine* 18/4 (April 1988) {Ibid, pg. 66}

So there is overwhelming evidence that the enemy has done a good job within the ranks of Seventh day Adventism; and this is not a witch hunt, this is just bona fide facts about what has taken place. I would suggest to every thinking Seventh day Adventist that we don't want to be in the ark that these men have climbed aboard, because it's not pitched like it needs to be pitched. It has not been constructed the way it needs to be constructed. They have not followed the Lord's design in the building of their ark, and when

the overwhelming scourge, when the decree goes forth, their ship is going to sink! But if we follow the counsel of the Lord and if we put our feet on the Rock of Ages, we have a certainty of going through. That is why Sister White makes that comment that “the church will go through” but the ones that do go through are going to be on a solid platform. Shall we pray?

Loving Father in heaven, Lord even though these things are delivered by stammering lips and uneducated minds, we pray and hope dear Lord that Your Holy Spirit has impressed the hearts of those who are hearing and listening, even of the one who is doing the speaking that we will hear Your voice speaking to us in a still small voice that spoke to Elijah, saying, “Elijah what are you doing here?” Please help us Lord to surrender our wills to heaven, that through Your love and grace for us, Your power and might that we will be conquerors in the name of Jesus, and that, dear Lord, we will give the last warning message to the world and bring glory and honor to Your name. Please help us in Jesus name we pray.

Amen.