

The Alpha and Omega Apostasy

PART ONE: THE DAILY IN DANIEL EIGHT

From a Presentation by Jeff Pippenger 11, 2011

Transcription and minor editing for readability by P G Temple

Shall we begin with prayer?

Heavenly Father; as we look at some of this history that Brother Duane's been covering, some of the issues that impact this history, we ask that You will grant us the presence of Your Holy Spirit to direct our considerations. This particular presentation is a little bit more like a mystery novel, that takes some focus on some various issues that take place. So we ask that those who are viewing these things, and following these things, that You will give them wisdom to understand beyond the words that I express because it may be a bit difficult to convey. We want to understand this history in a way that we can be benefitted by it personally, and that we can be prepared to better reflect Your character in the crisis that is now confronting Adventism, and better prepared to stand during the Sunday Law crisis that is soon to confront the world. We ask that You will prepare our hearts and minds to hear Your voice in these things and that You will pour Your Latter Rain out upon us by opening our understanding to the truth of Your Word. That You will take control of me, the human instrument, let me be hid behind Your cross and that the words that I share will be purified with the coals from off Your altar. We thank You for all these things; in Jesus' Name—Amen.

As Brother Duane has been sharing the Desolations of Jerusalem, the initial couple days I wasn't here; but recently there is a study that we have done that we haven't put into the public record or recorded that contributes to this history, and I determined that I want to add it to this series. If you've been listening to his presentations, then you have heard, whether it clicked on you or not, that the argument over the 'Daily' in the early part of the 20th century, consisted of two classes of men. To one class, the new view of the 'Daily' was salvational. They may not have said it that way, but if you're arguing that the 'Daily' represents Christ's sanctuary ministry, and you are professing to be a Seventh-day Adventist, then Christ's sanctuary ministry is certainly salvational to Seventh-day Adventists. Prescott; Daniells; they believed that the 'Daily' was Christ's sanctuary ministry, so this issue for them it was salvational.

Whereas those who were defending against this false view, that were upholding the Pioneer position, Stephen Haskell; Uriah Smith's son—L A Smith; F C Gilbert; these men—they weren't so much defending the importance of the 'Daily' as a prophetic symbol in the book of Daniel, as they were arguing that to change that position was to destroy the integrity and authority of the Spirit of Prophecy. Their issue was more about what happens to Sister White's passage in Early Writings 74, if you change her statement where she says those who gave the judgment hour cry had the correct view of the 'Daily', because the historical evidence is absolutely crystal clear, that those men, who gave the judgment hour cry, understood that the 'Daily' is Paganism. So to move away from that for these men, was to attack the Spirit of Prophecy.

So you have two different camps; one camp that believes the new view of the 'Daily'—that's salvational; the other camp is concerned that you are attacking the Spirit of Prophecy, and is less concerned about the actual symbol of the 'Daily' in prophecy than the other.

Duane's been doing a very nice job in putting all this into the context of Prescott's desire to bring in a Christo-logical approach to our message.

So we want to show a few things, and we're going to show the evolution of the statement in 'Early Writings' that is the statement under discussion. In 'Early Writings', page 74, this was written in 1882, but the passage that we find in 'Early Writings', page 74 that is the point of controversy, it was taken

from the book, 'Experience and Views', which was printed in 1851. But the passage in 'Experience and Views' that 'Early Writings' is derived from, is taken from the 'Present Truth' November 1850, but today when we go back into the Pioneer articles and we look at the early publications and we look at the 'Present Truth' of November 1850, is now called the 'Review and Herald', November 1850, so we're going to put it that way.

There's an Evolution of this passage that is very important to see, because of you heard what Duane said—you heard it but it may not have clicked on for you; one of the arguments that's developed by Prescott, and perpetuated by A G Daniells and W C White—W C White particularly, is that a way to understand the passage in 'Early Writings', is to place it in the context of time setting, and there is absolutely no grammatical or historical justification for doing that whatsoever. But if you look at 'Early Writings' alone, there is still no justification for doing it even in 'Early Writings'; but you have to follow the flow of events. So we're going to begin by looking at 'The Present Truth', November 1850.

I am not going to read the entire article. We are going to treat this more as a mystery. We're going to put some facts in place. This article that's found in November 1850, originally called the 'Present Truth' November 1850, now 'Review and Herald', November 1850; it has 13 paragraphs in this article. One of the things you need to see about this article if you are going to be discerning, is that Sister White says that she was shown 10 primary truths. By that I mean in these 13 paragraphs there are 10 times where she says, "The Lord showed me", or, "I was shown". As you go through these paragraphs and look at where she says, "I was shown", she's introducing a brand new truth.

The first paragraph starts:

REVIEW AND HERALD, NOVEMBER 1, 1850

*"Dear Brethren and Sisters—I wish to give you a short sketch of **what the Lord has recently shown to me in vision. I was shown** (Then she talks about the love of God—the point being, the first paragraph she was shown about the love of God.)*

Then in the next paragraph she says:

*"Some, **I saw**, had erred in praying for the sick to be healed before unbelievers."*

Now in this new paragraph she saw something different, and she is not going to talk about the love of God in the second paragraph; she says, "Some, **I saw**, had erred in praying for the sick". This paragraph that she saw was how we were to pray for the sick in agreement with Biblical truth. I am not intending to address each of these things she was shown; I am intending to make the point that she is identifying through this article that she is shown different truths as she proceeds through.

In the third paragraph she says:

*"Then **I was pointed back** to the time that Jesus took his disciples away alone, into an upper room, and first washed their feet, and then gave them to eat of the broken bread, to represent his broken body, and juice of the vine to represent his spilled blood. **I saw** that all should move understandingly, and follow the example of Jesus in these things, and when attending to these ordinances, should be as separate from unbelievers as possible."*

This paragraph, what she was shown, was how we should keep the communion service. So, 'I saw the love of Christ'; 'I saw how we should pray for the sick'; 'I saw how we should do the communion service'; and as you go through these thirteen paragraphs, from this article that is ultimately going to be in 'Experience and Views' and then finally in 'Early Writings', every time she says she is shown something, it is identifying a new piece of information. It's like, she is taken to the first door and the door, is opened

and she sees the love of God. Then she is taken to the next door, it's opened, she sees how we should pray for the sick; the next door, how we should handle communion.

Without reading it all, I have a summary in my notes; She was Shown Ten Primary Truths in these paragraphs:

Love of Christ; offerings; prayer for sick; the communion service; the seven last plagues connected with millennium truths; new light, how you were supposed to handle 'new light'; the gathering after 1844—because in October 22, 1844 there was a scattering; and we know even in 'Early Writings', in that first paragraph, she says, "The Lord stretched out His hand a second time to gather those people that have been scattered." What she is talking about is the scattering of October 22, 1844, after the disappointment, and in 1850, the Lord showed her that He is now gathering His people. So she was shown the gathering; she was shown the publishing work. She was shown that the 1843 chart was directed by the hand of the Lord and it should not be altered. She was shown the 'Daily', that those people that gave the judgment hour cry had the correct view of the 'Daily'. And she was shown that "time should never be a test"; and then she was shown about the foolishness of making pilgrimages to Jerusalem.

So in these 13 paragraphs she is shown, and she says it, she uses the expression, "I was shown", in at least 10 primary truths. Now this is important to see, because this is the original article in the 'Present Truth' November 1, 1850--'Review and Herald', November 1, 1850. Here is the 'Daily' Paragraph; this is the paragraph that the shaking of the early part of the 20th century went on over."

"Then I saw in relation to the 'Daily,' that the word 'sacrifice' was supplied by man's wisdom, and does not belong to the text; and that the Lord gave the correct view of it to those who gave the judgment hour cry. When union existed, before 1844, nearly all were united on the correct view of the 'Daily;' but since 1844, in the confusion, other views have been embraced, and darkness and confusion has followed."

What I want you to see here, it's a new paragraph. It's a new paragraph in this original article—she says:

"The Lord showed me that Time had not been a test since 1844, and that time will never again be a test."

So in grammar, a new paragraph introduces a new truth; but based upon what she is saying in here, she says **"The Lord showed me** that Time has not been a test." She is making a distinction both at the grammatical level, and at the level that the Lord is showing her these various truths, that the subject of 'Time being a Test' is separate from this paragraph about the 'Daily'.

They are separate—they *were* separate; but when you get into the 'Experience and Views', what it does is it takes the last 5 paragraphs from 'Present Truth' November 1, 1850. 13 paragraphs in 'Present Truth' November 1, 1850, but when they are going to reprint it a year later in 'Experience and Views', they just take the last 5 paragraphs of the 13 paragraphs.

'Present Truth' November 1, 1850: This has 13 paragraphs.

In 'Experience and Views', they take the last 5 paragraphs, but they don't turn it into 5 paragraphs—what do they do? They turn it into 4 paragraphs. They take the last 5 paragraphs from 'Present Truth' and they turn it into 4 paragraphs. Now that is important to see, because here one paragraph says; **"The Lord showed me** that Time had not been a test since 1844, and that time will never again be a test." When they reprint it here, they take that paragraph and they combine it with the previous paragraph; and the previous paragraph is about the 'Daily'.

So now they have combined the paragraph about the 'Daily' with the paragraph about 'Time setting'. Ok, they are brought together—but that is not all that is going to get done! That is just the beginning of this evolution. Let me point out one other thing here; in this book, 'Experience and Views' where you will find this listing, what they have taken out of 'Present Truth' November 1, 1850, is on page 61 through 62.

In this book 'Experience and Views' when they printed this in 1851, you'll find a vision on page 48. On page 48 of 'Experience and Views' there is a vision recorded that was from July 21st 1851. So when they take the passage from 'Present Truth' they take the last 5 paragraphs and they put it in 'Experience and Views', they turn it into 4 paragraphs and in this particular book, there's one paragraph on page 48 that came from a totally different vision. The reason you want to note that is because when they print 'Early Writings', they're going to take this paragraph and they are going to put it into those 4 paragraphs in 'Early Writings', they are going to turn 'Early Writings', back into 5 paragraphs.

This is what this paragraph says: it is a totally different vision—here's the paragraph that is on page 48:

“TIME NOT CONNECTED WITH THE THIRD ANGEL”

“The Lord has shown me that the message of the third angel must go, and be proclaimed to the scattered children of the Lord, and that it should not be hung on time; for time never will be a test again. I saw that some were getting a false excitement arising from preaching time; that the third angel's message was stronger than time can be. I saw that this message can stand on its own foundation, and that it needs not time to strengthen it, and that it will go in mighty power, and do its work, and will be cut short in righteousness.” *Experience and Views*, 48.

What's that paragraph about? It's about 'Time Setting', it has no connection with this vision; No connection whatsoever. It's noted 13 pages prior to the passage where this paragraph is put into 'Early Writings', and it's about 'Time Setting'. They're going to take this paragraph—remember—here's what they did; follow me. In here you have the controversial paragraph on the 'Daily', followed by a paragraph on 'Time Setting'. That's in 'Review and Herald', November 1, 1850.

But when they get to 'Experience and Views' 1851, they've turned these into 1 paragraph.

It is now a paragraph about the 'Daily' and 'Time Setting' in 'Experience and Views'. They put them together, the two paragraphs, which is OK—just a grammatical change because this paragraph is just one sentence—a one sentence paragraph, but it said, “The Lord showed me that time will never be a test.”

But when they get to 'Early Writings', after this new paragraph on the 'Daily', which is now a paragraph on the 'Daily' AND 'Time Setting', they're going to insert this paragraph on 'Time Setting'. So now it's a paragraph on the 'Daily' and 'Time Setting' followed by a paragraph on time setting that is from a totally different vision. No relevance, but that is not all they did. Let me show you one other thing they did.

By the way, let each man be fully persuaded in their own mind; but this issue—this paragraph on the 'Daily'—this is the controversy--'Early Writings', 74. I don't see a human hand in this. I don't see people in 1851 that decided that, “OK, we're just going to take the last 5 paragraphs and we're going to turn them into 4 paragraphs”—I don't see men in 1851 saying, “We need to make an argument that the 'Daily' needs to be represented in connection with 'Time Setting' in order to change the 'Daily' view from Paganism to Christ's sanctuary ministry”. I don't see that happening. I can see maybe some type of satanic foresight in that, but not human. I don't even see it in 1882.

But in any case; in 1882 they print 'Early Writings', they have already combined the 'Daily' paragraph with the 'Time Setting' paragraph, and now they are going to put them together in 'Early Writings', page 74, and they're going to insert a second paragraph about 'Time Setting' that was never in there.

But do you know what else they do? This is a little bit tricky to see: the paragraph that follows the 'Daily' paragraph, here in the original, it says this:

"The Lord showed me that Time had not been a test."

In this book it says, "The Lord showed me" but they are going to combine that paragraph with the 'Daily' paragraph and when they do so, they're going to change it to, "I have also seen"; no longer, "The Lord showed me". So it's a bit more vague about whether this is a specific new revelation, or if it's, "I also seen, when I had seen about the 'Daily', I saw this too."

But that is nothing like they do when they get to 'Early Writings', because when they get to 'Early Writings', they leave both of these off. The 5th paragraph that's been combined with the 4th paragraph that originally said, "The Lord Showed me that time is never to be a test"; it was changed to "I have also seen that Time has not been a test"; is now changed to simply, "Time is not a test". There's no reference whatsoever to her being shown.

This paragraph, the 5th paragraph, that had begun with "The Lord Showed me", and then was changed in 1881 to "I have also seen", when you get to it in 'Early Writings', what it says in 'Early Writings', is: "but in the confusion since 1844, other views have been embraced, and darkness and confusion have followed." Then there was a paragraph break that said, "The Lord showed me time has not been a test". But in here they combine this paragraph and it says, "**but in the confusion since 1844, other views have been embraced, and darkness and confusion have followed. Time has not been a test,**" you have no indication whatsoever in 'Early Writings', that this is a different subject that is shown to her—it is totally removed.

So now you have in the controversial 'Daily' paragraph, you have a closing sentence that says "Time has not been a test since 1844 and it never again will be a test." And you have a paragraph added from another vision, that says;

"The Lord has shown me that the message of the third angel must go, and be proclaimed to the scattered children of the Lord, but it must not be hung on time."

You read these Catholic historians in Adventism, and the reason I call them 'Catholic Historians' is that they use the historical technique of re-writing history to establish their own premises, and you will find that they make an argument that this 'Daily' paragraph has to be understood in the context of 'Time Setting', and it impacts many of the Primary arguments over the 'Daily' in the early part of the 20th century.

But more importantly, the one that really bothers me the most, is when A G Daniells in 1931 said that he had an interview with Sister White in 1910 on the 'Daily' and he says in his statement of the interview, he has at least two obvious lies, but one of them is that when he questioned Ellen White about it, all she could remember was that the passage in Early Writings was about 'Time Setting'! Brothers and sisters there was just no way that the passage in 'Early Writings', was about 'Time Setting'! and to suggest that the prophetess had bought into the political argument of her day and age about 'Early Writings', being about 'Time Setting', is to say that this is some bungling old woman that is not being inspired by the Holy Spirit. I reject that.

She wouldn't have made that comment—she couldn't have made that comment, because it was not about 'Time Setting'. She was shown about the 'Daily'; she was shown that the 1843 chart was directed

by the hand of the Lord; she was shown that after 1844, the Lord had stretched out His hand the second time to gather the remnant of his people; she was shown that Time is not a test; they are different thoughts. You can test this; go and test these. Get on your Ellen White CD-ROM, test it out and you'll see what I mean. This is just the starting of this mystery. This is just the beginning of this mystery.

September 23

Now, in the original 13 paragraphs, in 'Present Truth', when she gets to paragraph 8 or 9, she says; September 23rd the Lord showed me; from this point on we know that what she was shown in those final 5 paragraphs, she was shown on September 23rd. What does that matter? Well, it was September 23rd 1850; that's when she was shown this, and one of the things that she was shown on September 23 is;

"When union existed, before 1844, nearly all were united on the correct view of the 'Daily;' but since 1844, in the confusion, other views have been embraced, and darkness and confusion has followed."

They were all united on the correct view of the 'Daily' in 1844, but since 1844, she was told on September 23rd 1850, that other views of the 'Daily' had been embraced and the fruits of those views were darkness and confusion. Follow me?

When did James White begin publishing? In 1849; this is the beginning of the publishing work, 1849. So if you go back into the publishing work you'll find that in March of 1850, James White published an article by David Arnold, and in this article David Arnold teaches that the 'Daily' is the earthly sanctuary that was taken away by the Romans in 70 AD. That's not Paganism is it? That's another view of the 'Daily', but it is not the Pioneer view that the 'Daily' is Paganism. This is published in March of 1850.

In September of 1850, James White publishes an article by O R L Crosier; now this is where the rub comes—you have to understand this one, because this article here—the publication of this article will be used throughout Advent history, and the guy that perpetuates this usage is Willie White. It will be used by Adventists all the way down here to the Omega of Apostasy, as either inference or proof, depending on who's making the argument, that Crosier's view of the 'Daily' is correct. And Crosier's view of the 'Daily, he doesn't say it specifically, but I don't argue—he infers that the 'Daily' is Christ's sanctuary ministry. But he doesn't say it specifically.

So what I am saying is, as you go back to this history, people like Leroy Froom, W C White, Heidi Hieks, the modern guys from Prescott onward, if they think they can infer that Crosier's position is right and lead you to believe that the 'Daily' is Christ's sanctuary ministry, they do so. But sometimes they don't infer, they try to make an argument that Sister White here, places an endorsement on Crosier's position of the Daily being Christ's sanctuary ministry; that she's giving an inspired interpretation of that passage; and why do they do this? Now when I ask why do they do this, I am going to give two answers to this; they're going to make this claim based upon an endorsement of Crosier's article by Ellen White, that's why they do it, because of Sister White's endorsement. But also this answers the reason about why James White would republish Crosier's article in September of 1850.

So I am going to read to you now, Sister White's endorsement of Crosier's article from 'Word to the Little Flock' page 12. And what's "A Word to the Little Flock"? That is the first publication of James and Ellen White.

MAY, 1847

"Topsham, April 21, 1847 "To Brother Eli Curtis, New York City . . . "I believe the Sanctuary, to be cleansed at the end of the 2300 days, is the New Jerusalem Temple, of which Christ is a minister.

The Lord shew me in vision, more than one year ago, (*So if she wrote it in April 1847, when did the Lord shew her in vision? more than a year ago? In 1846.*) that Brother Crosier had the true light, on the cleansing of the Sanctuary, &c; and that it was his will, that Brother C. should write out the view which he gave us in the *Day-Star, Extra*, February 7, 1846. I feel fully authorized by the Lord, to recommend that Extra, to every saint.

"I pray that these lines may prove a blessing to you, and all the dear children who may read them." *A Word to the Little Flock*, 12.

Sister White recommends the Day Star Extra of Crosier to every saint and in it she says he gives the correct view of the sanctuary. But as he gives the correct view of the sanctuary, he infers that the 'Daily' is Christ's sanctuary ministry. So because Sister White says, "The Lord shew me in vision, more than one year ago, that Brother Crosier had the true light, on the cleansing of the Sanctuary, &c; and that it was his will, that Brother C. should write out the view which he gave us in the *Day-Star, Extra*, February 7, 1846. I feel fully authorized by the Lord, to recommend that Extra, to every saint." Therefore, Sister White put her seal of approval on his article and everything in it is perfect. Some people actually make that claim. But that does not stand the test of historical analysis. That isn't how the Pioneers of Adventism understood that.

In that statement, this is why the controversy of Crosier exists, because of Ellen White's endorsement; but this is also why James White republishes it. Because there isn't any of these 'Day-Star Extras' from 1846 that are still around in 1850; they're all gone; but because Ellen White has endorsed his view, James White, in fulfillment of being told, "I recommend this to every saint", he's going to reprint it in the Review and Herald so every saint can have it. You follow me? That's why he is doing it; but it is her endorsement also that allows people to stumble over this history or misrepresent it.

I want to look at Crosier's article a little bit here, and I have it all in the notes, but I want to find a couple of historic comments to read into this record to start with. This is from P. Gerard Damsteegt, *Foundations of the Seventh-day Adventist Message and Mission*, 125, concerning Crosier's article. See, Crosier's article had 8 sections; one of those sections was on the sanctuary; that's the section where the whole battle takes place. There were 8 sections in Crosier's article that Sister White recommended to every saint, and only one of them is where the controversy surrounds.

"She [Ellen Harmon] said: 'The Lord showed me in vision, more than one year ago, that Brother Crosier had the true light, on the cleansing of the Sanctuary, &c; and that it was His will that Brother C. should write out the view which he gave us in the *Day Star Extra*, February 7, 1846. I feel fully authorized by the Lord, to recommend that Extra, to every saint' (Letter. E. G. White to Curtis, *Word to the Little Flock*, 12). **Seventh-day Adventists have usually interpreted this statement to mean that Crosier's presentations were not without mistakes, but that his major typological argumentation was correct. Reprints of the article omitted the aspects which the felt to be inaccurate.**" P. Gerard Damsteegt, *Foundations of the Seventh-day Adventist Message and Mission*, 125.

The historians of Adventism, the certified historians of Adventism, they never claim that James and Ellen White thought that everything in Crosier's article was correct, because they know that when they did reprint it, they purposely left out – like the one section on the millennium, where Crosier taught that there was going to be a thousand years of peace. If you're going to use Ellen White's endorsement of Crosier's article as if everything he said was true, then you have to believe that Jesus somehow comes and then ushers in a thousand years of peace on Planet Earth, because that's what Crosier taught in this article.

And Damsteegt is saying that isn't how to relate to her endorsement and no one in Advent History ever did; but here at the End of the World, in the fourth generation of Adventism, where we are buried with all this darkness—some people will lead you to believe that her endorsement says that everything that Crosier wrote is true, and that is just historically dishonest.

Now here's another quote from W A Spicer:

“Sad to say, young Crosier walked in the light of the Sabbath truth but a very little time. He later repudiated the sanctuary teaching that he had helped to establish. **Our pioneer brethren reprinted his exposition on the sanctuary several times in their early papers, (that is not true) but they never could reprint his complete document.** In it he had added to the sanctuary exposition some ideas on the age to come—a temporal millennium, with a glorious age on this earth at the Second Advent. **These things our brethren always omitted.** These teachings of the age to come were all abroad in those days. The doctrine never fitted in with the definite advent message; and doubtless this leaven of error helped to lead the younger men away from the Sabbath and the sanctuary truths. He soon turned to bitter opposition to our early movement.”
W. A. Spicer, *Review and Herald*, December 14, 1939.

Never Could Reprint His Complete Document

So everyone that's a certified historian agrees; and Spicer is on the wrong side of the 'Daily', but here is a man that is on the wrong side of the 'Daily' but is still not willing to argue that Sister White's endorsement of Crosier is upholding his understanding of the 'Daily'; he knew there were errors and they were never reprinted.

Here's where it gets tricky; there are 8 sections in Crosier's article; 4 of those 8 sections were never, ever, ever reprinted in Adventism. You may not think that what we are doing here is significant or important, but it is. So bear in mind, where this gets you shows absolutely crystal clear that the 'Daily' cannot be Christ's sanctuary ministry, from history. So try to follow me even as difficult as it may be. Here are the titles of the 8 sections of Crosier's article:

EIGHT SECTIONS OF CROSIER'S ARTICLE: THE LAW OF MOSES; THE LEGAL TYPES AND ANTITYPES; THE SANCTUARY; (This is the one that is the controversy) THE PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST; THE ANTITYPE; THE AGE TO COME; THE SCAPE-GOAT; THE TRANSITION.

When Spicer says they reprinted his article several times, that's simply not true, he may think so but it isn't true, unless his idea of several times equates to two or three times. When I hear someone say several times I think they reprinted it 10 or 15 times, there was just a few times when any of them were reprinted, but four of the sections were never reprinted.

FOUR SECTIONS NEVER REPRINTED: THE LAW OF MOSES; THE LEGAL TYPES AND ANTITYPES; THE AGE TO COME; THE TRANSITION.

FOUR SECTIONS REPRINTED: **THE SANCTUARY**; THE PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST; THE ANTITYPE; THE SCAPE-GOAT.

Those four sections, James White printed in September, 1850. Focus in on this: James White takes four of the eight sections of Crosier's article that he is willing to reprint; But in order to do it they add up to so much material that he has to print 2 publications. So at the beginning of September 1850, he prints 'The Present Truth' (Review and Herald) vol. 1 #3. And then, immediately thereafter in September, he prints the conclusion of Crosier's article in vol. 1 #4. So in 3 and 4 what he has printed, he's got 'The Sanctuary' and part of 'The Priesthood' in #3 here; and in #4 he has 'The Priesthood', 'The Antitype' and 'The Scapegoat'.

In the book, 'Facsimiles of Early Seventh-day Adventist Periodicals' you can find these articles we are discussing in here. It's in Volume 3 that he deals with the Sanctuary section and he reprints Crosier's view of the 'Daily' that is inferred to be Christ's sanctuary ministry. He finishes the section on the Sanctuary, begins the Priesthood, and then he finishes what he is going to print of Crosier's in #4. These were both printed in the early part of September 1850.

Then do you know what happens? Ellen White has a vision on September 23rd, 1850. And what does James White do? He prints a 'Special' publication at the end of September—this is after these first two in September—he prints three times in September; and the third time he prints is after September 23rd, 1850. And imagine this: he reprints Crosier's section on the sanctuary in this article again, BUT he removes what he says about the 'Daily' being Christ's sanctuary ministry! Why did he remove it? Because his wife on September 23rd was shown that since 1844 other views than the Daily being Paganism had been brought in; Arnold's view—the 'Daily' the earthly sanctuary; Crosier's view—the 'Daily' Christ's sanctuary ministry. Since 1844 other views had been brought in and darkness and confusion has followed; and immediately thereafter, James White prints his third publication in September of 1850, and he removes what Crosier says about the 'Daily' in this one; follow me?

Historically James and Ellen White rejected that the 'Daily' was Christ's sanctuary ministry in September of 1850 and anyone that wants to look at the history can see this fact.

This is just the starting of the story; the only other time Crosier's articles were printed was in 1852. In 1852 they're printed again, and that's vol. 3 # 10, 11 and 12; printed in three different issues. But in this history, when it was reprinted, the sanctuary was not included. What Crosier said about the sanctuary was only printed two times in Advent history; at the beginning of September when it had the false view of the 'Daily' and at the end of September when the false view of the 'Daily' was removed. In these publications in 1852, the section on the sanctuary was not reprinted; the other three sections were printed. So when Spicer mistakenly says that it was printed several times in Advent history, well the reality of it is, Crosier's article as the subject of this history, it's only the section on the sanctuary and that was only printed two times; and it was printed in 1850 with the error in it, and after James White was told by his wife, 'you know you are printing false views of the 'Daily' and you're bringing in darkness and confusion', James White immediately reprinted and took that error out.

Now the plot thickens. The only other time that Crosier's article has been printed in Advent history unless it has been reprinted here in the modern times, I don't know about that; but it was in 1931. Does 1931 sound like a pivotal year in Advent history? And it's printed by Willie White; and if this was a court of law, not only would this piece of evidence be rejected by the judge and jury, be cast out—they would hold Willie White liable for perjury. You may claim that when he wrote these things out that he somehow made an accident—that may be, when Willie White's hauled into court to be tried for perjury, he may make that claim, "Well I didn't mean to say it that way", or, "It slipped my attention", and they may exonerate him. But the evidence is this is perjury. Stay with me if you are going to follow this—this is where the plot really thickens.

In this article where the wrong view of the sanctuary of Crosier's is printed, in these publications, they were printed in two columns side by side. So if you go into this article, in the section on the sanctuary, but not the part where Crosier's teaching the wrong view of the 'Daily', there are several paragraphs in the section on the Sanctuary, evidently, from my conclusion, when they printed it at this time they dropped off a column. You can go to this particular publication in here and you can see that it's missing a whole column. It's missing just over six paragraphs. But it does not impact the argument about what Crosier is saying about the 'Daily' being Christ's sanctuary ministry, but it is from the Sanctuary. What I am saying is, the only time in Advent history when Crosier's wrong view of the 'Daily' was printed by Sabbatarian Adventists, was this publication; (Volume 1, #3, in September 1850.) But in this publication,

six paragraphs were missed by the publishers; they dropped off through some publishing flaw, for whatever reason.

When Willie White publishes this, he claims he copied this from this issue, but he has the six missing paragraphs, and there is no way he could have copied those six missing paragraphs from this issue, because they were not there. Something's fishy there.

Now he has an introduction, Willie does, [In the note material the various articles are included for your study as they are impacted by our presentation here.] this is found in the introduction of this book:

THE CROSIER ARTICLE ON *THE SANCTUARY* (EXPLANATORY NOTE) [written by W C White in October 1931] "This article, *The Sanctuary* was printed in the *Day-Star Extra* in 1846. Regarding it, Mrs. White wrote in a letter to Brother Eli Curtis under date of April 21, 1847:

"I believe the Sanctuary to be cleansed at the end of the 2300 days, is the New Jerusalem Temple, of which Christ is a minister. The Lord shew me in vision, more than one year ago, that Brother Crosier had the true light, on the cleansing of the Sanctuary, etc; and that it was His will, that Brother C. should write out the view which he gave us in the *Day-Star Extra*, February 7, 1846. I feel fully authorized by the Lord, to recommend that Extra, to every saint." *A Word to the Little Flock*, printed in 1847.

"In the *Advent Review* of September 1850, the Crosier article was reprinted, **seemingly in full.** [*He knew it wasn't printed in full; they never reprinted it in full. It had eight sections; the most they ever reprinted was four; but he says 'seemingly in full'.*]

"In the *Advent Review*, printed at Auburn, in 1850, this article was again reprinted, but two and a half very important paragraphs were omitted. [*That's the Special*] These were also omitted in a partial reprint of the article in the *Review and Herald* of September 1852. [*In this reprint the Sanctuary section was not even in there. He's leading you to believe that they reprinted the Sanctuary section in 1852 and they left out his commentary on the 'Daily' being Christ's sanctuary ministry, and they shouldn't have done it—well they didn't even include the 'Sanctuary' section in this one!*]

"These essential two and a half paragraphs omitted from the later reprints of the article have been copied in this document, **in italics**, [*And when you go through here you'll find that Crosier's statement where he's inferring that the 'Daily' is Christ's sanctuary ministry, is in italics. That's what Willie is saying.*] in order to clearly point out to the reader the portion omitted from the later reprints. They will be found on pages 3 and 4 of this copy.

"[**CD-ROM Editor's Note: The italics have been lost.**] [*They KNOW that these paragraphs were lost here, so their commentary, You can get this article by W C White printed or you can download it—and when you download this identical thing on the CD-ROM, you're also going to have with it the commentary by those who prepared the CD-ROM; and they will lead you to believe—they'll try to make you think--they'll do some trickery with which section is lost because they know there were six paragraphs in here that weren't included in that September 1850 reprint. They add to the confusion, there's no doubt about it, and it's almost purposeful as you read through it, but it is very difficult to explain in this fashion—you have to go through it very carefully.*]

"Before copying this article, all Scripture references have been verified. For the convenience of the reader the figures used in the Scripture references have been changed from the Roman numerals to the Arabic. Where references were made, giving, "ch." referring to a book before mentioned, we have in each case substituted the name of the book. Illustrating this is the last Scripture reference in the first paragraph of page 4. It read, "ch. 8:1-2." In this copy it has been written "Hebrews 8:1, 2."

“Several very evident errors have been corrected in Scripture references and in a few cases where there was a seeming error we have used the reference given, and added “see” and we have given what we believe to be the correct reference.

“The long paragraphs have been broken up to make the article more readable.

“These mechanical changes have been made to render the article more easily read and more useful for study.” W. C. WHITE. October 9, 1931.

That’s the introduction, so at the end of this, what Willie White does is he reprints Crosier’s entire article on the ‘Sanctuary’ here; and that’s never been printed in full, James White tried to do it here, but it was missing six paragraphs. When James White did it in the September Special, he removed the portion where he said the ‘Daily’ is Christ’s sanctuary ministry; and then at the very close of this, Willie White says: **“Copied from *Advent Review*, Volume 1, Numbers 3 & 4, September 1850.”** He says he copied them from here—it’s not possible he copied it from here! Where this was copied from was Crosier’s original article; he copied this from Crosier’s, and he’s telling us he copied it from the September 1850 reprints!

Now why is he doing that? In our next presentation there is more to build on this, because Prescott begins to infer it; Daniells upholds it; but from my study the historical figure that puts it in place is Willie White. Puts what in place? The argument that ‘Early Writings’ has to be understood in the context of ‘Time Setting’; in the next presentation we will look over why Willie White says about that and what Arthur White says about that and then we will go in and look at A G Daniells supposed interview with Sister White in 1910, and realize that the darkness that is enveloping Adventism at this time—it’s a tragedy to have to name names, but as other’s have said, Sister White told Loughborough concerning her son Willie, concerning the fact that he had joined forces with Daniells and Prescott, she told Loughborough, “They have Willie!” Willie got drawn into the wrong side of this issue, and once the resident historian on the Spirit of Prophecy was on the wrong side of the issue, things were put in place in the historical record that are kind of difficult to see.

So what I am saying is this: the development of ‘Early Writings’, the evolution of it, there’s no justification historically or grammatically for placing the ‘Daily’ paragraph in the context of ‘Time Setting’. There’s not a statement about ‘Time Setting’ in that paragraph.

The argument about Crosier’s article, giving either inference or evidence that the ‘Daily’ is Christ’s sanctuary ministry—the historical evidence is PROOF that James and Ellen White rejected that position that the ‘Daily’ was Christ’s sanctuary ministry. If they didn’t, there was no reason for James to respond to her vision on September 23rd and immediately reprint and remove Crosier’s position. We don’t hear that history. This is evidence that we don’t hear that history. In 1931 we’re being taught just the opposite. Willie White is saying ‘the important paragraphs that were omitted were the important paragraphs where Crosier teaches that Christ’s sanctuary ministry is the ‘Daily.’ We’re being misled by this very history of September 23rd 1850 and ‘Early Writings’ page 74.

In the conclusion we want to show you why ‘Early Writings’ page 74, is the Alpha, and ‘Early Writings’ page 236, is the Omega. Shall we pray?

Heavenly Father, we are alarmed and startled as we recognize the history that has taken place since the early 1880s, when we as a people turned away from the authority of the Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy, and then led into the Minneapolis meetings with the philosophical justification of rejecting the Latter Rain; crucifying the Holy Spirit; and officially rejecting the Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy. Once on that course we’ve done nothing but go deeper and deeper into darkness, building a platform and foundation of our understanding of the Bible that is built upon sand and is soon to be swept away by the coming Sunday Law crisis; and as we see this history we are overwhelmed with our inability as

human beings to do much about this situation, except to try to personally prepare for the crisis, and hopefully, awaken and warn some of those who are willing to hear before the crisis hits.

We ask that You would put Your blessing upon this particular study that Brother Duane is doing in the sense that we know that we have nothing to fear for the future except as we forget the Lord's teaching and leading in our past history and experience. And that even though this history is dark and very sad, we wish to be benefitted by it and we ask that You would allow Your Holy Spirit to bring that benefit to our hearts and minds.

We give you thanks for this light that you are bringing to us; we give you thanks for this day that many in this country, this is the only time they take all year long to think about thanking You. We thank You for the sacrifice of Your Son, which took place in the midst of the week in the middle of that 2520 days that He confirmed the covenant; we thank you for these things—in Jesus name—Amen.