

The Desolations of Jerusalem 03

From a Presentation by Duane Dewey 11, 2011

Transcription by Sister Grace

Minor editing for readability by P G Temple

Good morning again, we are going to continue our study on the Desolations of Jerusalem, before we begin, all who can, can we please kneel.

Loving Father in heaven, again this morning dear Lord we want to examine by your Holy Spirit, the things that belong to our peace and to our safety. Dear Lord, there has been a fountain open for sin and uncleanness and we claim this morning dear Lord that through the blood of Jesus that things presented here Lord will have an impact on the heart and the mind, that they will see that the messages that stirred the people to come out of Babylon so long ago are the messages today that will stir our own hearts and give to us dear Lord the cleansing in both heart and mind that we need. Lord please be with me this morning as we open the scriptures and the history of the events involving our own denomination. Please help us to see these histories as they need to be seen, as a means that will be remedial and that we will see in them dear Lord your voice to us personally saying, "Come, give me thine heart", and we will do these things Lord. We ask in Jesus name, Amen.

As I mentioned in my prayer, these talks, I hope will be remedial for those who have been here and those who are watching, you will have to forgive me in some respects for my humanity. As I began to understand these issues, it touched me, when we left off yesterday, we were discussing the adaptation of the Historical Method of Biblical Interpretation and translation brought into the Seventh-day Adventist church in the 1930's up through the 1960's.

Now this method of understanding the Biblical languages, ancient history, chronology, archaeology, and ancient Bible manuscripts was employed by the church by sending our people to other universities than our own, to be retrained as Bible scholars. And although that endeavour was first done under what these men and women saw as an expectable form, if you read carefully for yourself this history and if you look around and see for yourselves what this has done in the church, you will recognise right away that this was not the right course to take. And it also is in full disagreement with the counsel given by Ellen White.

Now with that being said, I want to re-emphasise that even the man who wrote the book that we have been looking at, 'The Role of Biblical Hermeneutics in Preserving Church Unity' by Raymond Cottrell, none of the people that were involved in this are the enemies. We only have one enemy in this controversy and that is Satan. Our talks this week are not to be directed against people, but are to be directed to the source or the cause of the problem within our own church and that is because we have been under a heavy attack by an enemy that has gone unrecognised. And so we want to emphasise that our issues are not with human beings.

The vital truth that we have been given as Seventh-day Adventists, the third angels message to be given to the world with power and glory, it is through the messages of the first second and third angels messages that the world will be attracted to the beauty and the salvation proffered to them, and the atoning sacrifice of Christ, and with that, I want to continue the discussion this morning on whether or not it is indeed true that this Historical Method will bring unity to the church. Before I get back to the text of Raymond Cottrell's book, I wanted to read something to you. I was going to save this for later but I realised that with these talks this week I am going to run out of time, so I want to get this in.

The truths we are see behind me on these two charts (1843 & 1850 charts) are the Everlasting Gospel and there is a statement that you have heard many times by many of us who have been giving this message throughout the times that we have been doing it here. This is from Review Herald, November 25, 1884 and it's from 'Notes of travel' by Mrs Ellen G White.

She gave this in a talk at Portland Maine her home town where she was born. The part that we are familiar with is towards the end of the article and it says this:

"Those who are engaged in proclaiming the third angel's message are searching the Scriptures upon the same plan that Father Miller adopted. In the little book entitled "Views of the Prophecies and Prophetic Chronology," Father Miller gives the following simple but intelligent and important rules for Bible study and interpretation:{RH, November 25, 1884 par. 23}

"1. Every word must have its proper bearing on the subject presented in the Bible; 2. All Scripture is necessary, and may be understood by diligent application and study; 3. Nothing revealed in Scripture can or will be hid from those who ask in faith, not wavering; 4. To understand doctrine, bring all the scriptures together on the subject you wish to know, then let every word have its proper influence; and if you can form your theory without a contradiction, you cannot be in error; 5. Scripture must be its own expositor, since it is a rule of itself. If I depend on a teacher to expound to me, and he should guess at its meaning, or desire to have it so on account of his sectarian creed, or to be thought wise, then his guessing, desire, creed, or wisdom is my rule, and not the Bible." {Ibid par. 24}

So Sister White is telling us here that our rule is the Bible and the Bible alone and she is recommending what I just read were five of the rules of William Miller. Now she is making this statement at the end of a series of comments that she made as she revisited her home town after not seeing for fifty years. She says:

"We reached Portland about ten o'clock Tuesday evening, Sept. 9. Wednesday we rode twelve miles to Gorham to visit my sister, who has been an invalid six years from acute rheumatism. The suffering one awakened sorrow and called out deep sympathy; but we could do nothing to stay the progress of disease. We could only pray for and with her, and leave her in the hands of a compassionate Redeemer." {Ibid, par. 1}

"While in Portland, in company with Sr. McOmer, I visited localities of special interest in connection with my early life, among them the spot where I met with the accident that has made me a life-long invalid. This misfortune, which for a time seemed so bitter and was so hard to bear, has proved to be a blessing in disguise. The cruel blow which blighted the joys of earth, was the means of turning my eyes to heaven. I might never have known Jesus, had not the sorrow that clouded my early years led me to seek comfort in him." {Ibid, par. 2}

This I think is a very important piece of this history. Now at home I have two little birds, I have been trying to train one of them, excuse me, the marine court hymn from the halls of Montezuma and the little bird has almost got it learned, she is very cute when she starts off. We taught her first the wolf whistle, and she got that right away, but then when she decided to try her best at the Marine Corp hymn, I was so thrilled one morning, she just started singing it on her own and it was quite a little experience. So Sister White says here:

"I have read of a little bird that while his cage is full of light never sings the songs his master would teach him. He will listen, and learn a snatch of this, a trill of that, but never a separate and entire melody. But the master covers his cage, and then, in the dark, he listens to the one song he is to sing. He tries and tries again to sing that song, until it is learned (*and that's what my little bird would do*), and he breaks forth in perfect melody; and then the cage is uncovered, and ever after he can sing it in the light. Thus

God deals with his creatures. He has a song to teach us, and when we have learned it amid the deep shadows of affliction, we can sing it ever afterward." {Ibid, par. 3}

Now she says:

"I passed the spot where the house once stood where Jesus revealed himself to me in power, and I seemed to see his blessed face beaming upon me in divine love and gentleness..."

Now for those who don't think that Christ is in this history, let me read that again:

"I passed the spot where the house once stood where Jesus revealed himself to me in power, and I seemed to see his blessed face beaming upon me in divine love and gentleness. I also visited my early home, and the house where my first vision was given me; but railroad buildings have crowded out many dwellings that used to stand in this locality. In the chamber of the last-mentioned house, I once passed a night of anguish at the thought that I must go out and relate to others the things that God had presented before me. I shrank from this work in timidity and fear; **the cross** (*notice, if you don't think the cross is in this history*) seemed so heavy that it would crush me. How clearly I remembered the experience of forty years ago, when my light went out in darkness because I was unwilling to lift this cross, and refused to be obedient. I shall never forget the agony of my soul when I felt the frown of God upon me. I was urged to attend a meeting in my father's house. The brethren and sisters bore me in the arms of their faith to a pitying Redeemer..."

Now notice this, Sister White says something that has always puzzled me throughout the years and am sure it's puzzled everybody that read it, but she says we are in great danger or jeopardy she says until we understand the right action of the will. Now you are going to get the answer to your puzzle, she is going to explain it for you right here.

Continues... "The brethren and sisters bore me in the arms of their faith to a pitying Redeemer. (*She says these words*) I surrendered my will (*that's what it means to be in jeopardy until we understand the right action of the will, the will must be surrendered*), feeling that I would do anything if the Lord would once more let his light shine upon me. I was delivered from darkness and despair, and restored to the favor of Heaven. I then lifted my cross, and have not since tried to exchange it for a lighter one." {Ibid, par. 4}

"It has been my lot to be chastened by affliction, which has had a softening and subduing influence, removing enmity from my heart, and filling it with sympathy and love. My life of bereavement, pain, and suffering has not been without precious revealings of the presence of my Saviour. My eyes have been attracted to the heavens that shine in beauty above us; I have obtained glimpses of the eternal world and of the exceeding great reward. When all has seemed dark, there has been a rift in the clouds, and sunbeams from the throne have dispersed the gloom. God would not have any of us remain pressed down by dumb sorrow, with sore and breaking hearts. He would have us look up to catch the rainbow of promise, and reflect light to others." {Ibid, par. 5}

This is the vision of Revelation 10 where the rainbow is over the head of the angel.

"Oh, the blessed Saviour stands by many whose eyes are so blinded by tears that they do not discern him. He longs to clasp our hands firmly, while we cling to him in simple faith, imploring him to guide us. It is our privilege to rejoice in God. If we will let the comfort and peace of Jesus into our lives, we shall be kept close to his great heart of love." {Ibid, par. 6}

She says:

"I felt the deepest interest in the meeting in Portland (*she was once again after forty years going to address the people of Portland Maine with the third angel's message*), where my childhood and youth were passed. Some of my old school-mates made themselves known to me on the ground. I also met a

number of relatives who were my neighbors forty years ago. It afforded me great pleasure to meet and greet these old friends. {Ibid, par. 7}

“Strict order was observed on the ground. At nine or half past, the bell was rung for retiring, and after that no meeting or loud talking was allowed (*We should take a lesson*). At five, at the sound of the bell, the camp was astir, preparing for the morning meeting in the pavilion. I was gratified to see the full attendance at this early hour.” {Ibid, par. 8}

“The practice which prevails in camp-meetings held by some denominations, of continuing the meetings to a late hour...” (*She goes on to say that is not good*) {Ibid, 1884 par. 9}

“Wednesday evening the Lord gave me strength to bear my testimony. What emotions filled my heart as I stood before the people of my native city. It was here that I received my first impressions in regard to the speedy, personal coming of our Lord. Here my father's family, including myself, were excluded from the Methodist church for cherishing this blessed hope (*I wish I had been there*). I knew there were none in the congregation who had been active workers in the message of the first and second angels. And yet this city was favored with special light and privileges in the great movement of 1842-4. A large company accepted the faith (*she is talking about the one she was speaking to in 1884 when she says this*), and rejoiced in the glad tidings that Jesus was soon coming. Many more would have taken their position with the waiting, watching ones, had not the ministers warned them against attending the Adventist meetings, telling them that it was as great a sin to listen to these doctrines as to attend a theater.” {Ibid, par. 11}

She was facing the same hurdles as the Millerites faced in the 1840's as in 1844.

“A few paragraphs from a letter written in reference to the revival in Portland under Father Miller's labors will give a good idea of the character of his work. At the time, he was "lecturing to crowded congregations in the Casco-street church on his favorite theme, the end of the world and the literal reign of Christ for one thousand years." Eld. L. D. Fleming wrote of these meetings:-- {Ibid, par. 12}

These are the very sermons that Ellen White witnessed and heard for herself that brought her family the light of the first and second angel's messages. Now this is an account:

"Things here are moving powerfully. Last evening about two hundred requested prayers, and the interest seems constantly increasing. The whole city seems agitated. Bro. Miller's lectures have not the least effect to frighten people; they are far from it. The great alarm is among those who do not come near them. Many who stay away and oppose, seem excited, and perhaps alarmed; but those who candidly hear are far from excitement or alarm." {Ibid, par. 13}

"The interest awakened by his lectures is of the most deliberate and dispassionate kind; though this is the greatest revival I ever saw, yet there is the least passionate excitement about it. It seems to take a deep hold on the main part of the community. What produces the effect is this: (*And I love this*) Bro. Miller simply takes the sword of the Spirit, unsheathed, and lays its sharp edge on the naked heart, and it cuts; that is all. Before the edge of this mighty weapon, infidelity falls and Universalism withers; false foundations vanish, and Babel's merchants wonder. It seems to me that this must be a little the nearest to apostolic revivals of anything that modern times have witnessed." {Ibid, par. 14}

That's this history (*Millerite history*)

“A little later he wrote:” {Ibid, par. 15}

This is written by L.D. Fleming. You can look him up; he has some things to say.

"There has probably never been so much religious interest among the inhabitants of this place, generally, as at present... {Ibid, par. 16}

And he goes through describing the people that used to be rum sellers and closed their rum shops

"In short, it would be almost impossible to give an adequate idea of the interest now felt in the city. There is nothing like extravagant excitement, but an almost universal solemnity on the minds of all the people. One of the principal booksellers informed me that he had sold more Bibles in one month since Mr. Miller came here than in any four months previous..." {Ibid, par. 18}

Then Ellen White says:

"These statements I know to be true. And as under the first and second angel's messages the truth was proclaimed without excitement or extravagance, so the work goes forward under the message of the third angel. The discourses on the Portland camp-ground were not of an emotional character, but appealed to the intellect; and many listened with deep interest to the evidences of our faith. Some, like the noble Bereans, began to search the Scriptures prayerfully to see if these things are so. Others were unmoved; they were content with their position and doctrines, and did not wish to make any change." {Ibid, par. 19}

"Some passed our tent talking of the meetings. All expressed a favorable opinion, and acknowledged that a great deal of good instruction was given, which, if heeded, would prove a lasting benefit. One inquired, with considerable earnestness, "Well, what do you think of the Sabbath question, and the statement that the first-day Sabbath is a papal institution?" The answer came, "As for the Sabbath, I pay no attention to that. I just let the arguments go into one ear and out of the other. Why, the whole world keeps Sunday." {Ibid, par. 20}

What she is telling you here is, when she addressed the people of Portland in 1884, she presented the First, Second and Third Angels' Messages, and under the proclamation of the Third Angel's Message, there is a warning about receiving the Mark of the Beast, and in so doing the last controversy that the world will face, the Sabbath issue was presented in her home town in 1884 and it was over the Sabbath issue and some would say "Well, I just let it go in one ear and out the other".

"Here is a message from God presenting Bible evidence that they are keeping holy a common working day; that they are reverencing an institution of the papacy instead of the one established by Jehovah; and they care not whether it is genuine or spurious as long as the world accepts it. If Jesus were on earth, he could say of them, as he did of the Pharisees of old, "In vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." {Ibid, par. 21}

And it's after giving you this that she implores you to study the Bible as Father Miller did. Now I would suggest that for those who believe that the way Father Miller studied his Bible and the way that Ellen White studied her Bible, the way that James White and all the other pioneers studied their Bible according to Raymond Cottrell is a bunch of foolishness, they should take a close look at this and match wits with the history and with what Ellen White is saying and if they do, they will recognise that what the pioneers hammered out through prayer and through the guidance of the Holy Spirit through studying their Bibles without knowing one lick of Hebrew, mind you, they stood on an eternal platform that's called the First, Second and Third Angels' Messages. And with that now, we are going to examine what the progress is within the Adventist denomination in the middle of the 20th century and forwards into the 21st century and now replacing with, separating us from this good advice, for many years, they have introduced the new method. And we are now going to take a little closer look at their method in comparison with what we just read.

We left off yesterday with a description of how we sent some of our men to other universities to get training in the Biblical languages, ancient history, chronology, archaeology and ancient Bible manuscripts.

“They gradually came to realize the importance of the principles and procedures of the historical method in forming an accurate understanding of the Bible.” {The Role of Biblical Hermeneutics in Preserving Unity in the Church, pg.7}

According to this writer, if you have an accurate understanding of the Bible, you will not stand on this foundation (charts); you will throw it out, if you have an accurate understanding of the Bible, according to him (Raymond Cottrell). You know I find it interesting that this whole -- begins to really come to its head 100 after years after this movement; this is in the 1940's when this takes place. He is going to describe something to you that you need to know. He says:

“It was my privilege to become familiar with the historical method in the early 1940's, while teaching religion at Pacific Union College. As chairman of the Bible Research Fellowship (BRF) ...” {Ibid. pg.7}

You need to make a note of the BRF, (Bible Research Fellowship). You will have to excuse me because I am going to bring some stuff in, that I planed to do it a little differently but I have to share this with you. Now, in this article that we are reading by Raymond Cottrell, there is also mention of an article that is in this book, that he quotes from entitled 'The Bible Research Fellowship'. This is an article on the very thing that he is mentioning, and he wrote this article too; this is by Raymond Cottrell.

He gives you a brief history like he is doing here. (photo in article) This is a picture of the men who were part of the early formation of the Bible Research Fellowship. He tells you in here that this was a fellowship that was non-official, it was not part of the General Conference. It was a group of men who had got their training outside of our universities. They came back inside the confines of our teaching institutions and they formed the Bible Research Fellowship amongst themselves. In so doing they had an open and free atmosphere to examine what they believed from their studies that they learned from these universities.

One man would write on a subject, whatever it might be – the nature of Christ, or the sanctuary, or the daily, or whatever it might be. He listed various subjects for instance, the soul-winning motif; the two covenants; the shut door; the king of the Lombard's; the Jubilee calendar; before the veil; Melchizedek; this generation; the divorce question; the deity of Christ; the sealing of the saints; the Three Angels' Messages; developing of the Mystery of Iniquity; the place of Christ in spiritualism; spiritual significance of the sanctuary; the four divisions of Alexander's empire; and the list goes on and on. These men were re-examining the great truths that were laid in this history (Millerite history) and in so doing, they were changing this history because what they would do...this is Elder Caviness, he was the one that was the leader of it. And this man here is Elder Denton E Rebock, he was the second president of the theological seminary, he was also a member of this thing, the BRF. And what these men would do, they would present their papers amongst themselves to their colleagues and then all their colleagues would criticize their work and try to help them to improve on it.

So for Raymond Cottrell and these men, who believed that this new method was the best thing since sliced bread that was brought into the church, they thought that they were advancing the Seventh-day Adventist church by bringing in new light. Ellen White says that new light will never contradict the old. Eventually this idea begins to grow, look at this picture, you are getting a look here at what happened to Jerusalem, you are Nehemiah on his mule as you take a look at this, and your looking over the city at night. Now these were all good people according to what I have read and I am sure they were, but the generation today that are facing what they have done, are not prepared for what is about to take place. The picture here on the bottom left is Raymond Cottrell in his earlier days. Now, he says here:

“The influence of the Bible Research Fellowship did not cease with formal termination of its activities (*It was finally disbanded in 1952, it lasted ten year, (we’ll go over the reason why in a minute)*). In ten short years it made an impact on the denomination that has virtually affected church life and work. (*that’s an understatement*). There were both immediate, tangible results, and less tangible but equally important long-range results. The principal tangible results consisted of: 1. A permanent General Conference office of Bible research, established in 1952, the year of transition.” {The Bible Research Fellowship, pg.50}

I’ll get to this ‘transition’ he refers to in a minute, you’re going to enjoy this.

We had a 1990 Bible Conference back then in the beginning of the century, and in 1952 we have another Bible Conference. The reason we had to have the 1952 Bible Conference is because of the influence of the Bible Research Fellowship as they are an ad hoc group that they are not official and their work in Biblical investigation caused such an uproar down the southern hemisphere in Australia, that now brother Branson is getting heat from the brethren down in Australia over brother Louis Were. Because Louis Were showed up at the 1952 General Conference at his own expense, because at the 1950 General Conference, they had already taken away his ministerial credentials in Australia, and they had already blacklisted him in Australia, but he paid his own way to come to the General Conference in San Francisco in 1950, and there he would present his thoughts on Dan 11. Don’t you find that interesting?

This brings heat on the BRF finally and Elder Branson did not know what to do to settle the grief of the brethren in Australia over the influence the BRF has had and the trouble the BRF had caused in Australia because of the teachings of Louis Were. Ironically, the BRF was not in agreement with Louis Were, but yet the controversy would affect the BRF until they were disbanded. Cottrell calls it a ‘transition’, but in reality they were disbanded by request of the General Conference. It goes on to say:

“2. A permanent General Conference Committee for Biblical Study and Research, also established in 1952.” {Ibid, pg.50}

Ultimately, this is what Cottrell and the other group, the BRF, were after. They wanted to be legitimate within the Conference confines. So they didn’t really mind that they were disbanded; because it suited their purpose. Notice what happens:

“3. The ecumenical Bible Conference of 1952, in Takoma Park.” {Ibid, pg.50}

This was established. Now, this word ecumenical doesn’t mean that we invited all the other churches in, what he means by this term, it was ecumenical in that fact that all the representatives from the world church amongst ourselves were invited to this Bible Conference, so it’s ecumenical in that sense.

“4. The principles of interpretation built into the SDA Bible Commentary” {Ibid, pg.50}

Let me read it again, you guys need to get this part. He is talking about the Historical Method; when he says, “The principles of interpretation”, he means the Historical Method built into the SDA Bible Commentary, 1952 to 1957.

“Practically all of the writers and the two editors of the Commentary were Bible teachers and members of the Bible Research Fellowship at the time they accepted their assignments. The Commentary reflects the spirit, the hermeneutical principles, and the interpretation of Scripture encouraged by the Fellowship (*not encouraged by Father Miller*), and is a living monument to it. (*The Bible Commentary is a living monument to the Biblical Research Fellowship*) These hermeneutical principles are also set forth at some length in my chapter on principles of Bible Interpretation in the book ‘Problems in Bible

Translation'; in my article on "The Role of Israel in Old Testament Prophecy" in Volume 4 of the Commentary; and in numerous unpublished papers on the subject." {Ibid, pg. 50-51}

Now I was asked why we never read anything in our literature about Raymond Cottrell, it is because most of his work went unpublished. However where he did the most damage was in the Bible Commentary set, because the church doesn't know what I have been telling you about the last two days. I hope that they will know it now. Now this isn't an attack against Raymond Cottrell, it's an attack against what I believe the enemy has been so skilful in doing within the ranks of Seventh-day Adventism.

I started off yesterday by describing the desolation of Jerusalem and the armies of Rome have made a very serious attempt in influencing those who are to give the last warning message to this world will ever hear and they have done a pretty good job of it.

Now this is from 'Adventist Heritage', this is the summer issue of 1978, vol. 5, number 1. So now Brother Cottrell is going to mention his influence within the Bible Research Fellowship. He says:

"Dr. Caviness fostered use of the historical method..." {The Role of Biblical Hermeneutics in Preserving Unity in the Church, pg.7}

He says while teaching religion at Pacific Union College.

"As chairman of the Bible Research Fellowship (BRF) – professional organization of college Bible teachers from 1942 to 1952--Dr. Caviness fostered use of the historical method. As secretary of that organization during those years, it was my privilege to participate with him in encouraging its use. By 1952 BRF membership had risen to more than 250 and included practically every religion teacher in every Adventist college around the world. Seventeen were members of the General Conference headquarters staff." {Ibid pg.7}

"As we might have expected but did not anticipate (*in other words, they should have*), tension arose between the historical method followed by a majority of the Bible teachers and the proof-text method followed by church administrators (*So, as this thing begins to become an influence, they didn't anticipate a resistance. This is the years 1942 through to 1952. So we now have the historical-method boys and the proof-text men and they are clashing*). As a matter of fact that tension originated in Australia when Louis F. Were, a former minister who was under censure for his views on Daniel 11 and Armageddon, returned from the 1950 session of the General Conference in San Francisco and proclaimed that the college Bible teachers were all in agreement with him." {Ibid pg.7}

So he goes back to Australia and claims that all the members that were Bible teachers were members of the BRF are all in agreement with him. I don't think they were, but he went back and claimed so. That's what caused the mess to have Elder Branson in 1952 to ask the Research Fellowship to take a back seat and let's bring this in under the confines of the General Conference. He did that to quiet the voices that were coming from down under. So eventually what they got was an official status within the General Conference by doing this.

Elder Branson played really into their hands—in the judgment, when we see everything as it should be seen, I don't know what we will see, but it seems to me that Elder Branson didn't quite understand what he was getting himself into. He did it a remedial effort to bring some authority within the ranks of our theologians as to what they would teach and what they could not teach. That in itself is a dangerous proposition, is it not? Men must be free to choose the gospel or no, and we must not be restricted by the consciences or the thoughts and studies of others. Ellen White says that we are not saved in groups but we are saved one at a time. I believe in freedom. He says:

“My article on BRF in the Summer 1978 magazine Adventist Heritage narrates the details of this episode, which do not need repeating here.” {Ibid, pg. 7}

So if you want to read the details, they are right here:

<http://archives.llu.edu/cdm4/document.php?CISOROOT=/advhert&CISOPTR=595&REC=9>

“In an endeavor to resolve this tension between administrators and the Bible scholars of the church, I drafted a detailed proposal (*notice how convenient this was*) that the General Conference (GC) itself establish a permanent office of Bible Research and a permanent Biblical Research Committee. With Dr. Caviness’ approval I sent copies of this document to several personal friends in the GC, and as a result the Autumn (now Annual) Council of 1952 set up the office and the Biblical Research Committee (BRC), which metamorphosed into the Biblical Research Institute in 1975.” {Ibid, pg. 7}

So now you have a historical connection between what took place when we decided to re-educate our theologians in the 1930’s, right down to 1975. But there is another problem and he is going to explain that. The Lord stepped in; had not the Lord stepped in Brother Jeff Pippenger might not have a voice today, Dwayne Dewey might not have a voice today, Jamal Sankey, Kevin Howard or any one of us who believe that we are in the Judgment of the Living. Our voices might not be heard. But the God of heaven was in charge of all of this, as much of a mess as it seemed to appear. Notice what takes place:

“I arranged with Elder C. L. Bauer, then president of the Pacific Union Conference, for Dr. Caviness to be appointed as a delegate to the Autumn Council (*all this was arranged, mind you*), at one session of which he officially transferred the Biblical Research Fellowship to the new Biblical Research Committee.” {Ibid, pg. 7}

So the ‘Fellowship’ stepped right into the General Conference. If you were in a war and you wanted to get your secret spy right into the head quarters of the enemy, wouldn’t you draft a plan similar to this what we just read? You would. And you would defeat them hands down from the inside, and so that’s what they did.

“The original guidelines the GC set up for BRC stipulated that it was to serve the Bible scholars of the church in the same way that the Bible Research Fellowship had been serving them.” {Ibid, pg. 8}

“As providence would have it, that very summer (*he calls it providence*) Elder F. O. Nichol (an Australian, by the way) invited me to the Review and Herald Publishing Association to edit the Bible Commentary, (*so under all this transfer of power for the Biblical Research fellowship into the Biblical Research Committee, at the very same time now, Raymond Cottrell is invited by Elder F. O. Nichol to come to be the man to lead out in the making of the new Bible Commentary set*) Having served as secretary of the Bible Research Fellowship for its lifetime of ten years, it now became my happy privilege to participate, as a charter member, in every meeting of the Bible Research Committee for the next twenty-four years.” {Ibid, pg. 8}

So what this is telling you, is that Raymond Cottrell’s finger prints are all over modern Adventism.

“Soon after Robert H. Pierson became president of the General Conference (*now there is the part when the Lord steps in, when I read this, I had to smile*) in 1966 I presented him with a thirty-page document recounting the history of Bible Research in the church over the preceding twenty-five years (*He got a document similar to what we are going over right now. I would like to see this document, I haven’t seen it yet, Lord willing*), and recommending that the Biblical Research Committee become the Biblical Research Institute...” {Ibid, pg. 8}

Now it is suggested to Elder Pierson, that the Biblical Research Fellowship which became the Biblical Research Committee should now become the Biblical Research Institute. This was all the brain child of Raymond Cottrell.

Continues... "My purpose in this proposal was to give it a higher level of permanence and continuity, which experience had demonstrated it needed." {Ibid, pg. 8}

What he saying is, they wanted to control what we teach as Seventh-day Adventists.

"The privilege of writing more than two thousand pages for the Seventh day Adventist Bible Commentary and editing it from Genesis 1:1 to Revelation 22:20 (*this is what Cottrell did*) was perhaps the major event of my forty-seven years of service to the church prior to retirement in 1977. Last night I recounted for you the story of the Commentary and need not repeat it here. The important point I do wish to make is that, to the best of our ability, we built the principles and procedures of the Historical Method into it, making it the first Adventist publication to reflect that method of reading and understanding the Bible. My article in volume 4, "The Role of Israel in Old Testament Prophecy," was intended to foster use of the historical method in the interpretation of Old Testament prophecy, the perennial happy hunting ground of weird would-be expositors." {Ibid, pg. 8}

What he means is that Louis Were, Jeff Pippenger, Dwayne Dewey, anybody that you want to name, he was intending to use this new method to extricate from the church any would be, loose wing nuts.

"A further comment on the phrase "to the best of our ability" in the preceding paragraph calls for a word of explanation. We followed three fundamental guiding principles in editing the Commentary: (1) to be absolutely faithful to the meaning the inspired writers, guided by the Holy Spirit, intended their words to convey, (2) to make it a faithful witness to the Seventh-day Adventist understanding of the Bible, and (3) to be in harmony with the writings of Ellen G. White. At a few major points we found it impossible to reconcile the first two of these principles." {Ibid, pg. 8}

"We did the best we could, but none of us were happy with the compromise between them to which we found it necessary to come in these instances. The major instance in which we found it impossible to reconcile our comment with the first and second of these three principles was the eighth and ninth chapters of Daniel. In a number of relatively minor instances we dodged the issue with phraseology such as "Adventists believe that . . ." indicating that the editors did not find a particular interpretation compatible with sound exegesis." {Ibid, pg. 9}

So to avoid having the Commentary set at odds with their own particular believes on what this history really meant, they would put in the phrase "What Adventists believe", saying that they don't believe it. So that's how the commentary has been written. By a group of men who claim to be Seventh-day Adventists but at the same time say that we don't believe it

"During the time the Theological Seminary was located in a building adjacent to the General Conference in Takoma Park (1937-1960) there was a low-key feud between administrators immersed in the proof-text method, and Seminary teachers following the historical method. Students indoctrinated in the proof-text method would complain to an administrator regarding what they considered heretical views expressed by a Seminary teacher--which resulted in relatively minor ongoing tension between administrators and the Seminary. Fortunately, this never erupted into open warfare." {Ibid, pg. 9}

But excuse me, we have been in open warfare ever since. He is strangely deluded here. What we see in the church is the result of the impact of these men's studies and that is why you cannot go to any Adventist church today and have any one preacher agree on any two things. That is the exact reason why and if that is not open warfare, I don't know what else could be. Now he says:

“Doctrinal Discussions With Martin and Barnhouse” {Ibid, pg. 9}

He has got his hands in everything, including the Commentary Set, but now he is going to bring out the book, ‘Questions on Doctrine’. This all happens in the 1950’s. Ok so we can cover this and then in the next hour we going to get to...I mentioned yesterday about my favourite box of books that I used to carry around, we will get to the ‘Bible Readings for the Home Circle’ too. He says:

“At the very time we were struggling with the eighth and ninth chapters of Daniel for the Commentary the General Conference entered into a protracted series of eighteen doctrinal discussions with Walter F. Martin and Donald Grey Barnhouse, the first of which took place on March 8 and 9, 1955 and the last in August 1956. Participants representing the GC were LeRoy Edwin Froom, Walter E. Reed (*Reed would also a member of the BRF, the other too were not*), and Roy Allen Anderson, to whom we editors referred collectively by the acronym Freada.” {Ibid, pg. 9}

They took their last names and made an acronym and called them Freada.

“The three GC participants were administrators and not Bible scholars, and basically prooftext in their orientation (*Although Reed was a member, he was still a prooftexter of the BRF*). This left them at a disadvantage in the discussions, but as a result of the on-going ‘town-versus-gown’ (*meaning those who were educated and those who were not, you were a gown when you get your diploma and your tassel*) tension between the Seminary and the GC there was a minimum-of contact between them and the Seminary (*That percolated the event that now he is going to describe. Where was it then that the Freada group were going to get the help that they need to tackle the giant arguments that Barnhouse and Martin were bringing against the church. Barnhouse and Martin were planning to write a book to call us in that book, a cult, like the Mormons. So who was going to meet the challenge? Well according to brother Cottrell, the three men called Freada didn’t have the intelligence or training of the biblical hermeneutics to meet the challenge*). Instead, they kept coming to Don Neufeld and me for help in Greek and Hebrew, and exegesis. Elder Nichol required Don and me to be at work by 4:30 every morning every day of the week except Sabbath, and took a dim view of them preempting our time during those hours.” {Ibid, pg. 9}

They were working on the Bible commentary, that’s why these early hours were there while Elder Nichol was cracking the whip because they only had six years... when you read in the back of this book, there is a story of how the Bible Commentaries were done. They did a hundred years of work in six years to make the Bible Commentary Set. So they started their mornings at 4:30, and took the Sabbath off. He even tells back here that...in the last book, vol 7 of the SDA Bible commentary there is a section of the indexing where all the Bible is indexed. That was the last project they had to do before it went to the presses. He said that they worked night and day, ten hours, fifteen hours a day night and day and they worked till ten minutes before sundown on Friday, to finish the Bible index at the end of the time. That in itself violates the principles of good Sabbath organisation; you want to be ready for Sabbath at least an hour before sundown. But these men, nose to the grind stone worked until ten minutes before sundown on the Bible commentaries. He says so in here, but nevertheless he goes on to say:

Continues...“But out of hours Freada was in continual touch with us, and we were thus indirectly involved in the discussions.” {Ibid, pg. 9}

When I got to this part in this book, and read this, I called Jeff on the phone and informed him of what my wife had found. and what I had been reading and I read to him this part of this document. The only that it reminded me of in my own life that I can compare it with, was the man that they called ‘deep throat’ in the water gate scandal and he was the man that would go down to the basement to the two reporters’ Bernstein and the other one and he would give all the inside scoop on Nixon. So what this is, its similar, these guys Nuefeld and Cottrell are the men behind the scene feeding all the information to

Freeda to take to Barnhouse and Martin; they were the 'deep throat' of Adventism. Not in the same sense as the water-gate scandal, but similar nevertheless. He says:

"When a decision was made to publish Freeda's dozens of responses to the questions Martin and Barnhouse were asking, we became more directly involved. (*Now what takes place is that the Freeda group come to Nichols and Cottrell and Donald Neufeld and they inform them that they are going to write a book. This scares the living wits out of the three other men. Notice what they say*) Nichol, Neufeld, and I were mildly horrified at the idea of publishing their more or less inadequate responses as a book, which would inevitably be considered at least a quasi-official statement of Adventist doctrine. I proposed setting up an editorial committee. The GC appointed A. V. Olson, a vice president, to chair such a committee, W. E. Read (*he was one of the members of Freeda*), a participant in the discussions, and M. R. Thurber, Review and Herald book editor, to do the editing." {Ibid, pg. 10}

"Neufeld and I were asked to critique the documents in detail in order to bring them into more acceptable form. (*What this is telling you is, Cottrell wrote Questions on Doctrine*) Inasmuch as Martin wanted to quote from our book, Questions on Doctrine, in his forthcoming book to be published by Zondervan, The Truth About Seventh-day Adventists..." {Ibid, pg. 10}

Had we done what we needed to have done in this era, we should have told Barnhouse and Martin, we should have sent them packing and we should have told them that we are going to give the First, Second and Third Angels' Message, and told them "Brothers, you better get on board because Jesus is coming." But instead, we danced with the Devil.

Continues... "the editorial committee asked me to evaluate what he might say. I surveyed the Martin-Barnhouse articles in the evangelical press and prepared a 16-page, single-spaced, summary for the committee (*there is a lot of material in 16 pages*). My concluding paragraph warned that "a storm of opposition" was almost certain, and that "we should not close our eyes to the possibility of a serious division in our own ranks as a result of the certain refusal" of some to "go along with the interpretation of Adventism set forth in the documents now being prepared for publication, and in Martin's new book." (*This is an open admission of what these men did*) Soon after publication M. L. Andreasen, for fifteen years considered the dean of Adventist theologians but long since retired, mounted very vocal opposition to Questions on Doctrine and charged the GC with apostasy (*Amen!*). As a result of his refusal to remain silent the GC revoked his credentials and cut off his sustentation (*they took away his retirement*)--which the Federal government required the church to restore. (*They sued the church and the government made them give him back his retirement, Amen!*)..." {Ibid, pg. 10}

Now this type of laundry should not have to be aired before the world but unless it is, some of us will not come to our senses

"Generally speaking, Nichol, Neufeld, and I found the positions set forth in their final form reasonably acceptable..." {Ibid, pg. 10}

What he is saying is, that what they had in the book 'Questions on Doctrine' to them was reasonably acceptable, however, underneath it all, they were all denying the sanctuary doctrine, and because it didn't come out forthright and just say so, that's what he means by 'somewhat acceptable'. Because underlining the philosophy and the hermeneutics behind 'Questions on Doctrine', these men had long before in the 1940's had stepped aside from the sanctuary doctrine and had been disbelieving it for two decades, long before 'Questions on Doctrine' ever hit the press.

Cottrell will reveal in this document that Desmond Ford had come to the conclusions that he revealed in 1979 at PUC, he had already come to those conclusions in 1945. The difference between Desmond Ford and W. W. Prescott, because Prescott was brought to account for the same reason, because in the

1930's Prescott had voiced to Elder Branson, (when he was still a General Conference committee member, and not the General Conference president) at a camp meeting when they were hearing somebody talk on the sanctuary doctrine and Prescott voiced to Elder Branson that he had not yet heard anybody correctly answer the problems that were presented by A. F. Ballenger and the other man who earlier left the church, D. M. Canright, and others for the very subject that Ford would be brought to account for in 1979 and 1980 at Glacier view.

What is was is that they understood that Prescott himself was no longer believing the Sanctuary Doctrine. And so Elder Branson would go then and rush back to the committee and they immediately fired Elder Prescott—immediately. Now brothers and sister, lets face the music. This man has written a book praising Elder Prescott, but what happened to Brother Prescott, where Ford would present his views openly and publicly before Glacier view and he would face the music, Prescott never would. He wrote them a letter and said how unchristian of them to fire him without them talking to him first and then they invited him to come to the same type of General Conference committee meeting that they invited Ford to go to, but Prescott would refuse to go. He would not air his views on the Sanctuary Doctrine openly, and therefore he went down in the history of Adventism as the greatest scholar that the church has ever produced.

Shall we pray?

Loving Father in heaven, Lord in the Bible you have revealed the sins of David, you revealed the rancorous effects of disobedience, and I believe Lord today as painful as it is for the church, we must face what we have done. Lord this doesn't bring joy to any hearts here to face these facts, but Lord we want to know the truth and nothing but the truth. Lord we want to be like Jesus in every way and we recognise dear Lord our lack of being like Him; please forgive us. Lord there is no way to ask for the men that are in their graves, their records is on the books, but for those living here today, we ask that You would pour out Your Spirit, that You would help us to see what Sister White saw when surrendering her own will to the lovely Jesus, and that we would surrender ourselves to heaven, and that we would finish the work in this world and that we can go home. Please forgive us, please dear Lord cleanse us from all the things, do whatever needs to be done in the lives of Seventh-day Adventists, dear Lord that You can come and that we can go home. We pray and ask You for these blessings in Jesus name. Amen.