

Future NEWS

Volume 9, No. 11

November, 2005

CONTENDING FOR THE FAITH

I have a positive message from the Lord to **those who are standing as watchmen in the Lord's cause.** There must be **an earnest contending for the faith once delivered to the saints.** If you weaken your presentation of evidence in regard to the dangers of the present time, you will lose an advantage that should be maintained. Hold fast to the One who has given you power to become the children of God. Let your life be hid with Christ in God. Satan is not dead. He is not indifferent or careless. He is working with all deceivableness of unrighteousness, striving to lead men and women to deny the faith and enter the path where he leads the way. . . .

I have been instructed that the messages given in the past are to be revived, and that it is essential that as brethren and sisters, we be joined together in the bonds of sacred union in the accomplishment of the work before us. The world knows very little of the truths that we believe, and in clear, straight lines the message for this time must be given to all the world. The message comes to me, "Wake up the watchmen. Let every one now come into working order." . . .

My brethren, the value of the evidences of truth that we have received during the past half century, is above estimate. These evidences are as treasure hidden in a field. Search for them. Study the Bible truths that for fifty years have been calling us out from the world. Present this evidence in clear, plain lines. Those who have been long in the truth, and those who have recently received the truth, must now dig for the buried heavenly treasure. Let every man work to the point. Study the Word of God. Revive the evidences given in the past. "Search the Scriptures," Christ said; "for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me."

Those who stand before the people as teachers of truth are to grapple with great themes. They are not to occupy precious time in talking of trivial subjects. Let them study the word, and preach the word. Let the word be in their hands as a sharp, two-edged sword. **Let it testify to past truths, and show what is to be in the future.** *Review and Herald*, April 19, 1906.

We have **nothing to fear** for the future **except as we shall forget the way the Lord has led us.** *Testimonies to Ministers*, 31.

Future for America produces and mails out a monthly newsletter and audio presentation in English and Spanish. For information you may contact the following brethren who are affiliated with this work:

Future News

PO Box 7

Bonnerdale, AR 71933

Telephone: 888-278-7744

Circulation Manager—Kathy Pippenger

Author & Speaker—Jeff Pippenger

JeffPippenger@msn.com

Editor--Bronwyn Peck

calica4@hotmail.com

Spanish Department—Al & Lupe Perez

Futuro de America

PO Box 353

Glenwood, AR 71943

Telephone: 870-356-7049

aperez77@alltel.net

Future News—Canada

Phyllis Vallieres

RR 3, 2552 Cooper Road

Madoc, Ontario, K0K 2K0, Canada

Telephone: 613-473-5332

FAX 613-473-5630

phylv@primus.ca

Future for America—Great Britain

Russell & Charmaine Williams

29 Lascelles Close

Leytonstone, London

Telephone: 0044-208-279-6903

judicium1844@aol.com

Future-Is-Now Germany

Pietruska Family & Blaesing Family

Hoehenweg 11

D-74613 Oehringen, Germany

Telephone: 0049-07941-9148-0

FAX 0049-07941-9148-3

architekt@w-blaesing.de

MISSION STATEMENT

The ministry of *Future for America* is to proclaim the final warning message of Revelation 14 as identified within the prophecies of the Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy. The end-time fulfillment of Bible prophecy is no longer future—for it is taking place before our eyes. The historic, prophetic understanding of Seventh-day Adventism is now present truth. We are the final generation. Our emphasis on the prophetic word includes all the counsel of God's Word. To know what lies ahead is useless if we do not possess the experience to stand during these solemn times. Through obedience to God's law, and faith in the promises of God's Word, we are to receive that experience.

Coupled with the prophetic message, *Future for America* emphasizes all aspects of the medical missionary work. The "entering wedge"—medical missionary work—must be practiced by those who are to finish God's work in these final hours.

During this time period, country living becomes more essential with each passing moment. *Future for America* upholds and promotes this end-time truth. God's people must prepare for the coming storm, and that preparation includes the experience of learning how to survive in a simple fashion, away from the great centers of population.

Future for America is a self-supporting 501-C3 nonprofit corporation; funded by readers like you. The cost of this newsletter and audio-tape reaching a home is approximately \$3.50.

This publication is sent out free of charge. Your donations are greatly appreciated.

THE PFANDL RESPONSE

In the summer of 2004, the brethren in Germany sought permission to allow the prophetic message which we share to be preached without resistance in the Conference churches of Germany. During the discussion process the German leadership asked Gerhard Pfandl, a European, who was known by the leadership in Germany, and a member of the *Biblical Research Institute of the Seventh-day Adventist Church* to evaluate *The Time of the End* magazine. The magazine sets forth the basic overview of the last six verses of Daniel eleven, and is the foundational understanding of what we share prophetically.

Gerhard Pfandl critiqued the magazine, and in the February and March issues of our monthly newsletter we responded to his critique. The following is Pfandl's response to our responding to his critique. If you are new to the ministry of *Future for America* and the *Future News* newsletter, then logic would suggest that you should first review the *Time of the End* magazine, and Pfandl's first response, and our response in those two issues of the *Future News* newsletter. These documents are available from *Future for America*.

Pfandl also attacks the conclusion of John Peter's manuscript titled, *The Mystery of the Daily* in his recent response. Logic would also suggest that you consider Peter's manuscript as well. In *The Mystery of the Daily*, Peters demonstrates that the Hebrew of Daniel chapter eight supports fully the pioneer understanding that the "daily" in the book of Daniel represents paganism—and not the work of Christ in the sanctuary. The teaching that the "daily" represents the work of Christ in the sanctuary is the Protestant understanding which was held long before William Miller discovered the correct view of the "daily". Miller's view was held by Adventism exclusively until the 1901 time period when the infamous L. R. Conradi reintroduced the fallen Protestant view of the "daily". It was not until 1931, that Conradi's "new view" was actually grounded into Adventism, under very questionable circumstances.

We will first set forth Pfandl's second evaluation, and then respond.

EVALUATION OF JEFF PIPPENGER'S RESPONSE

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS:

1. The tone of Jeff Pippenger's response is surprising. He has obviously never participated in a scholarly debate where both sides point out the perceived weaknesses of the other person's views without getting personal. His *ad hominem* arguments are neither warranted nor helpful. Christians should be able to disagree without being disagreeable.

2. Clarity is not a hallmark of Pippenger's response. It is at times difficult to follow his arguments which leads to misunderstandings.

3. Pippenger rails repeatedly against the "educated group" in the Adventist Church, yet, a better grasp of Adventist and church history would have helped him to avoid some historical mistakes. To repeat over and over again, like a mantra, that the Adventist pioneers had the correct view is not enough. Particularly, since he himself picks and chooses which views among the pioneers he accepts and which not. Uriah Smith is referred to by name (p. 75), yet one of the mainstays of Smith's interpretation of Daniel 11 was his identification of the king of the North as Turkey; an identification that Pippenger rejects.

4. As I indicated in my book, I do not have a set interpretation of Daniel 11:40–45. I am open to any reasonable interpretation as long as it does not violate basic hermeneutical guidelines.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Page 67—"The history of verse forty: is the history of the papacy being attacked in 1798."

Comment: I would agree with Pippenger if the text said "at the beginning of the time of the end". The Hebrew expression *ube'et* "and at the time" appears 15 times in the OT. Depending on the context the preposition *be* can be translated with "in, at, on, into, with, from, when," etc. Hence, *ube'et* can also mean "and in the time of" in the sense of during a certain time period. For example:

2 Chronicles 28:22—"Now in the time of [*ube'et*] his distress King Ahaz became increasingly unfaithful to the Lord." Nehemiah 9:27—"Therefore You delivered them into the hand of their enemies, Who oppressed them; And in the time of their trouble, When they cried to You, You heard from heaven; And according to Your abundant mercies You gave them deliverers who saved them From the hand of their enemies."

Jeremiah 2:27—“Saying to a tree, ‘You *are* my father,’ And to a stone, ‘You gave birth to me.’ For they have turned *their* back to Me, and not *their* face. But in the time of [*ube’et*] their trouble They will say, ‘Arise and save us.’”

Jeremiah 15:11—“The Lord said: Surely it will be well with your remnant; Surely I will cause the enemy to intercede with you In the time of [*ube’et*] adversity and in the time of affliction.”

Jeremiah 33:15—“In those days [*ube’et*] and at that time I will cause to grow up to David A Branch of righteousness; He shall execute judgment and righteousness in the earth.”

Jeremiah 50:4—“In those days [*ube’et*] and in that time,” says the Lord, “The children of Israel shall come, They and the children of Judah together; With continual weeping they shall come, And seek the Lord their God.”

Jeremiah 50:20—“In those days [*ube’et*] and in that time,” says the Lord, “The iniquity of Israel shall be sought, but *there shall be* none; And the sins of Judah, but they shall not be found; For I will pardon those whom I preserve.”

Joel 3:1—“For behold, in those days [*ube’et*] and at that time, When I bring back the captives of Judah and Jerusalem.”

While the interpretation of Pippenger is possible, it certainly is not demanded by the text as he thinks. Since the “time of the end” is a time period and not a point of time, it behooves us to be a bit more cautious. According to Daniel 11:40, at or in the time of the end the King of the South shall attack the King of the North and the King of the North shall retaliate against the King of the South “like a whirlwind.”

Let me propose a possible scenario. Please note, when I say “let me propose” I am not saying that this is the correct interpretation, but it is another possibility. Since Ellen White is clearly indicating that after 1798 a new power appears on the scene which she identifies as atheism (GC 268–270) the following scenario is possible: Since the Communist Manifesto in 1848 communism (King of the South) has gained control over a number of nations in the world. After years of domination, several of these nations with the help of the papacy have freed themselves from communist control.

However, communism still controls large parts of the world (China, North Korea, Cuba, etc.). Since the King of the North (papacy) joining forces with Protestantism and Spiritualism (GC 588) will yet influence the whole world, the fulfillment of this prophecy may at the present time take place, or it may still be in the future. This is just to show that other interpretations of 11:40 are possible.

Page 70—“The king of the South, that is, the Soviet Union, (the king of atheism) was spiritually conquered in 1989.”

Comment: I agree with Pippenger that the papacy (a spiritual power) together with the US (a political power) brought about the break-up of the Soviet Union. I also agree that the Christian Coalition is attempting to conquer America spiritually, but to claim that the papacy has spiritually conquered the Soviet Union is simply contrary to the facts. The papacy has little, if any, spiritual influence in the countries of the former Soviet Union, in contrast to the spiritual influence of the Christian Coalition in the US.

Page 70—Pippenger maintains that using two different symbols in one verse for one and the same entity is acceptable. He tries to prove it by stating that in Revelation 13 the beast and the head of the beast both represent the papacy. “Two symbols—identifying the same power, and they are both within two verses of each other” (p. 71)

Comment: Pippenger fails to recognize that what we have in Revelation 13 is a literary device called synecdoche. A synecdoche is a figure of speech in which the whole can be put for a part or a part for the whole. For example, in Psalm 26:10—“In whose hands *is* a sinister scheme, And whose right hand is full of bribes.” The right hand as part of the body stand for the whole person. Revelation 13, therefore does not support his contention that there are two different symbols for the same power.

Page 78—“. . . let it here be stated that one of the basic approaches that I believe needs to be included in correct Bible study is an approach to the study of God’s word [sic] that includes referencing the message of the end, with the foundational truths that were established at the beginning of Adventism, by the men that were commonly called ‘the pioneers’ within the culture of Adventism.”

Comment: This is a basic problem in Pippenger's response. He believes that the pioneers had the correct view (at least where they agree with him) and anyone who differs with him must surely be one of those mentioned in Isaiah 29:11–12.

While I am sure Pippenger and I agree on the foundational truths, a study of SDA history shows that in regard to the interpretation of prophetic symbols different interpretations were hotly debated, as they are today. For example, James White and Uriah Smith differed in their interpretation of Armageddon and the king of the North. At the ministerial conference prior to the 1888 General conference one of the issues debated among ministers was the question of the tenth horn in Daniel 7, did it symbolize the Huns or the Alemanni? And until the end of the First World War Uriah Smith's view of the king of the North misled the church to focus on Turkey.

A proper hermeneutic is essential in the interpretation of Scripture. In 1986 the *Annual Council of the General Conference* voted to accept a statement outlining guidelines for the interpretation of Scripture (the document can be found on our website: biblicalresearch.gc.adventist.org). It is this hermeneutic which is used in the *Biblical Research Institute* and by most Adventist scholars today.

Page 83—In my evaluation of Pippenger's manuscript I wrote: "Pippenger, like Uriah Smith¹, sees the events of 11:30–36, fulfilled in the rise of the papacy and the papal persecution during the Middle Ages (p.13–14), but in contrast to Smith he believes that these verses will find a further spiritual fulfillment 'within the time frame from 1798 to the close of probation' (p. 11). Therefore, he identifies 11:40 as a 'description of a spiritual war between the papacy and atheism which began in 1798' (p. 14) with the deadly wound. He bases this idea on a statement in the Spirit of Prophecy where Ellen White says:

"We have no time to lose. Troublous times are before us. The world is stirred with the spirit of war. Soon the scenes of trouble spoken of in the prophecies will take place. The prophecy in the eleventh of Daniel has nearly reached its complete fulfillment. Much of the history that has taken place in fulfillment of this prophecy will be repeated. In the thirtieth verse a power is spoken of that 'shall be grieved, and return, and have indignation against the holy covenant: so shall he do; he shall even return, and have intelligence with them that forsake the holy covenant.' [Verses 31–36, quoted.]

"Scenes similar to those described in these words will take place. We see evidence that Satan is fast obtaining the control of human minds who have not the fear of God before them. Let all read and understand the prophecies of this book, for we are now entering upon the time of trouble spoken of: [Dan. 12:1–4, quoted.]. *Manuscript Releases*, volume 13, 394."

I then added the following comment: "Since Ellen White says, 'Scenes similar to those described in these words *will* take place' she was thinking of the future, not of 1798 which was more than one hundred years in the past. Most likely she was comparing the persecutions of the past (11:30–36) with the persecutions in the future in connection with Revelation 13:15. Hence any application to the deadly wound in 1798 is a misapplication."

Pippenger in his *Response* says, "This is the very heart of elder Pfandl's erroneous ideas . . . For Ellen White to refer to the history of verses thirty through thirty-six of Daniel eleven in order to identify persecution is simply misdirection. Persecution is certainly part of the history identified in those verses, but the persecution does not start until verse thirty-two."

Comment: This is quite astonishing. How anyone can read the text and Ellen White's comments and come to the conclusion that the persecution starts only in verse 32 must have a particular agenda. What this agenda is will become clear when we discuss the daily in verse 31. The text of Daniel 11:30–32 reads as follows:

³⁰ “For ships from Cyprus shall come against him; therefore he shall be grieved, and return in rage against the holy covenant, and do *damage*. So he shall return and show regard for those who forsake the holy covenant.

³¹ “And forces shall be mustered by him, and they shall defile the sanctuary fortress; then they shall take away the daily *sacrifices*, and place *there* the abomination of desolation.

³² “Those who do wickedly against the covenant he shall corrupt with flattery; but the people who know their God shall be strong, and carry out *great exploits*.

The language in verses 30 and 31, “rage against the holy covenant,” “defile the sanctuary,” etc., is clearly the language of persecution directed against God’s people. Ellen White made no distinction between verses 30 and 32 when she wrote, “Much of the history that has taken place in fulfillment of this prophecy will be repeated. In the thirtieth verse a power is spoken of that “shall be grieved, and return, and have indignation against the holy covenant: so shall he do; he shall even return, and have intelligence with them that forsake the holy covenant.” [Verses 31–36, quoted.]

If a break is understood between verses 31 and 32 it has to be read into the text. This called eisegesis rather than exegesis.

Page 87—In defending the glorious land of verse 41 as the United States Pippenger appeals to Hiram Edson and J. N. Andrews for support. He claims that this was an established pioneer position and says, “Identifying the glorious land in verse forty-one as God’s remnant church [which I suggested only as a possibility] is denying the distinction that Daniel included within the passage when he identifies the land in verse forty-one and the holy mountain in verse forty-five. A land and a mountain are two different entities. This is Andrew’s conclusion as well. There are several other ways to defend this truth from Scripture, but enough is here suggested to at least refute the idea that there is no inspired evidence to support the glorious land as the United States, in verse forty-one. There is much inspired evidence.”

Comment: What does Pippenger mean by “inspired.” Is he saying that Edson and Andrews were inspired? The text itself does not identify the glorious land as the United States. Ellen White does not identify the glorious land as the United States. So where is the inspired evidence? This is one of these places where it is difficult to follow his logic.

Pippenger is correct in stating that Hiram Edson identified the “glorious land” with America (*Review and Herald*, February, 28, 1856), but he is the only one who did so. J. N. Andrews did not support this view. The reference from Andrews to which Pippenger refers reads as follows:

“We have found that the earth is not the sanctuary, but simply the territory where it will finally be located; that the church is not the sanctuary, but simply the worshipers connected with the sanctuary; and that the land of Canaan is not the sanctuary, but that it is the place where the typical sanctuary was located. Now we inquire for the sanctuary itself. . . The sanctuary of the Bible is the habitation of God.” (*The Sanctuary and the Twenty-three Hundred Days*, p. 45).

There is nothing in the writing of Andrews that would support the idea that the glorious land is the United States. Neither was it an accepted idea among our pioneers.

With the help of the *Words of the Pioneers* CD I was able to check the writings of sixteen Seventh-day Adventist and Millerite pioneers from J. N. Andrews to E. J. Waggoner. Only Hiram Edson identified the glorious land in Daniel 11 with the United States. William Miller identified the glorious land with Italy.

“And he shall enter into the countries, and shall overflow, and pass over,” was literally accomplished. “He shall enter also into the glorious land,” (or land of delight, as it might have been translated.) This, I have no doubt, means **Italy**. Bonaparte fought some of his most brilliant battles in this delightful country. (*Miller’s Works*, volume 2, Lecture 7, 105).

Otis Nichol and probably a number of other Adventist pioneers followed Miller.

“And he [Napoleon] shall enter into the countries, and shall overflow and pass over.” Verse 40. “He shall enter into the glorious land, (or land of delight, margin, which applies to **Italy**,) and many countries shall be overthrown.” Verse 41. This was literally accomplished by the armies of Napoleon, who, in a short period, made all the continental governments of Europe subject to the influence and control of the French nation. (*Review and Herald*, January 20, 1853).

Uriah Smith in his book *Daniel and Revelation* identified the glorious land with Palestine.

VERSE 41. “He shall enter also into the glorious land, and many countries shall be overthrown: but these shall escape out of his hand, even Edom, and Moab, and the chief of the children of Ammon.”

Abandoning a campaign in which one third of the army had fallen victims to war and the plague, the French retired from St. Jean d’Acre, and after a fatiguing march of twenty-six days reentered Cairo in Egypt. They thus abandoned all the conquests they had made in Judea; and the “glorious land,” **Palestine**, with all its provinces, here called “countries,” fell back again under the oppressive rule of the Turk. (p. 295; the emphasis in each case is mine).

This became the standard position among Adventists until the twentieth century. Thus, to claim that the position the glorious land refers to the United States was an accepted position among Adventist pioneers is an exaggeration, to say the least.

Pippenger emphasizes the distinction between the land and the mountain in verses 40–45. In geography this distinction is certainly true, but is it also true in prophetic language? Couldn’t this be another case of a synecdoche where a part stands for the whole? In the Old Testament “Zion” often refers to Jerusalem, but is not confined to it. For example, in Isaiah 51:3 says:

The Lord will surely comfort Zion and will look with compassion on all her ruins; he will make her deserts like Eden, her wastelands like the garden of the Lord. Joy and gladness will be found in her, thanksgiving and the sound of singing.

Here “Zion” has not only “ruins,” but also “deserts” and “wastelands.” This passage clearly refers to the whole length and breadth of Judea.

Or take Isaiah 52:7:

How beautiful on the mountains are the feet of those who bring good news, who proclaim peace, who bring good tidings, who proclaim salvation, who say to Zion, “Your God reigns!”

The implication is that God would offer similar hope to all of the cities in Judea which were destroyed by the Babylonians. He is not saying that if a survivor came from city “A” he could claim the promise, but that if a person came from city “B” he could not. Since the promise was not limited to one city, the term “Zion” cannot be limited to one city. Here also “Zion” is a poetic reference to Judea. Hence, we need to be careful not to impose our understanding of mountain and land on the text.

Page 91—“Verse 30: For the Vandals shall come against pagan Rome and pagan Rome shall be restrained in its ability to rule the world supremely, and to place the papacy on the throne of the earth.”

Comment: Most of the rest of the paper (pp. 90–104) is spent in the interpretation of verses 30–36, according to Pippenger’s understanding of church history. A prominent part in this interpretation is played by “the daily” which he understands as paganism. At the end (pp 103–104) he repeats the end time scenario as he sees it in Daniel 11:40–45.

It is interesting to note that on page 90 Pippenger states that “First pagan Rome established the Sunday laws in 321, then in 330, the time for pagan Rome to rule the world supremely came to an end and the seven trumpets begin to sound.” Yet in the following pages (91–94) he has pagan Rome doing all kinds of things after 330:

p. 91 “The Vandals come against pagan Rome” [in 455]

p. 92 “The armies of pagan Rome shall stand up for the papacy”

“The armies of Rome shall take away the daily” [in 508]

p.93 “the armies of pagan Rome shall stand up for the papacy from the year 496 through 508”

p. 94 “Pagan Rome shall have intelligence”—communications with the Roman church culminating with Justinian’s decree in 533.”

It seems that Pippenger is using the phrase “pagan Rome” in a different sense from what the term generally means. Exactly what he means is not clear. The historical facts are as follows:

312 Constantine faces his last opponent at the Milvian Bridge. Just before the battle Constantine is supposed to have had a vision in which he sees a flaming sword and the words *In Hoc Signo Vinces* (“in this sign conquer”). He fights the battle in the name of the Christian God and defeats his rival Maxentius. Constantine becomes the first Roman Emperor to profess Christianity.

313 Edict of Milan. Christians are granted full religious freedom.

314 Silvester is named Bishop of Rome. He is crowned (clad in imperial raiment) as an earthly prince. Things have indeed changed! For centuries persecuted by the Empire, the Christian Church has now become allied with it! Christianity assumes an intimate relationship with the secular power. It quickly grows to a position of great influence over the affairs of the Empire.

321 Constantine issues an edict forbidding work on “the venerable day of the sun” (Sunday), the day that had come to be substituted for the seventh-day Sabbath.

324 The Emperor formally establishes Christianity as the official religion of the Empire. The previous year, Constantine had defeated the Eastern Emperor (Licinius) and had become the sole Emperor of East and West. Thus Christianity is now the established religion throughout the civilized Western world!

330 Removal of the capital to Constantinople. The Bishop of Rome takes the place of the emperor in Rome.

337 Constantine the Great dies on May 22, 337. Water is poured on his forehead and he is declared “baptized” on his death bed.

394 Under Emperor Theodosius (378–395), the ancient gods are formally outlawed in the Empire. Conversion to Christianity becomes compulsory.

395 Theodosius is the last ruler of a united Roman Empire. At his death the Empire is divided between his two sons Honorius (in the West) and Arcadius (in the East). Though in theory only a division for administrative purposes, the separation proves to be permanent. The two sections grow steadily apart, and are never again truly united. Each goes its own way towards a separate destiny. For decades many tribes have been coming across the Roman frontiers peaceably, as settlers. Many Germans are now serving in the Roman army, and some in the imperial palace itself. When Emperor Theodosius dies, one of these Germans is even named as guardian of his young son Honorius. He is Stilicho, a “barbarian” of the Vandal nation. A brilliant general, Stilicho repeatedly beats back attempted invasions of Italy by various barbarian tribes. Most troublesome of all is Alaric the Visigoth. Stilicho repels numerous assaults by Alaric into the peninsula.

410 After the death of Stilicho (408) Alaric takes the “Eternal City,” and for six days Rome is given up to murder and pillage. For the first time in nearly 800 years, Rome is captured by a foreign enemy!

452 Attila the Hun appears in northern Italy with a great army. The road to Rome lies open before Attila. Its citizens expect the worst. But Rome is spared. Attila withdraws when success lies just within his grasp. The threatened march on Rome does not take place! What has happened? The bishop of Rome at this time is a man named Leo (440–461). He has travelled northward to the Po to meet the mighty Attila. There is no record of the conversation between the two. But one fact is clear. A fearless diplomat, Leo has confronted the “Scourge of God” and won. He has somehow persuaded Attila to abandon his quest for the Eternal City. Attila dies shortly afterward. The Huns trouble Europe no more. The prestige of the papacy is greatly enhanced by Leo’s intervention on behalf of Rome. As the civil government grows increasingly incapable of keeping order, the Church begins to take its place, assuming many secular responsibilities. History will record that it was Leo the Great who laid the foundations of the temporal power of the popes. Leo has become the leading figure in Italy! In the religious sphere, Leo strongly asserts the primacy of Rome’s bishop over all other bishops.

Earlier in the century, the illustrious Augustine, bishop of Hippo in North Africa, had uttered the now-famous words, “Rome has spoken; the case is closed.” At the Council of Chalcedon in 451, the assembled bishops responded to Leo’s pronouncements with the words: “Peter has spoken by Leo; let him be anathema who believes otherwise.” The doctrine that papal power had been granted by Christ to Peter, and that power was passed on by Peter to his successors in Rome, begins to take firm root.

455 In June, 455, Geiseric—the Vandal king of North Africa—occupies Rome. Again Leo saves the day. Leo induces Geiseric to have mercy on the city. Geiseric consents to spare the lives of Rome’s citizens, demanding only their wealth. Leo’s successful intervention further increases the prestige and authority of the papacy, within the Empire as well as the Church.

476 A boy-monarch sits on the throne in Rome. His name is Romulus Augustus (472–476) but he is satirically dubbed “Augustulus,” meaning “little Augustus.” By curious coincidence, he bears the names of the founder of Rome (Romulus) and of the Empire (Augustus)—both of which are about to fall. The German warrior Odoacer—a Heruli chieftain ruling over a coalition of Germanic tribes—sees no reason for carrying on the sham of the puppet emperors any longer. On September 4, 476, he deposes Romulus Augustus. The long and gradual process of the fall of Rome is now complete. Every portion of the Western Empire is occupied and governed by kings of Germanic race. Many of these barbarian kings are, like Odoacer, converts to Arian Christianity of Rome, yet in the end Catholic Christianity prevails (adapted from K. W. Stump, *The History of Europe and the Church*, 9-12).

How anyone can speak of pagan Rome after 324 when Christianity becomes the official religion of the Empire is difficult to understand. Now, it is true that many Romans continued to worship pagan gods until Emperor Theodosius (378–395) formally outlawed the ancient gods in the Empire in 394 and conversion to Christianity became compulsory. Nevertheless, it is historically incorrect to speak of pagan Rome after Constantine, and particularly after Theodosius.

Page 92—The armies of pagan Rome, shall remove paganism as the legal religion in each of their kingdoms and replace paganism as the legal religion with Catholicism by 508.

Comment: Why pagan Rome would destroy itself by taking away paganism is a puzzle. Again it is not clear what Pippenger means by pagan Rome. Because of this logical anomaly John Peters in his manuscript “The Mystery of ‘The Daily’” has replaced paganism with the self-exalting character of paganism.

Page 98—“Daniel represents paganism with the Hebrew word **continual** [*tamid*] that is translated as ‘daily’ in the book of Daniel . . . Therefore when we identify 508, as the time period when the first dispensation of Satan known as paganism was being set aside, in order that the second dispensation of Satan known as Catholicism would fulfill its role, then we see that 508, is a time when there is a change of dispensations occurring.”

Comment: Seventh-day Adventists generally teach that the little horn (papacy) took the *tamid* (intercessory ministry) away from the Prince of the host (Christ). Pippenger, however, believes that “the daily” represents paganism which was taken away from pagan Rome and replaced with Catholicism. According to this interpretation of Daniel 12:9–12, the issue in these verses is not the great controversy between Christ/God’s people and Satan/little horn, but a battle between two phases of the little horn—pagan and papal Rome. Christ is only mentioned as an aside in verse 11. This is contrary to the thrust of the whole book of Daniel, which illustrates the great controversy in every chapter. See my response to this view in the evaluation of Peter’s manuscript *The Mystery of ‘The Daily’* below.

Page 98—When we identify 508, as a time period when the first dispensation of Satan known as paganism was being set aside, in order that the second dispensation of Satan, known as Catholicism would fulfill its role, then we see that 508, is a time when there is a change of dispensations occurring.

Comment: Here we see the reason why Pippenger must keep pagan Rome (whatever it represents) alive long after it has disappeared in history. 508 is for him the date when the daily (paganism) was taken away. However, the historical facts simply do not support this interpretation. Emperor Julian the Apostate (356–358) tried to restore paganism in the Roman Empire, but after reigning less than two years he was slain in battle with the Persians. When he died it can be said that paganism was “taken away,” but this is much too early for Pippenger’s interpretation.

Page 100—Pippenger believes that the current view of “the daily” originated with L. R. Conradi.

Comment: See my response to this view in the evaluation of Peter’s manuscript below.

Many other points could be taken up, but by now the reader should be able to see that Pippenger’s interpretation has a number of problems.

Gerhard Pfandl, Ph.D.; Associate Director;
Biblical Research Institute; August 2005

From all the evidence I have at my disposal, I must assume that Gerhard Pfandl is a genuine Christian gentleman, who has good motivations about his service to the Lord. I would not know the man if we were randomly seated together on an airplane flight. I never sought to have interaction with him on the subject of the last six verses of Daniel eleven, and I am now attempting to respond for a second time to his critique of what I understand to be present truth.

Whether intentional or not, the man has the ability to place stumbling blocks in front of me, in terms of his inability to stick to the issue at hand. Assuming his motives are pure, I can only say that his ability to discuss the Bible is weak, at least in terms of the last six verses of Daniel eleven. If it is not weakness about this particular passage, then it could be simply that he chooses to use rules of debate, rather than principles of truth to establish his positions. As an example:

Once again, he starts his paper off by attacking the man, not addressing the subject at hand. In his first critique, (See February and March 2005 issues of *Future News* newsletter) I was personally forced to re-write my response three times, in order to eliminate my knee-jerk reaction to his opening statement. Ultimately I disregarded his opening attack. It now needs to be noted for the record.

The starting point for his first critique was my relationship with Hope International. Pfandl had been plainly told before he critiqued the *Time of the End* magazine that I was no longer associated with *Hope International*, but his first point was to publicly infer that I was lying about my relationship. This is a technique that is employed by men who are **not** attempting to establish and identify truth, but who practice in the art of debate. In debate, the issue is not the truth—it is who wins the debate. The particular tactic of debate he first used is called, “guilt by association”.

I do not wish to win a debate, but I also do not wish to allow those who will read our interaction to be misled by techniques of debate, and then possibly miss the truth of the last six verses of Daniel eleven. Because of the personal burden I have concerning those verses, I feel convicted to point out where Pfandl employs techniques that are designed not to expose truth or error, but are designed to accomplish less than worthy purposes. In his efforts to do this, I do not know whether his motives are bad or good, but because this is a public interaction, his techniques need to be addressed, without delving into his heart motives.

Once again, in Pfandl’s second critique he starts with the same approach by stating, “The tone of Jeff Pippenger’s response is surprising. He has obviously never participated in a scholarly debate where both sides point out the perceived weaknesses of the other person’s views without getting personal. His *ad hominem* arguments are neither warranted nor helpful. Christians should be able to disagree without being disagreeable.”

It is not I, who opened up the first discussion by inferring that Pfandl is a liar. There are many in Adventism that believe that to have a relationship with *Hope International* is evidence of some type of rebellion. Pfandl knows this. So the first thing he did in his critique of the *Time of the End* magazine was to infer the author is a liar, and that the author is working with an organization that is on some unwritten black list in Adventism. He initiated the use of *ad hominem* arguments, and is pretending otherwise. This technique is where he started in his first critique, and this is where he starts on critique number two.

I have spent the last decade sharing Bible prophecy around the world in Adventism. This is not self-exaltation, it is simply a fact. I have interacted with Adventist brothers and sisters, Adventist elders, Adventist pastors, Adventist conference presidents, well and lesser known Adventist evangelists, Adventist Union officers and even some General Conference men on subjects connected primarily to Bible prophecy, (but in no wise exclusively limited to Bible prophecy). I have been involved in this work on a weekly basis during this period of time and would think that I have spent as much time participating in “scholarly debates” on these subjects as most in Adventism. I perceive that the real concern that Pfandl is identifying here is found in how we define “scholarly debate”. If he is defining “scholarly debate” as: “the *Biblical Research Institute* and its members are those who pass decisions on what and what is not truth”—then we are working under two different definitions for “scholarly debate”. The Bible is the definer of truth, not men.

For anyone who has read his first critique and my response to that evaluation, and then read through his second critique one thing is absolutely irrefutable. Pfandl avoids responding to any of the challenges to his reasoning which we identified in his first critique. A “scholarly debate” would include acknowledgments of mistakes where necessary, responses when due, withdrawals where appropriate, identifying points of common ground and other acknowledgments which would take place in an honest discussion about what is biblical truth. He simply approaches the whole situation as if his understanding of the Bible is above evaluation. Let those of you who are reading these things beware.

The last six verses of Daniel eleven are the clearest illustration of the events leading to the close of probation, for in Daniel 12:1, we are told that, “At that time will Michael stand up”. The close of human probation is identified in verse one of Daniel twelve—but the verse also identifies that probation closes somewhere in the previous verses, by stating “And at that time”. Therefore, verses forty through forty-five of Daniel eleven are the “events connected with the close of probation”. Consider the following:

“Before His crucifixion the Saviour explained to His disciples that He was to be put to death and to rise again from the tomb, and angels were present to impress His words on minds and hearts. But **the disciples were looking for temporal deliverance from the Roman yoke, and they could not tolerate the thought** that He in whom all their hopes centered should suffer an ignominious death. **The words which they needed to remember were banished from their minds**; and when the time of trial came, it found them unprepared. The death of Jesus as fully destroyed their hopes **as if He had not forewarned them. So in the prophecies the future is opened before us as plainly as it was opened to the disciples by the words of Christ. The events connected with the close of probation and the work of preparation for the time of trouble, are clearly presented. But multitudes have no more understanding of these important truths than if they had never been revealed.** Satan watches to catch away every impression that would make them wise unto salvation, and the time of trouble will find them unready.” *The Great Controversy*, 594.

Pfandl states, “As I indicated in my book, I do not have a set interpretation of Daniel 11:40–45. I am open to any reasonable interpretation as long as it does not violate basic hermeneutical guidelines.”

The so-called “scholarly debate” that is transpiring between myself and Pfandl can be boiled down in this fashion. Inspiration teaches that the last six verses of Daniel eleven have been clearly revealed, but that many do not understand these events. This lack of understanding is compared with those who would not listen to Christ as he forewarned about and predicted his death. Pfandl, perhaps without realizing it, states openly, that he is among the group that does not understand the “events connected with the close of probation”—“events” that have been clearly revealed. But he further states that he is willing to see these things, if they are in agreement with the rules of Biblical understanding, which he places so much confidence in. If those rules were correct and workable, would not those rules clearly and correctly identify the events in the passage? After all, those “events” are “clearly revealed”. Why doesn’t Pfandl’s basic rules of theological hermeneutics, decipher and discern what inspiration has identified as clearly revealed?

Let the reader beware. If someone stated that they “knew nothing of or about the Bible”, but that they “knew a certain man who professed to understand the Bible”, and they also “knew that certain man was incorrect in his understanding of the Bible”—we would not expect the man who professed no knowledge of the Bible to be the expert on the Bible.

There is the possibility the man who acknowledged he did not understand the Bible could be correct in his evaluation of the other man’s lack of understanding of the Bible, but we would certainly never place the man who confesses openly that he knows not the Bible, in the position as the expert on the Bible. Would we? Would you?

Yet Pfandl states, “I do not have a set interpretation of Daniel 11:40–45.” Let those reading this discussion, beware. If what we are teaching concerning the last six verses of Daniel eleven is actually present truth, and you dear Reader, reject that message based upon arguments that are drawn from the rules of debate, instead of God’s Word, how can you be blessed?

Notice William Miller’s fifth rule of prophecy:

RULE V—“Scripture must be—its own expositor, since it is a rule of itself. If I depend on a teacher to expound it 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, not the Bible.”

Pfandl states, “Clarity is not a hallmark of Pippenger’s response. It is at times difficult to follow his arguments, which leads to misunderstandings.”

I do not defend my ability to convey thoughts well. There is always room for improvement with human beings. I have need of improvement in many areas. That being said: Pfandl misunderstands things in our response without any valid justification for doing so. He is either careless in his reading, or perhaps unwilling to be fair in his reading, or perhaps purposely misstates thoughts and ideas to win the debate. This last possibility is acceptable in debating, but unacceptable in Christianity. As an example:

Pfandl states, “Pippenger rails repeatedly against the “educated group” in the Adventist Church.” This statement is false, even by a child’s analysis of the facts.

My response to Pfandl’s critique is found in the February and March 2005 issues of our monthly newsletter. These issues are twenty-four pages each, making a total of forty-eight pages. Six of the pages do not contain the response, leaving a total of forty-two pages. I address the “learned” of Isaiah twenty-nine in only one passage contained on only two pages—of forty-two pages. That is a little over two percent of the response, and the two percent is found in only one place in the article, and that one passage is enough for Pfandl to say, “Pippenger **rails repeatedly** against the ‘educated group’ in Adventism.”

“Repeatedly rails?”

In the same comment, he classifies my approach to the work and role of the pioneers as “a mantra”. (Employing the word “mantra” which comes from the realm of spiritualism), he then goes on to misrepresent and misstate how I understand the role and work of the pioneers. In the art of debate this technique is called the “straw man” attack. The “straw man” approach in the art of debate is to misrepresent a man’s position by incorrectly defining the position in a ridiculous and absurd light, in order to attack the position and simultaneously destroy the man and his credibility.

“Pippenger rails repeatedly against the ‘educated group’ in the Adventist Church, yet, a better grasp of Adventist and church history would have helped him to avoid some historical mistakes. To repeat over and over again, like a mantra, that **the Adventist pioneers had the correct view is not enough**. Particularly, since **he himself picks and chooses which views among the pioneers he accepts and which not**. Uriah Smith is referred to by name (p. 75), yet one of the mainstays of Smith’s interpretation of Daniel 11 was his identification of the king of the North as Turkey; an identification that Pippenger rejects.”

My understanding of the pioneers is public record. I have dealt with how I understand the role and work of the pioneers decidedly and openly for the last decade. There may be, and most likely is, some aspects of the pioneers that I do not understand correctly. BUT, I do not, nor have I ever taught that everything that the pioneers understood was flawless.

I do believe and teach that they were the men that the Lord used to establish the foundations of Adventism, and that we should understand their reasons for identifying and defending the positions they came to understand and defend. I also understand that they were part of the conclusion of the Protestant Reformation and that the truths they were used to establish continued to be developed at least into the last two decades of the nineteenth century.

I also understand that anyone who has a surface understanding of Pfandl's position of Bible prophecy would see the logical necessity for his downplaying and rejecting the pioneer conclusions—for he opposes some of their most significant understandings. If pointing to the work of the pioneers is a “mantra” what can we say about the Spirit of Prophecy chanting that same theme?

“I have had presentations regarding the deceptions that Satan is bringing in at this time. I have been instructed that we should make prominent the testimony of some of the old workers who are now dead. Let them continue to speak through their articles as found in the early numbers of our papers. These articles should now be reprinted, that there may be a living voice from the Lord's witnesses. The history of the early experiences in the message will be a power to withstand the masterly ingenuity of Satan's deceptions. This instruction has been repeated recently. . . .

“God has given me light regarding our periodicals. What is it?—He has said that the dead are to speak. How?—Their works shall follow them. We are to repeat the words of the pioneers in our work, who knew what it cost to search for the truth as for hidden treasure, and who labored to lay the foundation of our work. They moved forward step by step under the influence of the Spirit of God. One by one these pioneers are passing away. The word given me is, Let that which these men have written in the past be reproduced. And in the *Signs of the Times* let not the articles be long or the print fine. Do not try to crowd everything into one number of the paper. Let the print be good, and let earnest, living experiences be put into the paper. . . .

“Let the truths that are the foundation of our faith be kept before the people. Some will depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils. They talk **science**, and the enemy comes in and gives them an abundance of **science**; but **it is not the science of salvation**. It is not the **science** of humility, of consecration, or of the sanctification of the Spirit. **We are now to understand what the pillars of our faith are,**—the truths that have made us as a people what we are, leading us on step by step....

“In Minneapolis God gave precious gems of truth to His people in new settings. This light from heaven by some was rejected with all the stubbornness the Jews manifested in rejecting Christ, and there was much talk about standing by the old landmarks. But there was evidence they knew not what the old landmarks were. There was evidence **and there was reasoning from the word that commended itself to the conscience; but the minds of men were fixed, sealed against the entrance of light**, because they had decided it was a dangerous error removing the ‘old landmarks’ when it was not moving a peg of the old landmarks, but they had perverted ideas of what constituted the old landmarks. . . .

“Now at the present time God designs a new and fresh impetus shall be given to His work. **Satan sees this, and he is determined it shall be hindered. He knows that if he can deceive the people who claim to believe present truth, [and make them believe that] the work the Lord designs to do for His people is a removing of the old landmarks, something which they should, with most determined zeal, resist, then he exults over the deception he has led them to believe.** The work for this time has certainly been a surprising work of various hindrances, owing to **the false setting of matters before the minds of many of our people. That which is food to the churches is regarded as dangerous**, and should not be given them. And this slight difference of ideas is allowed to unsettle the faith, to cause apostasy, to break up unity, to sow discord, all because they do not know what they are striving about themselves. Brethren, is it not best to be sensible? Heaven is looking upon us all, and what can they think of recent developments?

“While in this condition of things, building up barriers, we not only deprive ourselves of great light and precious advantages, but just now, when we so much need it, we place ourselves where light cannot be communicated from heaven that we ought to communicate to others.

“When the power of God testifies as to what is truth, that truth is to stand forever as the truth. No after suppositions, contrary to the light God has given are to be entertained. Men will arise with interpretations of Scripture which are to them truth, but which are not truth. The truth for this time, God has given us as a foundation for our faith. He Himself has taught us what is truth. One will arise, and still another, with new light which contradicts the light that God has given under the demonstration of His Holy Spirit.

“A few are still alive who passed through the experience gained in the establishment of this truth. God has graciously spared their lives to repeat and repeat till the close of their lives, the experience through which they passed even as did John the apostle till the very close of his life. And **the standard-bearers who have fallen in death, are to speak through the reprinting of their writings. I am instructed that thus their voices are to be heard. They are to bear their testimony as to what constitutes the truth for this time.**

“We are not to receive the words of those who come with a message that contradicts the special points of our faith. They gather together a mass of Scripture, and pile it as proof around their asserted theories. This has been done over and over again during the past fifty years. And while the Scriptures are God’s word, and are to be respected, the application of them, if such application moves one pillar from the foundation that God has sustained these fifty years, is a great mistake. He who makes such an application knows not the wonderful demonstration of the Holy Spirit that gave power and force to the past messages that have come to the people of God.” *Counsels to Writers and Editors*, 26–32.

The necessity of understanding the message and experience of the pioneers is not Jeff Pippenger’s “mantra”—it is a warning from Jesus Christ. The final message will be built upon the foundations established by Christ through the pioneers of Adventism. Those foundations will be attacked by men with false “theories”, and we are to continue to promote and understand the work and role of the pioneers of Adventism—no matter what any scientific theologian might state!

Thus saith the Lord, Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask **for the old paths**, where *is* the good way, **and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls**. But they said, **We will not walk therein**. Also I set watchmen over you, *saying*, Harken to the sound of the trumpet. But they said, **We will not hearken**.

Therefore hear, ye nations, and know, O congregation, what *is* among them. Hear, O earth: behold, **I will bring evil upon this people**, *even* the fruit of their thoughts, because they have not hearkened unto my words, nor to my law, but rejected it. To what purpose cometh there to me incense from Sheba, and the sweet cane from a far country? your burnt offerings *are* not acceptable, nor your sacrifices sweet unto me.

Therefore thus saith the Lord, Behold, I will lay stumblingblocks before this people, and the fathers and the sons together shall fall upon them; the neighbour and his friend shall perish. Thus saith the Lord, Behold, **a people cometh from the north country, and a great nation shall be raised from the sides of the earth**. Jeremiah 6:16–22.

Please notice that when Jeremiah, and therefore the Bible, points out the old paths that are rejected by the “watchmen” of Adventism, he further identifies the “stumbling block” which the watchmen trip over. The stumbling block is “a great nation” that comes from “the north”. This is of course, a specific reference to the message about the “king of the north” in the last six verses of Daniel eleven.

And *they that shall be* of thee shall build **the old waste places**: thou shalt **raise up the foundations of many generations**; and thou shalt be called, The repairer of the breach, **The restorer of paths** to dwell in. Isaiah 58:12.

The Bible teaches that one aspect of the work of Adventism is to restore the old paths. To make the history and teachings of the pioneers a “mantra”—is to fulfill a divine mandate.

“There is a work of **sacred importance** for ministers and people to do. They are to study **the history of the cause and people of God**. They are not to forget the past dealing of God with His people. They are to revive and recount the **truths that have come to seem of little value to those who do not know by personal experience of the power and brightness that accompanied them when they were first seen and understood**. In all their original freshness and power these truths are to be given to the world.” *Selected Messages*, book 1, 157.

The word “mantra” is a spiritualistic word identifying a word or phrase that is repeated in order to reach a higher spiritual state or understanding. Repetition is the primary element of the word. Notice what God repeated to Sister White:

“**Again and again** I have been shown that the past experiences of God’s people are not to be counted as dead facts. We are not to treat the record of these experiences as we would treat a last year’s almanac. The record is to be kept in mind, for history will repeat itself.” *Publishing Ministry*, 175.

“**The record of the experience through which the people of God passed in the early history of our work must be republished**. Many of those who have since come into the truth are ignorant of the way in which the Lord wrought. The experience of William Miller and his associates, of Captain Joseph Bates, and of other pioneers in the advent message, should be kept before our people. Elder Loughborough’s book should receive attention. Our leading men should see what can be done for the circulation of this book.

“We must study to find out **the best way in which to take up the review of our experiences from the beginning of our work, when we separated from the churches, and went forward step by step in the light that God gave us. We then took the position that the Bible, and the Bible only, was to be our guide; and we are never to depart from this position.**” *Counsels to Writers and Editors*, 145.

In understanding the sacred experience of the pioneers of Adventism, one of the primary characteristics of that experience is that they were used by the Holy Spirit to establish truths based upon the Bible and the Bible only. Miller, Bates and Loughborough all taught that the “daily” in the book of Daniel is paganism. This understanding is directly opposed to Pfandl’s understanding on the subject.

“After the passing of the time, **God entrusted to His faithful followers the precious principles of present truth. These principles were not given to those who had had no part in the giving of the first and second angels’ messages. They were given to the workers who had had a part in the cause from the beginning.**

“Those who passed through these experiences are to be as firm as a rock to the principles that have made us Seventh-day Adventists. They are to be workers together with God, binding up the testimony and sealing the law among His disciples. Those who took part in the establishment of our work upon a foundation of Bible truth, those who know the waymarks that have pointed out the right path, are to be regarded as **workers of the highest value**. They can speak from personal experience, regarding **the truths entrusted to them**. These men are not to permit their faith to be changed to infidelity; they are not to permit the banner of the third angel to be taken from their hands. **They are to hold the beginning of their confidence firm unto the end.**

“**The Lord has declared that the history of the past shall be rehearsed as we enter upon the closing work**. Every truth that He has given for these last days is to be proclaimed to the world. **Every pillar that He has established is to be strengthened**. We cannot now step off **the foundation that God has established.**” *Selected Messages*, book 2, 390.

How can someone strengthen pillars that he does not recognize or acknowledge? The correct understanding of these pillars was given to and established through the pioneers—not modern theologians.

“My brethren, the value of the evidences of truth that we have received during the past half century, is above estimate. These evidences are as treasure hidden in a field. Search for them. Study the Bible truths that for fifty years have been calling us out from the world. Present this evidence in clear, plain lines. Those who have been long in the truth, and those who have recently received the truth, must now dig for the buried heavenly treasure. Let every man work to the point. Study the Word of God. Revive the evidences given in the past. ‘Search the Scriptures,’ Christ said; ‘for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me.’

“Those who stand before the people as teachers of truth are to grapple with great themes. They are not to occupy precious time in talking of trivial subjects. Let them study the word, and preach the word. Let the word be in their hands as a sharp, two-edged sword. **Let it testify to past truths, and show what is to be in the future.**” *Review and Herald*, April 19, 1906.

The truths identified and established in the first fifty years of Adventism are above estimate!

“I do not wish to ignore or drop one link in the chain of evidence that was formed as, after the passing of the time in 1844, little companies of seekers after truth met together to study the Bible and to ask God for light and guidance. . . . The truth, point by point, was fastened in our minds so firmly that we could not doubt. . . . The evidence given in our early experience has the same force that it had then. **The truth is the same as it ever has been, and not a pin or a pillar can be moved from the structure of truth. That which was sought for out of the Word in 1844, 1845, and 1846 remains the truth in every particular. . . .**

“The truths given us after the passing of the time in 1844 are just as certain and unchangeable as when the Lord gave them to us in answer to our urgent prayers. The visions that the Lord has given me are so remarkable that we know that what we have accepted is the truth. This was demonstrated by the Holy Spirit. Light, precious light from God, established **the main points of our faith as we hold them today. . . .**

“Listen not a moment to the interpretations that would loosen one pin, remove one pillar, from the platform of truth. Human interpretations, the reception of fables, will spoil your faith, confuse your understanding, and make of none effect your faith in Jesus Christ. Study diligently the third chapter of Revelation. In it is pointed out the danger of losing your hold upon the things that you have heard and learned from the Source of all light.

“When men come in who would move one pin or pillar from the foundation which God has established by His Holy Spirit, let the aged men who were pioneers in our work speak plainly, and let those who are dead speak also, by the reprinting of their articles in our periodicals. Gather up the rays of divine light that God has given as He has led His people on step by step in the way of truth. This truth will stand the test of time and trial.

“The truths that have been substantiated by the manifest working of God are to stand fast. Let no one presume to move a pin or a foundation stone from the structure. **Those who attempt to undermine the pillars of our faith are among those of whom the Bible says that ‘in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils.’**

“At this time many efforts will be made to unsettle our faith in the sanctuary question; but we must not waver. Not a pin is to be moved from the foundations of our faith. Truth is still truth. **Those who become uncertain will drift into erroneous theories, and will finally find themselves infidel in regard to the past evidence we have had of what is truth. The old waymarks must be preserved, that we lose not our bearings.**

“Give to the world the message the Lord has given you. **Remove not a pin or a pillar from the foundation of our faith.** Preach the truth as it has been given by the Lord.

“The third angel is represented as flying in the midst of heaven, symbolizing the work of those who proclaim the first, second, and third angels’ messages; all are linked together. The evidences of the abiding, ever-living truth of these grand messages, that means so much to us, that have awakened such intense opposition from the religious world, are not extinct. **Satan is constantly seeking to cast his hellish shadow about these messages, so that the remnant people of God shall not clearly discern their import, their time and place; but they live, and are to exert their power upon our religious experience while time shall last. . . .**

“**After the passing of the time, God entrusted to his faithful followers the precious principles of present truth. These principles were not given to those who had had no part in the giving of the first and second angels’ messages. They were given to the workers who had had a part in the cause from the beginning. . . .**

“I consider that that book [*Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation*] should go everywhere. It has its place and will do a grand, good work.

“[Speaking, in the nineties, of Elder Smith’s books, one of the leaders in our colporteur work asked Mrs. White]: **‘You believe they are inspired, do you not?’**

“**[Indicative of her recognition of the folly of the question, she replied]:** ‘You may answer that question, I shall not.’” *Manuscript Releases*, volume 1, 52–61.

Sister White endorses and even calls Smith’s book God’s helping hand, but considered it ridiculous to consider the book inspired. It is not in disagreement for me to identify Smith’s book as God’s helping hand, and also understand that the book has some problems, for it is certainly not inspired. I do believe that it is the finest overview of the pioneer understanding of Daniel and the Revelation that has ever been produced in Adventism, despite some of the erroneous positions set forth in the book.

“*Daniel and Revelation, Great Controversy, Patriarchs and Prophets, and Desire of Ages* should now go to the world. The grand instruction contained in *Daniel and Revelation* has been eagerly perused by many in Australia. This book has been the means of bringing many precious souls to a knowledge of the truth. Everything that can be done should be done to circulate *Thoughts on Daniel and Revelation*. I know of no other book that can take the place of this one. **It is God’s helping hand.**” *Publishing Ministry*, 356.

I did not repeat over and over, or even say one time, “The pioneers were correct about everything”. What I said, is that the pioneers had the correct understanding of the “daily” in the book of Daniel, and that Pfandl has an understanding of the “daily” in the book of Daniel that is exactly the opposite of the pioneers. I challenge him and other of the modern theologians to at least be as open as *The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary Dictionary* on this subject. That dictionary has both the correct pioneer view of the “daily” and the incorrect view of the “daily” that was introduced into Adventism by Conradi in the 1901 time period. The dictionary has an accurate overview of the history of the “daily” controversy in Adventism. The modern theologians tend to present their false view of the “daily” in the book of Daniel, as if their position is not only correct, but also the only understanding Adventism has ever embraced. Neither is true. This technique Pfandl himself employed in the fourth quarter *Sabbath School Lessons of 2004*.

Pfandl chastises me for misunderstanding Advent history. I would rather be accused of misunderstanding history than to be identified as one who attempts to re-write history. Inspiration states that the pioneers had the correct view of the “daily” and that the view which Pfandl holds about the “daily” came from angels that were expelled from heaven.

“Then I saw in relation to the ‘daily’ (Daniel 8:12) that the word ‘sacrifice’ was supplied by man’s wisdom, and does not belong to the text, and that **the Lord gave the correct view of it to those who gave the judgment hour cry.** When union existed, before 1844, **nearly all were united on the correct view of the ‘daily’**; but in the confusion since 1844, other views have been embraced, and darkness and confusion have followed.” *Early Writings*, 74.

No honest reading of Advent history will show that “those who gave the judgment hour cry” were united on any other definition of the “daily” than, that it represents paganism in general and pagan Rome in a specific sense. The history of the controversy in Adventism concerning the “daily” in the book of Daniel is a history that Pfandl and other modern theologians work very diligently to reinvent and reinterpret in order to maintain the old Protestant view of the “daily”. Their old Protestant view pre-dated the understanding of the “daily” which the pioneers understood and established as foundational in the 1844 time period. (William Miller is clear and correct when he explains that if one accepts the Protestant view of the “daily” as representing the work of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary, he destroys the twenty-three hundred year prophecy of Daniel 8:14. And you most certainly do!)

A. G. Daniells became the great propagator of this false view from 1901 and onward. In 1910 Sister White wrote a manuscript where she clearly identified that Daniell’s understanding of the “daily” (which was Conradi’s, and is now Pfandl’s) would only bring confusion. Who is the author of confusion? Answer that question correctly and you will know who invented the teaching that the “daily” in the book of Daniel represents Christ’s work in the sanctuary above.

“And there was **Brother Daniells, whose mind the enemy was working**; and your mind and Elder Prescott’s mind were being **worked by the angels that were expelled from heaven**. Satan’s work was to divert your minds that jots and tittles should be brought in which **the Lord did not inspire you to bring in**. They were **not essential**. But this meant much to the cause of truth. And the ideas of your minds, if you could be drawn away to jots or tittles, is **a work of Satan’s devising**. . . .

“And **I was shown from the first that the Lord had given neither Elders Daniells nor Prescott the burden of this work**. Should **Satan’s wiles** be brought in, should this **‘Daily’** be such a great matter as to be **brought in to confuse minds and hinder the advancement of the work** at this important period of time? **It should not, whatever may be. This subject should not be introduced**, for the spirit that would be brought in would be forbidding, and Lucifer is watching every movement.

“Satanic agencies would commence his work and there would be confusion brought into our ranks. You have no call to hunt up the difference of opinion that is not a testing question; but **your silence is eloquence. I have the matter all plainly before me. If the devil could involve any one of our own people on these subjects, as he has proposed to do, Satan’s cause would triumph.** . . .

“I have been instructed that such hasty movements should not have [been] made [such] as selecting you as president of the conference even another year. But the Lord forbids any more such hasty transactions until the matter is brought before the Lord in prayer; and as you have had the message come to you that the work of the Lord resting upon the president is a most solemn responsibility, **you had no moral right to blaze out as you did upon the subject of the ‘Daily’** and suppose your influence would decide the question. . . .

“Now I am to tell them [that] **when I was shown this matter**, when Elder Daniells was **lifting up his voice like a trumpet in advocating his ideas of the ‘Daily,’ the after results were presented**. Our people were becoming **confused. I saw the result**, and then there were given me cautions that if Elder Daniells without respect to the outcome should thus be impressed and **let himself believe he was under the inspiration of God, skepticism would be sown among our ranks everywhere, and we should be where Satan would carry his messages**. Set unbelief and skepticism would be sown in human minds, and **strange crops of evil would take the place of truth.**” *Manuscript Releases*, volume 20, 17–22.

For God is not *the author* of confusion, but of peace, as in all churches of the saints. 1 Corinthians 14:33.

When Pfandl begins his comments he states, “‘The history of verse forty: is the history of the papacy being attacked in 1798.’ I would agree with Pippenger if the text said ‘at the beginning of the time of the end . . .’” The Hebrew expression *ube’et* “and at the time” appears 15 times in the OT. Depending on the context the preposition *be* can be translated with “in, at, on, into, with, from, when,” etc. Hence, *ube’et* **can also mean** “and in the time of” in the sense of during a certain time period.”

He then goes on to build another possible application to the “time of the end” in verse forty, and concludes the word study by stating, “While the interpretation of Pippenger is possible, it certainly is not demanded by the text as he thinks. Since the ‘time of the end’ is a time period and not a point of time, it behooves us to be a bit more cautious.”

Notice William Miller’s eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth rule of Bible prophecy:

RULE XI—How to know when a word is used figuratively. **If it makes good sense as it stands, and does no violence to the simple laws of nature**, then it must be understood literally, if not, figuratively

RULE XII—To learn the true meaning of figures, trace your figurative word through your Bible, and where you find it explained, put it on your figure, and **if it makes good sense you need look no further**, if not, look again.

RULE XIII—To know whether we have the true historical event for the fulfillment of a prophecy. **If you find every word of the prophecy** (after the figures are understood) is literally fulfilled, then you may know that your history is the true event. But if one word lacks a fulfillment, then you must look for another event, or wait its future development. For God takes care that history and prophecy doth agree, so that the true believing children of God may never be ashamed.

Identifying the “time of the end” as 1798 “makes good sense” for Sister White does so. The book of Daniel conclusively identifies that when Daniel employs the phrase “time of the end” in chapter eight, and twice in chapter eleven, it means the end of a specific time prophecy. Therefore “tracing” the “time of the end” “through” the Bible to identify the “time of the end” as 1798 “makes good sense”, and we therefore “need” to “look no further” “Every word” in verse forty has a direct and important relationship to identifying 1798 as “the time of the end” so we can “know that” our “history is the true event”.

What I want to suggest here is that William Miller identified rules of Bible prophecy which emphasized the simple confirmations of truth. They were not rules built upon standards established by men, but God.

Pfandl admits the feasibility of the “time of the end” being 1798, but is unwilling to allow it to stand in its simplicity, in spite of inspired endorsement to the contrary.

William Miller’s rules were accepted by the pioneers and endorsed by God! They are rules which require a student to exercise logic, honesty and simple faith. When applied they are consistent and profound.

Pfandl’s basic argument here is “caution”. The message in the final verses of Daniel eleven are identifying that the Sunday law is about to arrive and the crisis which Adventism has acknowledged for years is about to take place. In considering this passage Pfandl argues for “caution”! “Caution” as the events leading to the close of probation begin to unfold?

“**The people need to be aroused** in regard to the dangers of the present time. **The watchmen are asleep**. We are years behind. Let the chief watchmen feel the urgent necessity of taking heed to themselves, lest they lose the opportunities given them to see the dangers.

“**If the leading men in our conferences do not now accept the message sent them by God**, and fall into line for action, the churches will suffer great loss. When the watchman, seeing the sword coming, gives the trumpet a certain sound, the people along the line will echo the warning, and all will have opportunity to make ready for the conflict. But too often the leader has stood hesitating, seeming to say: ‘**Let us not be in too great haste. There may be a mistake. We must be careful not to raise a false alarm.**’ The very hesitancy and uncertainty on his part is crying: “Peace and safety.” Do not get excited. Be not alarmed. There is a great deal more made of this religious amendment question than is demanded. This agitation will all die down.’ Thus he virtually denies the message sent from God, and **the warning which was designed to stir the churches fails to do its work**. The trumpet of the watchman gives no certain sound, and the people do not prepare for the battle. Let the watchman beware lest, **through his hesitancy and delay, souls shall be left to perish, and their blood shall be required at his hand.**” *Testimonies*, volume 5, 715, 716.

The understanding of the “time of the end” in verse forty is established from several proofs. The context, of Daniel 11:31 and onward, identifies and establishes the papacy as the subject of the verses. The papacy began to rule the world in 538, when in verse thirty-one, the “abomination that maketh desolate” was placed. Forgive me, but this is established pioneer understanding. See “God’s helping hand”—that is; the book *Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation*, by Smith.

And arms shall stand on his part, and they shall pollute the sanctuary of strength, and shall take away the daily *sacrifice*, and they shall place the abomination that maketh desolate. Daniel 11:31.

Once the papacy is empowered in 538, the persecution of the Dark Ages is identified.

And such as do wickedly against the covenant shall he corrupt by flatteries: but the people that do know their God shall be strong, and do *exploits*. And they that understand among the people shall instruct many: yet they shall fall by the sword, and by flame, by captivity, and by spoil, *many* days. Now when they shall fall, they shall be holpen with a little help: but many shall cleave to them with flatteries. And *some* of them of understanding shall fall, to try them, and to purge, and to make *them* white, *even* to **the time of the end**: because *it is* yet for **a time appointed**. Daniel 11:32–35.

The “the sword, and by flame, by captivity, and by spoil, *many* days” is the persecution of the 1260 years. The “sword, flame, captivity, and spoil” is the persecution, and the “many days” is the 1260 year time period.

The verses teach that this persecution continues until “a time appointed” which is also identified as “the time of the end”. The “time appointed” in the passage is 1798, and it is also the “time of the end”. When you get to verse forty there has been no break in the subject of the passage. It continues to be the papal power. When verse forty states that “at the time of the end”, by context of the passage, it can only mean the “time” which has been “appointed” for the conclusion of the 1260 years of papal rule. That was 1798. This is why Sister White teaches in *The Great Controversy*, page 356, that 1798 is the “time of the end”.

“But at **the time of the end**, says the prophet, “Many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased.’ Daniel 12:4. . . . **Since 1798** the book of Daniel has been unsealed, knowledge of the prophecies has increased, and many have proclaimed the solemn message of the judgment near.” *The Great Controversy*, 356.

In inspiration truth is established upon the testimony of two.

And for that the dream was doubled unto Pharaoh twice; *it is* because the thing *is established* by God, and God will shortly bring it to pass. Genesis 41:32.

In the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be **established**. 2 Corinthians 13:2.

There are more ways to prove that the “time of the end” in verse forty is 1798, but it is established in the book of Daniel and Sister White. The other proofs are simply further confirmation. The pioneers also use Daniel 11:35, to demonstrate that the “time of the end” in verse forty is 1798. The verse itself does not say, “In the time of the end”, the verse states “And **AT** the time of the end”. Pfandl suggests other possibilities by employing the theological rules which he holds in such high esteem.

Pfandl then opposes the verse by accusing me of falsely claiming “that the papacy spiritually conquered the Soviet Union”. He continues on this thought by stating that the idea of the papacy conquering the Soviet Union in 1989 “is simply contrary to the facts. The papacy has little, if any, spiritual influence in the countries of the former Soviet Union.”

The secular historians have recently dealt with the funerals of Ronald Reagan and Pope John Paul II. As they eulogized both these men, they consistently pointed out that it was the secret efforts of these two men and their respective powers that brought down the Soviet Union. This is a historical fact. It is not something Pippenger has invented. Pfandl misdirects the consideration by lifting up the influence of the papacy in Russia. The influence of the papacy in Europe is not the fulfillment.

The fulfillment of verse forty is that through the efforts of the papacy, (the king of the north) and the United States (the chariots, horsemen and ships) the Soviet Union (the king of the south) is no longer in existence! The fulfillment is not that the papacy now dominates Russia or Eastern Europe! The fulfillment was when the Soviet Union was swept away like a whirlwind! Where is the Soviet Union? It's gone, swept away, no longer there. Why is this so hard to see? In fact, it is now incorrect to say the Soviet Union. Now it is the "former" Soviet Union!

If Pfandl chooses to oppose my understanding of the fulfillment of verse forty, should he not address what I identify as the fulfillment as he presents his opposition? Honesty would require him to do so, but "straw men" is the method which seems most familiar for Pfandl to employ.

Identifying the collapse of an empire in verse forty is in agreement with a basic prophetic premise in the book of Daniel.

"From the rise and fall of nations as made plain in the books of Daniel and the Revelation, we need to learn how worthless is mere outward and worldly glory." *Prophets and Kings*, 548.

"The prophet Daniel described the kingdoms that would rise and fall." *Bible Training School*, December 1, 1912.

The prophetic message set forth in the book of Daniel specifically describes the rise and fall of nations. It would, no doubt, be helpful to those who would attempt to employ and uphold Pfandl's theological rules, to include that "premise" in their considerations of Bible prophecy, though it appears that very "few" are currently willing to do so.

"Few study the working out of His purpose in the rise and fall of nations." *The Ministry of Healing*, 442.

Pfandl next enters into an argument against these verses that can only be categorized as "smoke and mirrors".

He states, "Pippenger maintains that using two different symbols in one verse for one and the same entity is acceptable. He tries to prove it by stating that in Revelation 13 the beast and the head of the beast both represent the papacy. 'Two symbols—identifying the same power, and they are both within two verses of each other'. **Pippenger fails to recognize** that what we have in Revelation 13 is a literary device called synecdoche. A synecdoche is a figure of speech in which the whole can be put for a part or a part for the whole. For example, in Psalm 26:10—'In whose hands is a sinister scheme, And whose right hand is full of bribes.' The right hand as part of the body stand for the whole person. Revelation 13 therefore does not support his contention that there are two different symbols for the same power."

In Pfandl's first critique he criticized my position that "the chariots, horsemen and ships" in verse forty represent the United States, and that "the glorious land" in verse forty-one also represent the United States. I simply argued that Revelation thirteen, verses two and three also have two different symbols for the same power. The leopard-like beast of verse two is the papacy during the Dark Ages, but the head that is healed is the papacy when it returns to power. They are the same power, but at two points in history. The two different symbols identify two important characteristics of the overall message concerning the papacy.

The Chariots, horsemen and ships of verse forty is identifying the strengths which the United States exercises as it places the papacy on the throne of the earth.

In verse forty-one the United States is symbolized as the glorious land. This symbol is emphasizing the prophetic role of the United States as the great defender of religious liberty.

The two verses emphasizing two aspects of the role of the United States in Bible prophecy are emphasizing two truths also associated with the United States in Revelation thirteen. ("The object is to bring these books [Daniel and Revelation] together, showing that **they both relate to the same subjects.**" *Publishing Ministry*, 314.)

The “chariots” and “horsemen” represent military strength, and “ships” represent economic strength. These two symbols agree with and correspond to Revelation thirteen:

And he [the United States] had power to give life unto the image of the beast, that the image of the beast should both speak, and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast **should be killed**. And he causeth all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads: And that **no man might buy or sell**, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name.

The “glorious land” of verse forty-one represents the prophetic role of the United States as the defender of religious liberty. This aspect of the United States is identified in Revelation thirteen when it is symbolized as a “lamb”.

“When the land which the Lord provided as an asylum for His people, that they might worship Him according to the dictates of their own consciences, the land over which for long years the shield of Omnipotence has been spread, the land which God has favored by making it the depository of the pure religion of Christ,—when that land shall, through its legislators, abjure the principles of Protestantism, and give countenance to Romish apostasy in tampering with God’s law,—it is then that the final work of the man of sin will be revealed.” *Signs of the Times*, June 12, 1893.

“The Lord has done more for the United States than any other country upon which the sun shines. Here He provided an asylum for His people, where they could worship Him according to the dictates of conscience. Here Christianity has progressed in its purity. The life-giving doctrine of the one Mediator between God and man has been freely taught. God *designed* that this country should ever remain free for all people to worship Him in accordance with the dictates of conscience. He *designed* that its civil institutions, in their expansive productions, should represent the freedom of gospel privileges.” *Maranatha*, 193.

Pfandl is employing “smoke and mirrors”. In his first critique he criticized the concept of identifying one power within two verses, when symbolized by two differing symbols. I suggested that in verses two and three of Revelation thirteen we have a similar example.

And the **beast which I saw** was like unto a leopard, and his feet were as *the feet* of a bear, and his mouth as the mouth of a lion: and the dragon gave him his power, and his seat, and great authority. And I saw **one of his heads as it were wounded to death; and his deadly wound was healed**: and all the world wondered after the beast. Revelation 13:2, 3.

When I used this argument, I was simply pointing out that the papal power is the composite leopard-like beast in verse two, while the papal power is also the head with the deadly wound in the next verse. Inspiration confirms this. Same power—identified two ways—within two verses. It is unnecessary to consider the *grammar* in order to recognize and establish this truth.

“The prophecy of Revelation 13 declares that the power represented by the beast with lamblike horns shall cause ‘the earth and them which dwell therein’ to worship **the papacy—there symbolized by the beast ‘like unto a leopard.’** . . . And prophecy foretells **a restoration of her power. ‘I saw one of his heads as it were wounded to death; and his deadly wound was healed**: and all the world wondered after the beast.’ Verse 3. *The Great Controversy*, 578.

Inspiration here identifies the composite beast of verse two as the papacy, and the wounded head of verse three as the papacy. Now please follow closely.

Pfandl chastises me for seeing the United States in verse forty as the “chariots, ships and horsemen”, and then again in verse forty-one as the “glorious land”. I responded that it is not unacceptable in prophecy for one power to be represented within two verses, with two differing symbols. When he responds to my point—he uses the grammar of the Bible to prove that most certainly there are times when two verses will describe the same power, with different symbols. He agrees with my premise that he first identified as erroneous!

After and while he uses his understanding of grammar to **sustain** my position, he acts as if his knowledge of the grammar somehow demonstrated that I was erroneous in my application of verse forty and forty-one—while all he truly does, is to confirm and support my position. He concludes by stating, “Revelation 13 therefore does not support his contention that there are two different symbols for the same power.” Wow!

Is the head with deadly wound, the papacy? Yes. Is the leopard-like composite beast the papacy? Yes. Are they within two verses of each other? Yes. Are they a “literary device called synecdoche”? Probably, maybe—as long as we understand that verse two is the papacy of the Dark Ages and verse three the modern papacy after the deadly wound is healed. Are the two symbols identifying different aspects of the same power? Yes. Are the chariots, ship and horsemen of verse forty, and the glorious land of verse forty-one identifying two aspects of the same power? Yes. Is this an acceptable understanding in Bible prophecy? Yes. Did Pfandl actually give grammatical support for my stated understanding of verse forty and forty-one, which he had previously criticized? Yes. After offering the grammatical support, did he then suggest that his grammatical support confirmed his previous criticism and refuted my position? Yes. This is nothing more than smoke and mirrors.

Next Pfandl takes his position on the pioneers. He starts by referring to a passage where I am saying, “let it here be stated that one of the basic approaches that I believe needs to be included in correct Bible study is an approach to the study of God’s word [sic] that includes referencing the message of the end, with the foundational truths that were established at the beginning of Adventism, by the men that were commonly called ‘the pioneers’ within the culture of Adventism.” He then comments on this by stating, “This is a basic problem in Pippenger’s response. He believes that the pioneers had the correct view (at least where they agree with him) and anyone who differs with him must surely be one of those mentioned in Isaiah 29:11–12.”

Please notice: as Pfandl quotes me, he does not provide one instance where I say that “the pioneers had the correct view (at least where they agree with him) and anyone who differs with him must surely be one of those mentioned in Isaiah 29:11–12.”

According to Pfandl, this is one of my basic problems. Yet in identifying one of my basic problems, he defines my understanding of the pioneers in a totally false light, and then launches his arguments upon the false premise he raised up. Nowhere in my response to his critique do I even come close to endorsing the false position concerning the pioneers that he is attempting to label me with. This is another “straw man” approach, intended to misguide the discussion. There is not one time in my writings or my recorded audio & video presentations where I teach, or even imply that “anyone who differs with” me—“must surely be one of those mentioned in Isaiah 29:11–12.” Nor is there any place where I teach or imply that the pioneers were always correct. The attack that Pfandl here employs is not valid, nor can he demonstrate from any of my public presentations a statement that justifies him assigning the false premise which he raised against my position on this subject. Neither can he point to any of those presentations to justify his repetitious usage of the “straw man” technique. It is certain though that my public position concerning the pioneers of Adventism stands opposed to his public prophetic model within the Bible.

I sometimes wonder at the validity of the old proverb that points out: “When you throw a rock into a pack of dogs, the dog that yelps—is the one who got hit with the rock.”

We will continue our response to Pfandl’s evaluation in our next newsletter.

FIGHTING AGAINST GOD

I saw a company who stood well guarded and firm, and would give no countenance to those who would unsettle the established faith of the body. God looked upon them with approbation. I was shown three steps—one, two and three—the first, second and third angels' messages. Said the angel, “**Woe** to him who shall move a block, or stir a pin in these messages. The true understanding of these messages is of vital importance. The destiny of souls hangs upon the manner in which they are received.” I was again brought down through these messages, and saw how dearly the people of God had purchased their experience. It had been obtained through much suffering and severe conflict. Step by step had God brought them along, until he had placed them upon a solid, immovable platform. Then I saw individuals as they approached the platform, before stepping upon it examine the foundation. Some with rejoicing immediately stepped upon it. Others commenced to find fault with the laying of the foundation of the platform. They wished improvements made, and then the platform would be more perfect, and the people much happier. Some stepped off the platform and examined it, then found fault with it, declaring it to be laid wrong. I saw that nearly all stood firm upon the platform, and exhorted others who had stepped off to cease their complaints, for God was the master-builder, and they were fighting against him. They recounted the wonderful work of God, which had led them to the firm platform, and in union nearly all raised their eyes to heaven, and with a loud voice glorified God. This affected some of those who had complained, and left the platform, and again they with humble look stepped upon it. *Spiritual Gifts*, volume 1, 168.