**Seventh Day Adventist Theological War Sermon**

**PART 1**

Today we see a lot of confusion and separation in our church today...among many who call themselves “Seventh Day Adventists”. For example Doug bachelor was banned last year (2015) from speaking in the Florida Conference leadership for his role in the whole women ordination crisis as it was reported on their website. I’m sure many of you remember the agitation between the various ministries that lead up to the whole General Conference session that took place in 2015. Many were at the edge of their seats in regards to the whole ‘women’s ordination’ crisis that took place that year and what the outcome would be... there we saw the marked separation between what’s known as the ‘liberal’ Seventh Day Adventists and the ‘Conservative’ Seventh Day Adventists. (I will explain who these are later on the in presentation.)

Recently the SDA conference in Kenya banned Jeremiah Davis from speaking in conference churches in Kenya... and it doesn’t end there... I have a friend, many of you are familiar with the story as I recorded the subject on utube a few months ago, about how a teacher, an Adventist teacher in an Adventist school was basically sacked for believing ... not preaching it... just believing in the 2520... I also was asked to do a campaign at a church here in the England, they had the flyer ready and everything... only for it to be cancelled. And then there was Danny Vierra who was also dis-fellowshipped from the SDA church for reportedly putting up signs announcing the Roman Catholic church as Babylon many years ago. And then of course there’s Mr Jeff Pippenger... probably the most hated out of all in Adventism and deemed a complete apostate by many... the majority in Adventism and he has also been dis-fellowshipped from the Adventist Church. Now the interesting thing about this... is that all... we all claim to be Seventh Day Adventists, yet if that’s the case, why is there is such a marked difference in the beliefs and doctrines we advocate? Why is this so? Well a big part of the reason for this is because of the chosen methodology one chooses to use to study the bible. This is the key to understanding why there is such a difference and many different conclusions are drawn by men who supposedly study the bible. I mean you can read one passage in scripture and another person can read the same... and yet they can come to two completely different conclusions... why is this so? Well you’ll find it is because of the chosen methodology one chooses to use when studying the bible and in Adventism you will find that there are three key methodologies that are used in the Adventist Church and depending on the methodology you choose to use will often draw you to a different conclusion from another ‘Adventists’ who uses the other. The three methodologies are:

1. ‘Proof text Method’, which William Miller and Pioneers used which led to the introduction of the Advent Faith / 1844
2. **Historical Critical Method.** – 1930’S (Advocated by Raymond Cottrell, Desmond Ford,) – (Liberals) – make the bible to fit modern times... need to understand Hebrew and Greek
3. Historical Grammatical Approach 1960’s (Samuel pippin, Ted Wilson, Stephen Bohr) Mixture of both – (Conservatives)

The best way for me to introduce how these theologies entered the church is to begin in the beginning where it all started... and that’s with the methodology the pioneers used to establish the SDA church. No doubt, the central pillar to the Adventist faith is the sanctuary message. 1844. And many of us well know that if you destroy the validity of this date, the whole structure of the Seventh Day Adventist church falls apart. The methodology that Miller used to help lead us to this date is commonly known as the ‘proof text method’ It was by using this method, William Miller was able to lead us to this date... by comparing scripture with scripture. By allowing Scripture to be its own expositor. He tells us:

Prof Text Message

"I determined to lay aside all my prepossessions, to thoroughly compare Scripture with Scripture, and to pursue its study in a regular and methodical manner. I commenced with Genesis, and read verse by verse, proceeding no faster than the meaning of the several passages should be so unfolded as to leave me free from embarrassment respecting any mysticisms or contradictions. Whenever I found anything obscure, my practice was to compare it with all collateral passages; and, by the help of Cruden, I examined all the texts of Scripture in which were found any of the prominent words contained in any obscure portion. Then, by letting every word have its proper bearing on the subject of the text, if my view of it harmonized with every collateral passage in the Bible, it ceased to be a difficulty. In this way I pursued the study of the Bible, in my first perusal of it, for about two years, and was fully satisfied that it is its own interpreter. {1853 SB, MWM 69.3}

This methodology used by William Miller was in his own words, to compare scripture with scripture. Which is recognized as the proof text message. How he came to 1844 what not just through Daniel 8:14, it included the ‘7 times’, Daniel 9 helped... it was these prophecies that led him to the understanding of 1844... though they misunderstood the event... they knew at that time something important was to happen.

He also tells us:

Whenever I found anything obscure, my practice was to compare it with all collateral passages; and, by the help of Cruden, I examined all the texts of Scripture in which were found any of the prominent words contained in any obscure portion. {1853 SB, MWM 69.2}.

Cruden concordance is a Word reference only. Miller did not understand Hebrew or Greek. We can say according to that day and age he was an ‘unlearned man’ like the disciples... even like John the Baptist as he was not schooled in the schools of theology in that day and age. This is clearly noted in the passage below taken from the book entitled ‘Memoirs of William Miller’ written by Sylvester Bliss:

“Mr. Miller again repeated the call for ‘Anonymous’ to stand up, if he was present. No one arose. Mr. Miller then read the question which closed the letter, namely - 'Mr.
Miller, how dare you assert your theory with so much confidence without a knowledge of the Hebrew and Greek languages?" To this Mr. Miller promptly replied, 'If I am not acquainted with the HEBREW and GREEK, I know enough to quote the English texts of the Scriptures rightly.' - 'Anonymous' never made himself known, and it was the impression of many of the audience that the author of the letter, if he was skilled in the Hebrew and Greek, was exceedingly deficient in his knowledge of the English Scriptures." {1853 SB, MWM 155.1}

Now what caused Miller to follower the ‘proof text’ methodology? Note what the pen of inspiration tells us:

"God sent His angel to move upon the heart of a farmer who had not believed the Bible, to lead him to search the prophecies. Angels of God repeatedly visited that chosen one, to guide his mind and open to his understanding prophecies which had ever been dark to God’s people. The commencement of the chain of truth was given to him, and he was led on to search for link after link, until he looked with wonder and admiration upon the Word of God. He saw there a perfect chain of truth. That Word which he had regarded as uninspired now opened before his vision in its beauty and glory. He saw that one portion of Scripture explains another, and when one passage was closed to his understanding, he found in another part of the Word that which explained it. He regarded the sacred Word of God with joy and with the deepest respect and awe”. {EW 229.1}

Miller had no formal training, no college degree, He as the prophet Ellen White describes was taught by God himself and angels... and that is the greatest and best teacher ever. And the method that God gave to Miller was not just for his time span but was to last forever as we are told:

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

The third angels message leads us to the end of the world... therefore this method is to be adopted by those living in the final generation.

Now with all that being said, you’d think it would be enough for God’s people. God has spoken through the prophet to the end time church whom we believe to be Ellen White... and has said that those living in these last days will be using Miller’s rules. We note a historical pattern in the times of Ancient Israel when God called them out of Egypt. He gave them the 10 commandments... and the book of the law and he told them that ‘this was their wisdom in the sight of the other nations’. They were to be a separate and peculiar people from the world but what happened? After Moses died, and then Joshua another generation arose who knew not the Lord and that’s when the apostasy came in... they began to mingle with the apostate nations... the Babylonians and that is what paved way for the great apostasy.
And it was the same thing with the Advent Church, after the pioneers died one by one, and then Ellen White it paved way for apostasy to now enter in the church. No doubt we see evidences of the apostasy entering in whilst she was alive... i.e. the rejection of the 1888 message among other things but Ellen White... the inspired one was always there to clearly address it and put a check on things... but two years before she died. A generation arose who knew not their history and that paved way for Satan to come in and enter the church. I’d like to quote from the following book ‘solving our church crisis’ by Vance Ferrell as he gives us some insight in regards to how it all began. We are told

“A number of crises occurred during the years when Ellen White was active, but her prompt warnings eliminated many of them. (We will mention some of them later in this book.) But the situation changed by 1913, when, in feeble health, she focused her remaining years on completing her final books. (These were two important earlier crises: the one in 1888, which began a rejection of the Spirit of Prophecy by some influential men, and the one in 1903, when one person gained excessive control of the General Conference and also significantly affected later events. Both will be discussed later in this book.)

1913: The accreditation crisis—This was the first of an increasing number of major crises which had a profound effect on our denomination in later years. As a result, secular organizations, outside of our denomination, were to gain control of our schools by the late 1930s.

The lengthy story of how this began, and continues on down to the present time, is told in the historical book, Broken Blueprint*. Unfortunately, President A.G. Daniells (1902-1922), firmly in power at the time, brushed aside all interference and pushed through accreditation of our new medical school at Loma Linda.

This set in motion a chain of circumstances, by which the AMA gained control of what was taught at Loma Linda, demanded extremely expensive changes, and changed the entire type of treatments taught there—from natural remedies to drugs. This ultimately brought on a chain reaction of accreditation at all our other colleges, since they were required to obtain accreditation in order to send young men to Loma Linda for medical training. Accreditation requirements at all these schools (1) affected the selection of books in the library, (2) the curriculum that was taught, and (3) which teachers could be hired. A majority of instructors in our colleges were required to have Ph.D.s which, even down to the present time, could only be obtained from outside secular, Protestant, and Catholic universities.

It is well-known in the universities that doctoral professors mold—actually change—the beliefs of their students—or they refuse to graduate them! This requirement, that a majority of our college teachers had to have doctorates, meant that, instead of qualified, godly men and women with a deep commitment to our historic beliefs and years of faithful service in the church,—preference must always be given to untried Ph.D. graduates who applied for work. This had the effect of inducing our young people to attend outside universities to study under worldlings in order to obtain Ph.D.s.
The decision to seek accreditation for our Loma Linda medical school was made shortly before Ellen White’s death in 1915; and, by the early 1920s, that institution became fully locked into AMA standards and practices. The changes in our other colleges began in the mid-1930s. But it was not until about 1940 that all of them gained full accreditation. The effects of this gradually began producing changes in the church by the late 1940s and thereafter. Fortunately, we did not have many doctoral religion teachers until the early 1960s. But when that happened, things really began to change! The result was the crisis in beliefs which was ready to erupt by the late 1970s.

More on that later. Because a few of our leaders pushed through the accreditation of our Loma Linda medical school (which for reasons explained in the book, Broken Blueprint,* was not necessary),—this made it necessary for all our colleges to abandon the original blueprint for our schools and accept the requirements of the accreditation agencies—or not be able to send graduates to Loma Linda to obtain the medical degree.

As a result, today, our teachers, pastors, and administrators are either educated in outside universities or trained by men who have completed lengthy doctoral training in those universities.

In 1935, W.H. Branson delivered the Branson Report on Accreditation to the Annual Council; and, amid many discussions of fearfulness and deepest regret (discussed in detail in the Broken Blueprint* with many quotations), it was voted to let a few colleges apply for accreditation. But immediately, all of our colleges in North America rushed to obtain accreditation—and their capture by worldly accreditation agencies was made certain. (Solving our Church Crisis p13-16)

Now its important to understand here... that from 1935, as documented in the Branson report which you can download online, they realised that this was a mistake... they saw that by sending these students to these worldly schools it was causing many to lose their faith and they knew this, they tell you this themselves in that document, they knew Ellen White spoke strongly against this... nevertheless they thought they would do it anyway in order to stay in good and regular standing with the world.

(More about this you will find in the 1935-Branson report which you can download online)

Now around the same era when Adventists were sending their schools for accreditation, Raymond Cottrell came on the scene, His genealogy can be traced to the beginnings of Adventism. I believe Ellen White even mentions his father in some of her writings. Raymond Cottrell was reported to become one of the first Adventist to become a member of a scholarly theological society and he also taught at PCU (Pacific Conference Union) which according to the Branson report published in 1935 was one of the schools to get fully accredited. Raymond taught biblical exegesis at the school. The method he adopted to teach was not the standard proof text
method as our pioneers taught but rather the ‘historical critical method.’ It was around the 1930’s this new method of teaching the scriptures entered the SDA church. I hope you see the connection here... as soon as the schools get accreditation... learning from the Babylonians... the Worldlings and adopting their methodology... a new way of studying the bible is brought into the school which goes completely against the pioneers and how Ellen White tells us we should study the bible. Cottrell tells us:

“There most if not all of his predecessors and contemporaries, William Miller followed the prooftext method of prophetic interpretation... As pioneers of the Seventh-day Adventist faith struggled to understand the Bible in the turbulent wake of the great disappointment of October 22, 1844, they too followed the prooftext method... Prior to about the mid-1930’s Adventist exposition of the Bible was basically by the prooftext method,” {RBHPUC, PT3 pg5-6}

Also

There are two basic ways, or methods, by which people read the Bible and try to understand it. These two methods look at the Bible from opposite directions and often come to opposite conclusions as to what it means. One reads it from the viewpoint of what its words (in translation) mean to us today, from our modern perspective of life, society, culture, salvation history, and the world about us--as if the writers had us in mind as they wrote. The other method reads the Bible looking for the meaning they intended their words to convey, from their perspective of life, society, culture, salvation history, and the world, and as their contemporaries would understand what they wrote). Then, having found the meaning they intended to convey, this method looks for the divine principles and instruction reflected in a Bible passage and how they applied to that particular situation, in order to know how those principles and instruction apply to us today.

The first of these two methods of reading and understanding the Bible usually goes by the name prooftext method, which often takes Bible statements and passages out of their original historical and literary context and applies them directly to our time--often under very different circumstances to which they do not apply. The second usually goes by the name historical method because it first reads the Bible in its own literary and historical context, with the ultimate objective of understanding how to apply its principles and instruction to our time and circumstances. The big advantage of the prooftext method, if there be any advantage, is that it requires no special training or experience. In fact-- a person need not even be aware of following any method. For most people the big disadvantage of the historical method is that it does require training and experience. Fortunately, however, those who have not had the privilege of that training and experience can still follow the historical method by making use of information those who do have that training have provided. {RBHPUC, PT 1 pg 5}

Now Cottrell was dead against the proof text message, note what he states:
“Like most if not all of his predecessors and contemporaries, William Miller followed the proof text method of prophetic interpretation. An informed person today reading what he wrote is aghast at his misuse of Scripture. {RBHPUC PT3 pg3}

Prior to about the mid-1930's Adventist exposition of the Bible was basically by the prooftext method, which may often be in context and correct, but often is not. The problem with it is two-fold: (1) It is highly subjective and relies on presuppositions, principles, and procedures which may—or may not—be valid, and which vary from one person to another, and (2) it has no built-in safeguards such as those inherent in the historical method. {RBHPUC PT3 pg4}

So its pretty clear that Cottrell rejects the proof text message even though the SOP endorses it as we saw earlier. She tells us that those who are engaged in proclaiming the third angels message will be following Millers rules.

Now lets look at the ‘historical critical method’ as an example. These are some examples taken directly from the historical critical source for this study "THE ROLE OF BIBLICAL HERMENEUTICS IN PRESERVING UNITY IN THE CHURCH" (RBHPUC) by Raymond Cottrell:

Genesis 8:9: "The waters [of the Flood] were still on the face of the whole earth."

MODERN READER: The planet Earth.
BIBLE WRITER: The visible or known surface of the earth. In its 2,407 occurrences in the Old Testament the Hebrew word 'erets', earth, never refers to the earth as a planet, but to its visible or known surface. According to Genesis 41:7, “All the world ['erets] came to Joseph in Egypt to buy grain." Here "all the world" denotes lands of the Middle East in the vicinity of Egypt. Evidence for what we refer to as a world-wide Flood must come from the rocks. {RBHPUC PT2 pg1-2}

This interpretation implies that the flood from the story of Noah was not worldwide.

John 5:4: “An angel of the lord went down at certain seasons into the pool, and stirred up the water; whoever stepped in first after the stirring of the water was made well from whatever disease that person had.”
MODERN READER: Does God, indeed, reward those least in need of healing who can out maneuver those in greater need? How different from Jesus healing all who needed it (Mark 1:32).
BIBLE WRITER: Manuscript evidence is conclusive that John did not write these words. It does not occur in the earliest and most reliable manuscripts, including the oldest complete manuscript of the Gospel of John known as Bodmer II (about 200 A.D.).

Matthew 5:22: “whoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment...”
MODERN READER: Does this imply that Jesus approved of anger a person thinks justified?
BIBLE WRITER: The phrase “without a cause” is lacking in the earliest and most reliable manuscripts, including Bodmer II.

_The interpretation of these two texts implies that the Gospel of John has uninspired writings in it._

Galatians 3:16: (Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ.) Here the Apostle Paul identifies Christ as the son God promised to Abraham. MODERN READER: God’s promise to Abraham specifically referred to Christ. BIBLE WRITER: Here Paul uses the Old Testament typologically, not as the fulfillment of a prediction. **Nothing in the Old Testament implies that the promise, as given, was intended to apply to Christ.**

This interpretation pretty much personifies the historical critical methodology. In defining this method Cottrell states; **“It first reads the Bible in its own literary and historical context, with the ultimate objective of understanding how to apply its principles and instruction to our time and circumstances.”** {RBHPUC PT1 pg5}

On the surface it seems to make sense, but in practice we find that this hermeneutic will not allow for the promises of the Old Testament to apply to Christ. So as you can see, the proof text message and the historical critical method comes to completely different conclusions in the reading of the Word of God, and because those were adopting this way of studying the bible, it led to Cottrell’s rejection of the date 1844. Note the conclusions Cottrell came to when he was editing the book of Daniel and by adopting this method he began to destroy the fundamental pillars of our faith: He tells us:

“With our recent experience in editing the Book of Daniel vividly in mind I set out resolutely to find a way to reconcile our sanctuary doctrine with sound biblical hermeneutics--and failed miserably. Upon the recommendation of senior editor Nichol, I sent a brief questionnaire to the head of each college Bible department in North America and to every teacher versed in Hebrew. All 27 of them were personal friends of mine. All replied, and without exception they took the position that there is no linguistic or contextual basis for our sanctuary-in-heaven-investigative-judgment interpretation of Daniel 8:14.” {RBHPUC PT3 pg11}

When the General Conference got wind of this poll that had been done on Daniel 8:14 they reacted and started covertly dealing with the issue that the SDA theologians were highlighting, this time period is known to SDA theologians as the ‘decade of obscurantism’ Cottrell continues:

“When the results of this poll (sans names) came to the attention of GC president R. R. Figuhr, he and his officers appointed a committee they named Committee on Problems in the Book of Daniel, which deliberated inconclusively for five years and issued no formal report. The committee finally voted an informal report that
reaffirmed the traditional interpretation but was silent as to any "problems." Again the problem was one of biblical hermeneutics. It was impossible to reconcile the traditional interpretation with sound principles of biblical interpretation. Few, even in the General Conference, ever heard about this committee, and at the Glacier View conference of the Sanctuary Review Committee in August 1980 Neal Wilson commented that he knew nothing about it prior to that time. “{RBHPUC PT3 pg11}

This conflict gained momentum when Robert H. Pierson was elected to conference president and thrust an effort to deal with the erosion of the traditional SDA doctrinal pillars. Cottrell

Elder Pierson graduated from Southern Junior College in 1933 and entered the ministry in the Georgia-Cumberland Conference. In 1936 he responded to a call to service overseas and served with distinction in India, the Caribbean, and South Africa. At the time of his election to the presidency of the General Conference thirty years later, in 1966, he had more than fulfilled the unwritten requirement of significant overseas service. But his lifetime of service overseas proved to be a severe handicap when he returned to General Conference headquarters. For most of his life out of touch with the church in North America, he experienced considerable difficulty in understanding and relating to, changes that had taken place during his absence, in several important areas of the life and work of the church. This was especially true with respect to the corporate biblical-theological-doctrinal processes of the church at the General Conference level, which he considered it his duty to restore to the way they were when he went overseas in 1936. What changes? Prior to 1936 the church was following the prooftext method of Bible study, and administrators were the "brethren of experience" in those processes. But during Elder Pierson’s absence church administrators (Pastors, Elders, Deacons etc) had come to rely on a new generation of trained and experienced Bible scholars as their brethren of experience in such matters, and he very sincerely believed that the Bible scholars, with their historical method of Bible study, were leading the church astray! Repeatedly he expressed it to be his conviction and policy that administrators, and not Bible scholars, should conduct the corporate biblical-theological process at the General Conference level. It was his implementation of that policy that, to this day, has made it difficult for church administrators and Bible scholars to work together in a spirit of mutual understanding and confidence, as they had been doing prior to his administration...

Implementing his policy, Elder Pierson appointed two administrators without training or experience in Bible study on the research level to be in charge of the GC office of biblical research and the Biblical Research Committee--GC vice president Willis J. Hackett, and Gordon Hyde. Both shared his convictions in such matters and conscientiously proceeded to implement them. On April 3, 1969 the Spring Meeting of the General Conference removed the Bible scholars en masse from the Biblical Research Committee (currently called the biblical research institute) and staffed it with administrators. A vigorous protest by the Seminary faculty forestalled implementation of the plan, but a similar effect was achieved a few months later by
adding a large number of administrators and other non-scholars to the existing committee. [RBHPUC PT3 pg13-14]

All the while that Elder Pierson is campaigning to rid the SDA organization of the historical critical ideology in our doctrines, the theologians that ascribed to the historical critical method were vying for open and transparent dialogue to deal with the issues. Before this time, these new interpretations of the doctrinal pillars were by at large concealed from the laity. However because the men in the conference were hiding this issue, Desmond Ford, another theologian... with numerous degrees when public with the issue. Cottrell writes:

It was this climate of obscurantism, and their persistent unwillingness to resolve issues by consensus in open dialogue, that resulted in Desmond Ford going public on the investigative judgment at Pacific Union College before an audience not prepared to understand or relate to what he said, on October 27, 1979 [RBHPUC PT3 pg16]

I’d like to play a video where Desmond Ford himself speaks about this.... In an Adventist Church

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=v_pR_d3TkWs

So many were hiding this.... Note he said all our scholars believe this and rather for them to come forward, they let him take the slack... because they know if the conference,., the scholars truly came forward about 1844 not being true, there would have been an uproar because the laity many hold on to these foundational pillars dearly. The best way I can explain this is though an example of in the times of Christ when speaking to the leaders he asked if the baptism of John

“And when he was come into the temple, the chief priests and the elders of the people came unto him as he was teaching, and said, By what authority doest thou these things? and who gave thee this authority? And Jesus answered and said unto them, I also will ask you one thing, which if ye tell me, I in like wise will tell you by what authority I do these things. The baptism of John, whence was it? from heaven, or of men? And they reasoned with themselves, saying, If we shall say, From heaven; he will say unto us, Why did ye not then believe him? But if we shall say, Of men; we fear the people; for all hold John as a prophet. 27And they answered Jesus, and said, We cannot tell. And he said unto them, Neither tell I you by what authority I do these things” (Matthew 21:23-37)

Same thing going on, that’s why the scholars kept quiet... and who did John the Baptist come in the Spirit off? Elijah. And who does Ellen White tell us William Miller comes in the Spirit of? Elijah. And the people believe Ellen White to be prophet It’s the same history being repeated today.

Now because of what happened New set of leaders in the conference rose up and established the ‘historical grammatical method’... often known as the ‘conservatives’ in Adventism... and it was set up to counteract the liberalism entering in the church. Now there are many who say, these who follow the grammatical method.... Are actually teaching the proof text message by Miller, they say it’s the same method,
but actually when you study it... it's really not. It's a mixture of both the historical Critical method and the proof text message and in the next video we will go into this in great detail. But I want to close this statement.

“quote on sanctuary point of attack by EW”

“In the future, deception of every kind is to arise, and we want solid ground for our feet. We want solid pillars for the building. Not one pin is to be removed from that which the Lord has established. The enemy will bring in false theories, such as the doctrine that there is no sanctuary. This is one of the points on which there will be a departing from the faith. Where shall we find safety unless it be in the truths that the Lord has been giving for the last fifty years?-- Review and Herald, May 25, 1905. (CW 53.2)

“I know that the sanctuary question stands in righteousness and truth, just as we have held it for so many years. It is the enemy that leads minds off on sidetracks. He is pleased when those who know the truth become engrossed in collecting scriptures to pile around erroneous theories, which have no foundation in truth. The scriptures thus used are misapplied; they were not given to substantiate error, but to strengthen truth.”--Gospel Workers, p. 303. (1915.) {CW 54.1}