

Were's Assumptions and the Truth

By Jesse Ravencroft

I gladly welcome feedback and am very interested in further materials on this topic.

jesse@wdfsermons.org

One dear soul may be considered to be among the chief founders of the majority view of Daniel 11. He is well known to those who study Daniel 11—Louis F. Were. No matter what view we may take on Daniel 11, it is well known that Were's teachings on the topic have been some of the most influential. Were quotes from, and seemed to be very influenced by, Raymond Cottrell¹ who claimed to have done an exhaustive research on all that the pioneers believed concerning the King of the North. His claims aside, we will see for ourselves what the pioneers actually wrote. I personally appreciate Were's earnestness and candor. You don't have to guess where Were stands. However, our dear bother has made some very serious assertions that I believe are contrary to the facts. Since his works are so respected, well known and have influenced so many at this symposium I feel it's time to set the records straight on certain things. Though I² and the majority of Adventists today may disagree with Uriah Smith's interpretation of Daniel 11:40-45, yet I feel that Were has resorted to unfounded claims to oppose Smith's teachings. I would like to believe that if Were was contemporaneous with Smith that they could be friends—like we all should be at this symposium though we may see things quite differently.

¹ Raymond Cottrell (April 21, 1911– January 12, 2003) would later cast doubt on the sanctuary teaching and would become a companion of Desmond Ford. He would start the publication *Adventist Today* and would contribute much to *Spectrum Magazine* – https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Raymond_Cottrell

² You can read my paper *Liberty to Differ on Daniel 11*(you can find it on <http://www.daniel11prophecy.com/resources.html>) to know my personal views on the topic.

Were's Strong Assumptions

In this paper I will compare some of Were's strong judgments of Elder Smith with the historical facts. Notice how strongly Were attacks Smith's teachings:

“His [Uriah Smith's] presentation that Turkey is the king of the north (Dan. 11) and that, Armageddon refers to a military battle in Palestine is a part of the Jesuit-fostered system of interpretation-the counterfeit of the Spirit of Prophecy teaching concerning ‘the final conflict.’”³

“Jesuit-fostered system of interpretation” are pretty strong words, even for our outspoken brother Were. He says even stronger things, later in this paper. Were doubles down in his strong words claiming that Smith's rejection of righteousness by faith in 1888 was due to his views on Daniel 11 and that those who today teach Smith's view are, in essence, rejecting righteousness by faith. He goes so far as to state that “opposition to the message of righteousness by faith” will come from those who, among other things, “stubbornly follow Uriah Smith's teaching concerning Turkey being the king of the north.”⁴ I would be very interested to see any evidence of this as I have not found any although I have searched diligently. I think it is very serious to make such strong accusations against one of our dear Adventist pioneers without any evidence to back up such a claim. While I am not against reading Were's writings I do feel that we should not use this spirit when we disagree with one another.

It should be noted that both the men Smith opposed in 1888 (Jones and Waggoner) also held the Turkey view:

³ THE TRUTH-concerning Mrs. E. G. White, Uriah Smith, and The King of The North, a paper by Louis F. Were, page 10

⁴ THE TRUTH-concerning Mrs. E. G. White, Uriah Smith, and The King of The North, a paper by Louis F. Were, page 12

A.T. Jones

“And bear in mind that the king of the South is always in Egypt, and the king of the North is always the power occupying the territory of which Constantinople is the center. And all the world knows that since 1453 A. D., the territory of which Constantinople is the center, has been held and ruled by the Turks. Then the king of the North at the time of the end is the Turkish dominion.”⁵

“So, then, when the Word says that ‘he shall plant the tabernacles of his palace between the seas in the glorious holy mountain,’ it means that he will move his palace from Constantinople to Jerusalem. What then?—‘Yet he shall come to his end, and none shall help him.’ That is what the Turks, and the mighty powers, and the people of the nations, all expect.”⁶

“The power therefore which, at the time of the end, occupies the territory of Thrace and Bithynia, originally held by Lysimachus, will be the king of the north as certainly as was the power of Lysimachus itself. And as Constantinople is the center of the territory originally held by Lysimachus, the first ‘king of the north,’ and as the power (Turkey) that now reigns in Constantinople holds the identical territory held by Lysimachus himself, it is plain enough that this power is ‘the king of the north’ of the last verses of the eleventh chapter of Daniel, and of our own day.”⁷

E.J. Waggoner

“Now again the kings of the south and the north are before us. Egypt was the territory of the king of the south. The king of the north, in the division of Alexander's empire and the conquests of the Seleucid, was the dominant power along the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles, and in Asia Minor and Syria. It is the territory of Turkey. The Turkish Empire has for generations filled the dominions of the original king of the north.”⁸

Another charge by our dear brother Were is that Smith changed his views and once believed differently about the interpretation concerning the King of the North. Were quotes Raymond Cottrell in his paper, who claimed that his version of interpretation of the King of the North was a “landmark fully established in the Advent Movement,” and that it was a view which was “held by the pioneers of this message, without exception, from the days of William Miller down to at least

⁵ Alonzo Trevier Jones, *The Marshaling of the Nations*, 1900, page 30

⁶ Alonzo Trevier Jones, *The Marshaling of the Nations*, 1900, page 34, Emphasis Supplied

⁷ Alonzo Trevier Jones, *The Eastern Question, What Its Solution Means to All the World No 4*, 1896, page 171

⁸ Ellet Joseph Waggoner, *The Present Truth #13, April 1, 1897*

1863.” That is an interesting assertion since I having spent years searching, I have never once found anyone teaching a view similar to Were’s, Cottrell’s or the majority view today among the Adventist Pioneers. Cottrell, as quoted by Were, then claims that when Smith came up with his views he was “removing the landmarks fully established in the Advent Movement.”⁹

As far as exalting any position on Daniel 11 to “landmark” status I believe it wise to follow Sister White’s admonition:

“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.

“The passing of the time in 1844 was a period of great events, opening to our astonished eyes the cleansing of the sanctuary transpiring in heaven, and having decided relation to God's people upon the earth, [also] the first and second angels' messages and the third, unfurling the banner on which was inscribed, ‘The commandments of God and the faith of Jesus.’ One of the landmarks under this message was the temple of God, seen by His truth-loving people in heaven, and the ark containing the law of God. The light of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment flashed its strong rays in the pathway of the transgressors of God's law. The nonimmortality of the wicked is an old landmark. **I can call to mind nothing more that can come under the head of the old landmarks.** [that would include any position on Daniel 11] **All this cry about changing the old landmarks is all imaginary.**”¹⁰

I’m all ears if any original statement of Smith’s could be produced that showed that he once believed that the King of the North was Rome. As you will see later in this paper, I believe that the bone of contention had little to do with the King of the North but was concerning the Willful King of Daniel 11:36-39 and the identity of the “he” in Daniel 11:40-45. The Millerites and Smith all saw the last war of Daniel 11 as a triangular war and quotes from James White suggest that he may

⁹ THE TRUTH-concerning Mrs. E. G. White, Uriah Smith, and The King of The North, a paper by Louis F. Were, page 12

¹⁰ EGW, Manuscript 13, 1889 “Standing by the Landmarks” Emphasis Supplied

have believed the same.

What the Millerites and Adventist Pioneers Actually Believed

I feel that it is completely false to say that the Roman view was held since the days of William Miller without a single quote from a pioneer to back it up. Here is what Mr Miller, his associates and later early Seventh-day Adventists actually believed:

J.V. Himes

“‘The king of the south,’ is Egypt; ‘the king of the north,’ Syria. This we contend was fulfilled in the collision between France, the Atheistical government, and Egypt, the king of the south, in A. D. 1798, when Buonaparte invaded Egypt. And the king of the north, Syria, came against him, (France) like a whirlwind, (with irrisistible power in 1799, when Buonaparte was defeated before St. Jean de’Acre.)”¹¹

William Miller

“And the time of the end (of Antichrist,) shall the king of the south (Spain) push at France (Vendean war) and the king of the north (Great Britian) shall come against France, like a whirlwind, with chariots, and with horsemen, and with many ships; and the French (or Bonaparte the principle ruler;) shall enter into the countries, and shall overflow and pass over. ‘Bonaparte shall enter also into the glorious land (Italy) and many countries shall be overthrown; but these shall escape out of Bonaparte's hands, even Edom and Moab, and the chief of the children of Ammon' Ottomons and eastern nations.”¹²

Charles Fitch

“Here we have a most striking epitome of the history of Bonaparte. All that was here foretold was true of him, as history abundantly shows. He did plant the tabernacles of his palace between the seas, in Italy, which we know is between two seas, and which has ever been the glorious holy mountain of the Romans. On the 15th of May 1796, Bonaparte took possession of Milan in Italy—and at that place on the 26th of May, 1805, he was crowned king of Italy. Thus he planted the tabernacles of his palace between the seas in the glorious holy mountain of the Romans. But he came to his end on a solitary Island, as we well know,

¹¹ Joshua V. Himes, *Review of Dowling's Reply to Miller*, Vol 2, February 1, 1842, page 166, Emphasis Supplied

¹² William Miller, *Evidence from Scripture and History of the Second Coming of Christ About the Year A. D. 1843, and of His Personal Reign of 1000 Years*. 1833, page 28, Emphasis Supplied

and none helped him. All these predicted events therefore are now in the history of the past.”¹³

Josiah Litch

"The king of the south shall push at him." At whom? The answer is, at the subject of prophecy in the preceding verses-the revolutionary government of France. That power is clearly antecedent to 'him,' in this verse.

“‘The king of the south.’ And who is the king of the south? The answer is given in the exposition of the first six verses of the chapter, which the reader can examine. It is clearly the government of Egypt. I do not know that there is a dissenting voice to the application of this term to Egypt in the former part of this chapter; nor can I see any good reason why there should be in the latter part, as long as it was literally fulfilled in Egypt.

That a collision did actually take place between the French and Egypt is notorious. In the winter of 1798, after Bonaparte's return from his Italian campaign, he was appointed by the directory, commander-in-chief of the foreign armies of the French nation; and in that character he left France, on the morning of May 20th, 1798, with a fleet 'of thirteen ships of the line, and fourteen frigates, and four hundred transports. They carried 40,000 picked soldiers and officers.' On the 1st of July they reached the coast of Egypt, and landed the army about a mile and a half from Alexandria.

“‘Like a whirlwind.’ The king of the north, it is universally acknowledged, signifies in this chapter, Syria, as being the northern division of the empire of Alexander the Great.”¹⁴

James White

“There is a line of historic prophecy in chapter eleven [of Daniel], **where the symbols are thrown off**, beginning with the kings of Persia, and reaching down past Grecia and Rome, to the time when that power 'shall come to his end, and none shall help him.'”¹⁵

“We have passed the period, in the political history of the world, when the western empire was extinguished; and the way was thereby opened for the exaltation of the papacy. The imperial power of the city of Rome was annihilated, and the office and the name of the emperor of the west was abolished for a season. The trumpets assume a new form, as they are directed to a new object, and the close coincidence, or rather express identity between the king of the south, or the king of the north, as described by Daniel, and the first and

¹³ Charles Fitch, *Signs of the Times and Expositor of Prophecy*, Vol 3, No. 8, May 25, 1842 Extract from Fitch's Sermons, No. 6

¹⁴ Josiah Litch, *Prophetic Expositions*, Vol. 2, pages 99-100, Emphasis Supplied

¹⁵ James White, *Review and Herald*, Oct. 3, 1878, Emphasis Supplied

second wo, will be noted in the subsequent illustration of the latter. The spiritual supremacy of the pope, it may be remembered, was acknowledged and maintained, after the fall of Rome, by the emperor Justinian. And whether in the character of a trumpet or a wo, the previous steps of history raise us, as on a platform, to behold in a political view the judgments that fell on apostate Christendom, and finally led to the subversion of the eastern empire.”¹⁶

Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers:

“Edson shared what was evidently the majority view at this time; namely, that the Papacy is the power of the latter part of Daniel 11, as Miller and James White had held it, and many others back to Reformation times. Russia might become the king of the north.”¹⁷

This is evidence that what they meant by the “power” in the later part of Daniel 11 concerned the identity of the Willful King, not the King of the North. Hiram Edson here believed that the Willful King was the Papacy but Russia might become the King of the North.

Otis Nicolas

“As the empire of France, under Napoleon III, is viewed with alarm and jealousy by England and Russia, the northern and eastern powers of Europe, it is not improbable that ‘tidings out of the east and out of the north’ may trouble him; [verse 44,] the French empire confederate with the Pope. England stands at the head of the Protestants in Europe, ‘the king of the north,’ France now stands as the head of the Papal power, ‘the king of the south,’ and Russia is the power of the Greek church in the east, - the three divided parts of the great city, Babylon. Rev.xvi,19...”¹⁸

R. Cecil

“It is our opinion that any power that reigns over Syria is - for the time being - ‘the king of the north,’ spoken of Daniel xi; hence that the Turkish Dynasty is now that power. If Russia, Austria, England, or France should become possessed of supreme power over Syria, then it - whichever it might be - would become ‘the king of the north.’ Till then none but the Turkish Dynasty occupies that position, in our opinion. Our views of Russia, Turkey, and France are known to our readers. No arguments, nor ridicule, that has yet appeared, has in the least shaken our mind; yet we do not affirm that we are right; events

¹⁶ James White, *The Sounding of the Seven Trumpets of Revelation 8 and 9*, 1859, page 31. This booklet was written by James White but as was often the case in pioneer days, much of his book was simply a compilation from other authors. This quote is definitely from James White’s book and it represents what he believed yet it these are not his words but those of Alexander Keith (who wrote the original of this quotation in *The Signs of the Times As Denoted by Fulfillment of Historical Predictions*, 1832) whom is also quoted by Josiah Litch and Uriah Smith.

¹⁷ Le Roy Froom, *The Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers*, Vol. 4, 1954, page 1086, Emphasis Supplied

¹⁸ Otis Nicolas, *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald*, January 20, 1853, Emphasis Supplied

may convince us that we are wrong in this matter. We have no theory at stake, and shall feel, we think, no mortification to find we are - just what we believe all others to be - fallible.”¹⁹

S.N. Haskell

“At the time of the end (1798) the kings of the north and the south again contended. From the founding of Constantinople by Constantine in 330, the power which held that city had maintained control of the Mediterranean, for Constantinople is recognized by all nations as the key to both Asia and Europe. In the time of the end, history will again center about this city.

“As in times past, so again we are obliged to trace far back to find the source of events which now appear in full view. About the time that the papacy was growing into a full-fledged monarchy, recognized among nations of the earth, another power had birth. This new work of Satan came in the form of Mohammedanism, which to-day holds about one sixth of the world's population in its grasp. The new doctrine originated in Arabia, from whence it spread as a smoke from the bottomless pit. Syria fell under its power, but Egypt became the center of its influences. Egypt has felt every evil influence, and the banks of the Nile have fed every form of idolatry.

“Mohammedanism is but another form of Egyptian darkness. By the power of the sword the followers of Mohammed strove to enter Europe. The western horn of the Crescent, the Moslem symbol, was extended into Spain in the early part of the eighth century, and for a time all Europe was threatened, but the battle of Tours (732) stopped the progress of the conquerors. In 1453, however, Constantinople was captured, and has since remained in the hands of the Turks, the boldest advocates of the doctrine of Mohammed. As the founding of Constantinople is a guidepost in history, so the capture of that city in 1453 is another landmark. One of the greatest checks received by the papacy was due to the influx into Italy of Greek scholars, driven from Constantinople by the incoming Mohammedans. The discovery of America was due to the closing of the eastern passage to the rich islands of the Indian Ocean by the Mohammedans in Constantinople and Asia Minor, and so in more ways than is usually thought, God worked to advance truth through those who were ignorant of his truth.”²⁰

Uriah Smith

“‘And he shall overflow and pass over.’ We have found events which furnish a very striking fulfilment of the pushing of the king of the south, and the whirlwind onset of the king of the north against the French power. Thus far there is quite a general agreement in the application of the prophecy. We now reach a point where the views of the expositors begin to diverge. To whom do the words he ‘shall overflow and pass over,’ refer? - to

¹⁹ R. Cecil, *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald*, December 12, 1854

²⁰ Stephen N. Haskell, *The Story of Daniel the Prophet*, 1901, pages 245-246

France or to the king of the north? The application of the remainder of this chapter depends upon the answer to this question. From this point two lines of interpretation are maintained. Some apply the words to France, and endeavor to find a fulfilment in the career of Napoleon. Others apply them to the king of the north, and accordingly point for a fulfilment to events in the history of Turkey. We speak of these two positions only, as the attempt which some make to bring in the papacy here is so evidently wide of the mark that its consideration need not detain us. If neither of these positions is free from difficulty, as we presume no one will claim that it is, absolutely, it only remains that we take that one which has the weight of evidence in its favor. And we shall find one in favor of which the evidence does so greatly preponderate, to the exclusion of all others as scarcely to leave any room for doubt in regard to the view here mentioned.”²¹

I believe that here Smith is bringing out the real bone of contention between him and James White—to whom is the “he” referring? He mentions three positions. The one he calls “wide of the mark” was the one which seems to have been held by James White, Edson, perhaps Smith himself at one time and others. They held that the papacy was the Willful King of 36-39 rather than France as taught by Smith above and that the “he” of verse 40 was the Willful King (therefore the Papacy) rather than the King of the North as taught by Smith above. This same “he” of the Willful King comes to his end in verse 45 and was therefore (according to James White and many others) the “last power in chap. 11”. See the famous quote from *A word to the Little Flock* in light of these facts:

“That Jesus rose up, and shut the door, and came to the Ancient of days, to receive his kingdom, at the 7th month, 1844, I fully believe. See Luke 13:25; Mat.25:10; Dan.7:13,14. But the standing up of Michael, Dan.12:1, appears to be another event, for another purpose. His rising up in 1844, was to shut the door, and come to his Father, to receive his kingdom, and power to reign; but Michael's standing up, is to manifest his kingly power, which he already has, in the destruction of the wicked, and in the deliverance of his people. Michael is to stand up at the time that the last power in chap. 11, comes to his end, and none to help him. This power is the last that treads down the true church of God: and as the true church is still trodden down, and cast out by all christendom, it follows that the last oppressive

²¹ Uriah Smith, *Daniel and the Revelation*, 1897 edition, page 305, Emphasis Supplied

power has not ‘come to his end;’ and Michael has not stood up. This last power that treads down the saints is brought to view in Rev.13:11-18. His number is 666. Much of his power, deception, wonders, miracles, and oppression, will doubtless be manifested during his last struggle under the ‘seven last plagues,’ about the time of his coming to his end. This is clearly shadowed forth by the magicians of Egypt, deceiving Pharaoh and his host, in performing most of the miracles, that Moses performed by the power of God. That was just before the deliverance of Israel from Egyptian bondage; and may we not expect to see as great a manifestation of the power of the Devil, just before the glorious deliverance of the saints? If Michael stood up in 1844, what power came ‘to his end, and none to help him,’ ‘AT THAT TIME’? The trouble that is to come at the time that Michael stands up, is not the trial, or trouble of the saints; but it is a trouble of the nations of the earth, caused by ‘seven last plagues.’ So when Jesus has finished his work of atonement, in the Holy of Holies, he will lay off his priestly attire, and put on his most kingly robes and crown, to ride forth, and manifest his kingly power, in ruling the nations, and dashing them in pieces.”²²

So, Were and many today are mixing up what James White and Uriah Smith were really debating. Were and many today assume that they were debating over the identity of the King of the North but I would like to see more evidence—from original sources, not later works concerning what some think Uriah Smith and James White believed—before I can agree with that supposition. The evidence currently seems to indicate that the bone of contention between James White and Uriah Smith was regarding the identity of the Willful King of Daniel 11:36-39 and the “he” of Daniel 11:40-45 who comes to his end. White (and many others with him) appears to have believed that the Willful King of Daniel 11:36-39 was the Papacy and he may have believed that the “he” of Daniel 11:40-45 was the same as the Willful King and therefore the Papacy and therefore the last power of Daniel 11. While Smith clearly taught that the “he” in verses 40-45 referred to the King of the North and thus to Turkey, James White clearly believed that “the symbols are thrown off” in Daniel 11 from the beginning clear to the end of the chapter (contrary to the teachings of Were and the popular views today) and that there was a direct relation between the seven trumpets and the

²² James White, *A Word to the Little Flock*, 1847, page 8, Emphasis Supplied

King of the North and the King of the South of Daniel 11. This suggests that he clearly believed that the King of the North and the King of the South were involved with Islam, the Middle East and the Ottoman Empire. I have yet to find a single pioneer dissenting voice as to the interpretation that the battles between the King of the North and King of the South involved literal military wars throughout the entire chapter. Excepting William Miller, Charles Fitch and Otis Nicolas (until further evidence can be produced) many Millerites and early Adventists believed that the battles between the King of the North and King of the South involved literal Egypt and the lands of the Ottoman Empire as Smith taught.

Perhaps a great deal of this confusion is because today most Adventists see Daniel 11:40-45 as a conflict between the King of the North and the King of the South. This is a more recent viewpoint, so far I have only seen indications that the Millerites and early Adventists believed that Daniel 11:40-45 is speaking about a three-way war involving the Willful King and the kings of the north and south. Most Adventists today believe that the Willful King *is* the King of the North and therefore when they read that William Miller, at one time Uriah Smith, and many others believed that the Willful King was the Papacy they automatically superimpose the majority current majority belief that the Willful King and the King of the North are one and the same; not realizing that, so far as I have seen yet, the pioneers believed that they were two totally different powers. At least this is what I can tell from those pioneers who wrote on the topic and those writings of the pioneers which are accessible today.

Ellen White's Comments Compared to Were's

In conclusion, let us compare what Ellen White wrote on the topic and what she said about Uriah Smith and his teaching on the "Eastern Question" and compare that with Were's strong assertions:

“The world is stirred with the spirit of war. The prophecy of the eleventh chapter of Daniel has nearly reached its complete fulfillment. Soon the scenes of trouble spoken of in the prophecies will take place.”²³

This strongly suggests that she saw Daniel 11 and how it relates to us today to involve the spirit of literal-earthly war like the rest of the Millerites and early Adventist taught; not symbolic battles between the Papacy and Atheism/Communism/Secularism. It would be very hard to believe that Smith’s and A.G. Daniel’s Turkey views were inspired by Jesuits and were a cause of Smith’s rejection of the righteousness by faith message, as Were suggests, in light of the following endorsements from Ellen White:

“*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.**”²⁴

“Sunday forenoon **Elder Smith spoke upon the *Eastern Question***, just the subject the people wished to hear. . . . Elder Smith improved the hour at five o’clock in addressing the large crowd upon the mark of the beast. Brother Haskell spoke in the evening to a large and attentive audience, **and the great day of the meeting was over. Many had listened to the truth**, and the day of final reckoning will reveal the results of that day’s meeting. We hope and pray that the **good seed sown** may spring up and bear fruit to the glory of God.”²⁵

“The evening meeting was largely attended. Elder Smith **spoke with great clearness**, and many listened *with open eyes, ears, and mouths. The outsiders seemed to be intensely interested in the *Eastern question**. He closed with a very solemn address to those who had not been preparing for these great events in the near future.”²⁶

“Elder Daniells speaks this evening upon the *Eastern Question*. May the Lord give His Holy Spirit to inspire the hearts to ***make the truth plain***.”²⁷

²³ EGW, Testimonies, vol. 9, page 14, Emphasis Supplied

²⁴ EGW, Manuscript 76, 1901, Emphasis Supplied

²⁵ EGW, Letter 10a, 1877, Emphasis Supplied

²⁶ EGW, Letter 55, Aug. 24, 1884, Emphasis Supplied

²⁷ EGW, Manuscript 189, Dec. 25, 1898, Emphasis Supplied