

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

From the time that Elder A. G. Daniells wrote his book¹ about the reasons why the "Great War" sucked so many nations into its terrible vortex, and projected what might be the outcomes at its conclusion, many events transpired that appeared to raise barriers to the conceptualization that the Ottoman Empire—reduced to the boundaries of modern Turkey—could ever arise again to such a status as to threaten the establishment of a capitol in Jerusalem. By 1923 Turkey had been secularized, the capitol moved from Constantinople to Ankara, and Great Britain had a mandate to exercise civil authority over much of the Middle East, but particularly that of Palestine and specifically that of Jerusalem. Seventh-day Adventist Bible prophecy students, pastors, evangelists, and scholars mostly continued to tow the line, so to speak, on the Uriah Smith position regarding the Eastern Question even as Germany once more militarized its government and mobilized its population for the commencement of World War II, a terrible conflict that surpassed the horrors of the "war to end all wars." Still, during the 1920s and 1930s, some, like Louis F. Were, became dissatisfied by the appearance of false conclusion, and began to change their positions. By 1944, editors at the Review and Herald made the decision to continue publishing Smith's book *Daniel and the Revelation* but with deletions that went beyond editing out any semi Arian leanings Smith held on the human nature of Christ to those historical paragraphs that had given such great weight to Smith's conclusions regarding the Eastern Question. In so doing, the groundwork was laid for a multitude of interpretations on Daniel 11 with an emphasis on the identity of the king of the north being the papacy, and a variety of divergent identities of the king of the south—including Islam, atheism, communism, and others. By 1948 the British would leave Palestine—allowing Zionists to plant the blue Star of David emblem on a white flag of the newly birthed nation—modern Israel. This is the historical backdrop to the book that Louis F. Were published in 1949 on the identity of the king of the north.²

While Were raised many objections to Uriah Smith's position on the Eastern Question, it is the objective of this paper to narrow the field down to those issues underpinning the objections to those of major importance: 1) James White's position on the king of the north being the papacy and his objections that Were echoed; 2) the omission of William Miller's and Adam Clarke's positions on the king of the north because they significantly influenced Smith; 3) the double standard of White and Were regarding the exposition of unfulfilled prophecy; 4) the distinct differences between rules, or principles, of Bible interpretation presented by Were and Miller; 5) how Joshua Himes responded to attacks on Millerite hermeneutics; 6) some of the historic reasons why Were thought it impossible for Turkey to be the

¹ Arthur G. Daniells, *The World War: Its Relation to the Eastern Question and Armageddon* (Washington, D. C.: The Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1917).

² Louis F. Were, *The King of the North at Jerusalem: God's People Delivered* (Melbourne, Victoria, Australia: May 11, 1949). This book is currently published by LMN Publishing International, Inc., located in St. Maries, Idaho.

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

king of the north; and, 7) the accusation that Uriah Smith was a false prophet, informed and influenced by a "Jesuit-fostered system of interpretation" that would prevent Smith and his adherents from ever accepting and teaching the genuine message of "Righteousness by Faith." To do justice to the critique, references to biographical and historical facts relevant to the discussion will also be provided.

Louis Fitzroy Were was born on April 29, 1896 in Prospect, South Australia. His grandfather, Walter Were, had become a Seventh-day Adventist by the turn of the century, though his father, Albert, did not. Soon after Louis became a Seventh-day Adventist, he married Jessie Blanche Henderson—a convert about the same time as Louis, and a few months older than he—on November 11, 1915.³ Louis would graduate from Avondale College from the Missionary and Bible Worker course in November, 1919.⁴ By January 18, 1925, Were was ordained, having labored successfully in the South New Zealand Conference for some time.⁵ After many years of co-laboring in the work, Jesse would succumb to a long battle with cancer on January 6, 1942.⁶

A much respected and beloved Seventh-day Adventist pastor, evangelist, missionary, and published author,⁷ Louis Were found himself in a vulnerable position, shortly after he remarried on January 25, 1943 to Alma Belle Preuss,⁸ that would lead to false accusations of improper conduct. When the South Australian Conference Executive Committee voted to dismiss Were on March 9, 1943,⁹ the woman involved in the matter wrote letters to the president of the conference and to Were in an effort to clear his name.¹⁰ When President Scragg objected to the dismissal to union headquarters, the matter ended up being sent back to the local

³ Eric Were, *The House That Were Built: The History of the Were Family in Australia 1880-1980*, With a Study of Origins in England and 'Cousins' Abroad (Adelaide, Australia: Lutheran Publishing House, 1980), 61, 62, as cited by Milton R. Hook in an unpublished paper written in 1986.

⁴ Hilda M. Osmond, "Move Forward," *Australasian Record*, December 22, 1919, 1.

⁵ W. J. Westerman, "South New Zealand Camp-Meeting," *Australasian Record*, February 23, 1925, 3.

⁶ Obituary, *Australasian Record*, February 9, 1942, 7, as cited by Milton R. Hook in an unpublished paper written in 1986.

⁷ Louis F. Were was a frequent contributor to the *Signs of the Times Australia* from about 1928 until his dismissal by the South Australian Conference in 1943.

⁸ H. E. Piper, "Wedding Bells: Were-Preuss," *Australasian Record*, March 1, 1943, 7.

⁹ Minutes, South Australian Conference Executive Committee, March 9, 1943, as cited by Milton R. Hook in an unpublished paper written in 1986.

¹⁰ Letter, D. E. Jacobs to L. F. Were, March 29, 1943; Letter, D. E. Jacobs to W. M. R. Scragg, April 26, 1943, as cited by Milton R. Hook in an unpublished paper written in 1986.

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

conference for review.¹¹ He would not be dis-fellowshipped over the appearance of indiscretion, but Louis Were was never reinstated as a pastor even though he reapplied in 1954.¹² He and Alma remained faithful members of the Seventh-day Adventist church in good standing, giving Bible studies, and leaving candidates with the pastor to baptize. On April 2, 1967, about three weeks before his 71st birthday, Were died from a heart attack.¹³ But the influence of his theories on hermeneutics and defense of James White would live on, swelling in popularity until it has become the majority view today.

One might then conjecture, based upon this short biography, that Were would be strongly motivated to vindicate James White and his position on the Papacy fulfilling Daniel 11:45. One might also conclude that in his attempt to vindicate White, he didn't learn from his own experience because he appears to use every means possible to excoriate Uriah Smith—presenting every evidence possible of Ellen White's reproofs and corrections where ever Smith strayed on matters such as the humanity and divinity of Christ, or "Righteousness by Faith" in 1888.

Perhaps Were felt some self-vindication in the face of early opposition to his views when, years later, he concluded, "Today our Godly scholars revere the memory of Pastor James White for, after years of research and weighing all the evidence, the majority accept the truth maintained by him that the Papacy is indeed the king of the north."¹⁴ The veracity of such a conclusion can only be tested by the accuracy of fulfilled prophecies. The danger of such a claim inherently demonstrates the very kind of idolizing of ministers of which we have been warned. The amount of time that has passed since the deaths of those who originally proclaimed their positions, only to have prophecy remain unfulfilled should prompt us to question—not the reasons for the rightness or wrongness of interpretations, but—for reasons why the winds of strife are held back. It is because God's people lack the character, the righteousness of Christ, that we are not yet sealed. When the sealing is complete, and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit is granted in the full strength of the Latter Rain, then the winds of strife will be released and the remaining prophecy will be accomplished as it should be.

But has all the evidence truly been discovered? We must ask ourselves the question: How much of Daniel 11:36-45 has been fulfilled by the papacy between 1798 and 1870, or, for that matter, since James White died in 1881? We know the answer. If

¹¹ Minutes, Australasian Union Conference, May 18, 1943, as cited by Milton R. Hook in an unpublished paper written in 1986.

¹² Minutes, Australasian Union Conference, November 28, 1954, as cited by Milton R. Hook in an unpublished paper written in 1986.

¹³ J. W. Kent, "A Tribute - L. F. Were," *Australasian Record*, May 15, 1967, 10-12, as cited by Milton R. Hook in an unpublished paper written in 1986.

¹⁴ Louis F. Were, *The Truth Concerning Mrs. E. G. White, Uriah Smith, and The King of The North*, 34.

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

we believe the Papacy is king of the north, then the answer is none—even though we might see how prophecies relating to Revelation have been leading up to fulfillment, there is still controversy over the healing of the deadly wound with some saying it was healed in 1929 when Mussolini restored Papal sovereignty, while others make a case that the deadly wound cannot be healed so long as the Papacy is not a persecuting power as it used to be. If we could connect any viable evidence to the actual text of Daniel 11:40-45, we wouldn't be having this discussion on who is right in their interpretation.

On the other hand, if we believe Turkey is the king of the north, then all but Daniel 11 verse 45 has been fulfilled since 1798. And yet current events are demonstrating a potential revival of the Caliphate with the formation of ISIS, or ISIL, and the revived persecution of Christians within the Levant, aka Syria-Palestine-Egypt that just might end up with a literal conflict over the combative demands of Turkey for Jerusalem. Still, the rightness or wrongness of our understanding is not going to hasten or delay the fulfillment of prophecy. If we would hasten the coming of Jesus we must perfectly reflect the character of Jesus so that the sealing might be completed, the universal probation of all humankind is closed, and the four winds of strife released.

Elder Louis F. Were wrote and published books and articles on Bible hermeneutics, prophecy, and the three angels' messages. He strongly questioned the validity of Uriah Smith's position on the Eastern Question simply because historical events had not panned out as many had thought and taught.

One pamphlet he published deals with an article that James Springer White wrote in *The Review and Herald*, November 29, 1877, titled "Unfulfilled Prophecy."¹⁵ Louis Were observed that a portion of this article was used in the Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary, Vol. 4, p. 877, and that it did not reflect well on the whole context of the original source document, postulating, "It is unfortunate that the employment of only a portion of James White's article has caused some to find support for a belief that the whole of his article makes clear he did not support. He unwaveringly taught until his death that the beast power of Rev. 13 is the king of the north—the power that would persecute the remnant church, the power that would come to his end with none to help him (Dan. 11:45). He had no doubt about the future of this power. Those who use this portion of his article and suggest doubt concerning the certainty that the king of the north is Rome do injustice to James

¹⁵ This article reflected some of the same thoughts later published in *The Review and Herald*, October 3, 1878, which White intended to be a series that never was continued. See my paper, "A Comparison and Contrast of James White and Uriah Smith on Daniel 11." <http://www.daniel11prophecy.com/resources.html>

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

White for in that very issue of the Review and Herald he emphatically declared that Rome is the King of the North."¹⁶

But, Were's claim that White "unwaveringly taught until his death that the beast power...is the king of the north" is an exaggeration of historical fact. According to Willie White, his father had presented a differing opinion to "check a movement that he thought was bordering into fanaticism, and might lead to the hindrance of the work to be done. He was reproved by the Lord for bringing in distrust as to the unity of the leaders and sank down in discouragement, and thus the great financial campaign [to overcome the debts of the Battle Creek College and Sanitarium, as well as establishing Mission offices in Europe and Britain] collapsed."¹⁷ Indeed, Willie's conversation is consistent with the tone of James White's 1877 article, as indicative in his closing statement posed in the form of the question, "And in advancing opinions upon unfulfilled prophecy, is it not safer to move slowly?" In the process of publishing this exaggeration, Louis Were violated principles of which White wrote in the article published in 1877. It also appears that a double standard is uplifted—one by which Smith was required to uphold while White, and later Were, could skirt around with immunity as they made their assertions and predictions. [For purpose of closer scrutiny, I have quoted White's 1877 article in total, with emphasis added, for the readers' convenience.]

"Unfulfilled Prophecy"
James S. White
The Review and Herald, November 29, 1877
Vol. 50, No. 22, Page 172

THE Bible was given as a lamp to our feet and a light to our path. It was designed for the benefit of the people in this world and not the next. It is the sure word of prophecy that shines in this dark world. It was not designed for Angels or for immortal saints. Therefore we shall not have to wait until we reach Heaven before we understand what the Lord has said to us in his word. The Bible is what God has revealed to man, and if he does not understand it the fault is because he does not search its pages as he should, or because he does not live as near him as he should, so that he can understand what the Lord has revealed. To say that the Bible was given to be understood—and who will deny this plain proposition?—is one thing, and to say that we do understand every chapter and every verse, is quite another thing.

¹⁶ Louis F. Were, *Pastor James White and Unfulfilled Prophecy* (Melbourne, Victoria, Australia: A. F. Blackman, Printer, UL, 1867), 2, emphasis added.

¹⁷ John C. Witcombe, *Unholy War: ...and the King of the South is...* (Prophecy Waymarks Publications, 2014), 17, 18, quoting a letter dated December 12, 1930, also cited by David H. Thiele, "A Comparison and Contrast of James White and Uriah Smith on Daniel 11." <http://www.daniel11prophecy.com/resources.html> , 18, 19, emphasis added.

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

Fulfilled prophecy may be understood by the Bible student. Prophecy is history in advance. He can compare history with prophecy and find a complete fit as the glove to the hand; it having been made for it. But in exposition of unfulfilled prophecy, where the history is not written, the student should put forth his propositions with not too much positiveness, lest he find himself straying in the field of fancy.

There are those who think more of future truth than of present truth. They see but little light in the path in which they walk, but think they see great light ahead of them.

Positions taken upon the Eastern question are based upon prophecies which have not yet their fulfillment. Here we should tread lightly, and take positions carefully, lest we be found removing the landmarks fully established in the advent movement. It may be said that there is a general agreement upon this subject, and that all eyes are turned toward the war now in progress between Turkey and Russia as the fulfillment of that portion of prophecy which will give great confirmation of faith in the soon loud cry and close of our message. But what will be the result of this positiveness in unfulfilled prophecies should things not come out as very confidently expected, is an anxious question.

Wars, pestilences, famines, and earthquakes are not the surest signs of the end. These have ever existed. We may have war, then peace, pestilence, then health, famine, then plenty, earthquakes, then the bowels of the earth may be quiet; but the message of the third angel is given but once. The progress of this Work in fulfillment of prophecy is the highest and brightest light now shining in the religious heavens. Those looking at the Eastern question will probably be disappointed; but we may bear our whole weight upon the last message without fear of disappointment. As we now see our worldwide message extending to the nations, we see the fulfillment of prophecy, and the clearest sign of the close of the work, and the consummation of the hope of the church.

Let us take a brief view of the line of prophecy four times spanned in the book of Daniel. It will be admitted that the same ground is passed over in chapters two, seven, eight, and eleven; with this exception that Babylon is left out of chapters eight and eleven. We first pass down the great image of chapter two, where Babylon, Persia, Greece, and Rome are represented by the gold, the silver, the brass, and the iron. All agree that these feet are not Turkish but Roman. And as we pass down, the lion, the bear, the leopard, and the beast with ten horns, representing the same as the great image, again all will agree that it is not Turkey that is cast into the burning flame, but the Roman beast. So of chapter eight, all agree that the little horn that stood up

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

against the Prince of princes is not Turkey but Rome. In all these three lines thus far Rome is the last form of government mentioned.

Now comes the point in the argument upon which very much depends. Does the eleventh chapter of the prophecy of Daniel cover the ground measured by chapters two, seven, and eight? If so, then the last power mentioned in that chapter is Rome.

"And he shall plant the tabernacles of his solace between the seas in the glorious holy mountain, margin, of delights of holiness, yet he shall come to his end and none to help him." Dan. 11:45. Is it said that Palestine is such a glorious land, and that the Turkish seat of government is to be removed to that land, then we will remark that:—

Palestine has had the curse of God resting upon it ever since the death of the Son of God. Whatever it may have been, it is not now at the time the prophecy speaks to us any such a country. If there is any portion of our world that God has forsaken more than another, it is that which drank up the blood of prophets, the Son of God, and his holy apostles.

But the western continent is now at the time of the fulfillment of the prophecy just such a land. Here, stretching between the Atlantic and the Pacific is a country which is the desire of all nations. Even the poor Chinaman with all his idolatry and filth flocks to our comparatively delightful land by thousands.

It is here that all nations are represented. Three years since, in a Catholic procession which was three hours passing a given point, one carriage flung to the breeze thirty-two flags, representing that number of nations.

Our free schools, the freedom of the press, and freedom of religious liberty, added to the fertility of our vast country, make it at this time the land of delight. We close this article with the inquiries: Viewing the past and present, is there not more probability that the seat of the beast will be moved to our country, than that the seat of the Turkish government will be moved to Palestine? And in advancing opinions upon unfulfilled prophecy, is it not safer to move slowly? J.W.

When one prophesies, the foretelling of future events can only mean unrevealed history is about to be made. The future—from the prophet's perspective—becomes history to the reader or hearer of prophecy depending on the proximity to the prognosticator. The apostle John would see more prophecy fulfilled than did Daniel. Martin Luther could see more prophecy fulfilled than John. William Miller and Josiah Litch could see more prophecy fulfilled than Luther. Uriah Smith could see more prophecy fulfilled than William Miller, Josiah Litch, and Adam Clarke.

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

Miller, Litch, and Clarke interpreted the fulfilling of Daniel 11 the same as Uriah Smith, except Miller and Litch taught that verses 44 and 45 applied to France, Great Britain, and Russia. Of the three, only Adam Clarke proposed that verses 44, 45 were as yet unfulfilled. Why did Miller and Litch think this way? How does our proximity to history aid in our perspective of fulfilled prophecy?

Napoleon Bonaparte wanted to create an empire equal to or greater than that of Alexander the Great. He desired to win for France all of the territories conquered by Alexander as a legacy for himself. He had conquered most of Italy and Malta in 1797, preparing the way for General Berthier to arrest the Pope in 1798—a significant date, for it was the fulfilling of prophecy's 1,260 day for a year time period of Papal oppression. But the subsequent invasion of Malta before Napoleon moved on to Egypt proved to be the fulcrum for Russia turning against France. Napoleon had wanted Russia as an ally. The Knights of St. John being expelled from Malta by the French general proved to be the excuse Tsar Alexander I would use to war against France—declaring himself to be the patron and protector of this order. Great Britain would prove victorious in naval battles at the Nile Delta and all along the Palestine coast—hindering Napoleon's supply lines by sea and capturing his siege apparatus.

Napoleon would not receive the news of Russia's declaration of war until after his retreat from Acre, where the combined forces of the British and Turks proved persistent enough opponents to force Napoleon back into Egypt. It was this news that Britain (in the north) and Russia (in the east) had formed an alliance and would transport Ottoman troops by sea to Egypt that would suffice as prophetic fulfillment in the mind of William Miller. Napoleon quickly decided to flee Egypt for France to protect and restore his reputation. At that time, Rear Admiral Nelson knew of three French corsairs (privately owned and armed ships used as privateers) sailing from Egypt. But thinking that Napoleon was too proud and arrogant a man to use such vessels as a means of personal transport, Nelson allowed them to slip through the ever-tightening blockade. It was as great a miracle for Napoleon's escape as had been the initial invasion at Alexandria, where Nelson arrived before the French thinking he was behind them, and then departing to search them out just a day or two before the French fleet appeared. God's hand was certainly moving in the events of men.

Thus Miller concluded that the terrible bloodshed of Napoleon's Russian campaign fulfilled verse 44 of Daniel 11. He reasoned that Napoleon also fulfilled verse 45 by his conquest of Italy—Rome being the glorious mountain of Catholicism located between two seas—and that Napoleon eventually came to his end, because "none shall help him."¹⁸ Josiah Litch would virtually concur with William Miller.¹⁹ And

¹⁸ William Miller, *Evidences from Scripture and History of the Second Coming of Christ About the Year A. D. 1843, and of His Personal Reign of 1000 Years* (Vermont Telegraph Office, Brandon, Vermont, 1833), 27, 28.

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

even after the great disappointment, Otis Nichols would publish along the same lines regarding Napoleon fulfilling verse 45, though he thought England to be the king of the north, and France to be the king of the south.²⁰

Nichols' 1853 article would be published without rebuttal by White—even though James White was then editor—because it was mostly consistent with Miller's and Litch's views as taught by those prominent stalwarts in the Millerite movement, and despite White's views published in 1847.²¹ Such evidence dispels the claim that belief in Turkey fulfilling prophecy was removal of any "old landmarks" pronounced by James White in his 1877 article. And then events in southeastern Europe would create public interest in the Eastern Question. Six months after Nichols' article, Russia attacked the Ottoman Empire in the Balkans after Great Britain failed to successfully negotiate on unresolved issues between Russia and France concerning the safe passage of Christian pilgrims to the Holy Land then under the control of Turkey. Suddenly there would be another attempt to shift the balance of power within Europe, and the World's attention focused again on the fulfillment of prophecy before their widening eyes.

Although the Eastern Question has its origins in the conclusion of the Russo-Turkish War (1768-1774) which brought Kabardia and Crimea into Russia's possession, William Miller could not possibly know of its importance to Bible prophecy as it related to the Ottoman Empire and the king of the north because he had wrongly concluded that the cleansing of the sanctuary in Daniel 8:14 was the cleansing of this earth at the second coming of Jesus. He thought he was properly adhering to the rules of Bible prophecy interpretation when he applied the history of Napoleon's Russian campaign to Daniel 11:44, 45. Napoleon certainly did not appear to have the help of any other nations when he came to his end. But it turns out that Miller didn't know which historical events would more perfectly supply the want of prophecy, even though Josiah Litch had accurately predicted the demise of the Ottoman Empire according to the time prophecies involving the first and second woes—ending on August 11, 1840—which concluded with French and British intervention that curtailed the near Egyptian overthrow of Constantinople. The Crimea War (1853-1856) would be the further developed history necessary to partially fulfill that want.

¹⁹ Josiah Litch, *The Probability of the Second Coming of Christ About A.D. 1843 Shown by a Comparison of Prophecy with History, Up to the Present Time, and an Explanantion of Those Prophecies Which are Yet to be Fulfilled* (David H. Ela, Boston, 1838), 102-104.

²⁰ Otis Nichols, "The Papacy and France," *The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* (Rochester, N. Y.: Review and Herald), Vol. III, No. 18, January 20, 1853, 142.

²¹ James White, *A Word to the Little Flock* (Gorham, Maine, 1847), 8, 9. This is the earliest known record of White's view on papacy being the king of the north.

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

The connection between the woes of Revelation and the work of the king of the north in Daniel 11:40-45 would be made by Uriah Smith and the 1862-1872 Sabbath School participants that contributed the material to what would be initially published in 1881 as the now combined *Daniel and the Revelation*. The material studied from 1862 covered the prophecies of Revelation first published in 1867. Five years later, the prophecies of Daniel were published as a companion volume. In this volume, as well as the combined volumes published in 1881, the Crimea War is recognized as the fulfillment of Daniel 11:44. Note the predictive nature of Dr. Clarke's 1825 comment—quoted in part by Smith—as he provides two possible interpretations:

Verse 44. *But tidings out of the east and out of the north shall trouble him]*
This part of the prophecy is allowed to be yet *unfulfilled*; and what is portended, the course of prophetic events will shew. Were we to understand it as applying to *Antiochus*, then the news might be of the preparations which he heard, that the provinces of the *East*, and *Artaxes*, king of *Armenia*, on the *north*, were intending to rise up against him. But if the *Turkish* power be understood, as in the preceding verses, it may mean that the *Persians* on the *east*, and the *Russians* on the *north*, will at some time greatly embarrass the Ottoman government.²²

Smith would then elaborate on just how these events occurred long after the death of Adam Clarke in 1832—the same year in which Miller began preaching on the subject of Christ's second coming. The nature of Clarke's prediction would have had as striking an influence upon Smith—whether or not it brought about a change of previous position—and others, just as the prediction Josiah Litch had made regarding the end of the second woe would have upon those in the valley of decision up to the time of its fulfillment on August 11, 1840.

Between this conjecture of Dr. Clarke's, written in 1825, and the Crimean War of 1853-1856, there is certainly a striking coincidence, inasmuch as the very powers he mentions, the Persians on the east and the Russians on the north, were the ones which instigated that conflict. Tidings from these powers troubled him (Turkey). Their attitude and movements incited the sultan to anger and revenge. Russia, being the more aggressive party, was the object of attack. Turkey declared war on her powerful northern neighbor in 1853. The world looked on in amazement to see a government which had long been called "the Sick Man of the East," a government whose army was dispirited and demoralized, whose treasuries were empty, whose rulers were vile and imbecile, and whose subjects were rebellious and threatening secession, rush with such impetuosity into the conflict. The prophecy said

²² Adam Clarke, *The Holy Bible: Containing the Old and New Testaments ... : with a Commentary and Critical Notes Designed to Help to a Better Understanding of the Sacred Writings*, Volume 4 (New York: Abraham Paul, 1825), Daniel 11:44.

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

that they should go forth with "great fury;" and when they thus went forth in the war aforesaid, they were described, in the profane vernacular of an American writer, as "fighting like devils." England and France, it is true, soon came to the help of Turkey; but she went forth in the manner described, and as is reported, gained important victories before receiving the assistance of these powers.²³

A further understanding of the connection between the Russo-Turkish War and the Crimea War is best understood as a political-military strategy for maintaining the status quo. Britain was king of the seas, the world premier navy. Russia wanted to challenge the grip over the oceans Britain had maintained, but lacked a warm water harbor from which to launch a navy year around. Russia could only navigate when her northern ports were not icebound in winter—greatly hindering economical and military aspirations. With the demise of French military supremacy at the end of the Seven Years' War (sometimes called "World War Zero" for its global extent), Russia correctly surmised that it could successfully war against the Ottoman Empire to acquire its most coveted warm water harbor. Thus concluded the matter just before the French Revolution. Russia hoped to further her aspirations in 1853. Though there was no formal declaration of war by Turkey until October, conflict had already occurred in the Balkans.

Russia had tired of having her navy bottled up in the Black Sea—unable to freely pass through the straits at Constantinople without Ottoman permission. Great Britain did not want the Russian navy to have free access to the eastern Mediterranean where the British happily dominated. When the Turks obtained guarantees that France and Britain would come to aid them they formally declared war on Russia in October. But Europe was slow to fulfill their promises. French and British troops didn't mobilize in any useful fashion until after June, 1854. Karl Marx acerbically remarked on the tardiness of Europe's response, "there they are, the French doing nothing and the British helping them as fast as possible."²⁴ When the Crimean War ended, Russia had lost its bid for supremacy in the eastern Mediterranean—its Black Sea fleet destroyed along with the fortifications at Sevastopol. The ruined prestige suffered by Russia only fermented as a desire for revenge in the future. The Ottoman Empire was weakened further because of influence lost in the Balkans and the ruinous debt created by the conflict.

²³ Uriah Smith, *Daniel and The Revelation: Thoughts, Critical and Practical, on the Book of Daniel and the Revelation: Being an Exposition, Text by Text, of These Important Portions of the Holy Scriptures* (Nashville, Tennessee: Southern Publishing Association, 1897), 310.

²⁴ Alexis S. Troubetzkoy, *A Brief History of the Crimean War*. (London: Constable & Robinson, 2006), 192.

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

From the end of the Crimean War to the next conflict with Russia, the Ottoman Empire confronted several rebellions and uprisings in which thousands of Christians died. In 1860, during the crisis in Lebanon, as many as 12, 000 people died in the violence which led to reprisal killings in Damascus where as many as 25, 000 lost their lives. Between 1866 and 1869 a revolt in Crete about 750 people were slaughtered without quarter after surrendering. The Bulgarian Uprising in 1876 ended with up to 30,000 massacred. Some modern historians calculate the number to be as high as 100,000. In addition to these atrocities would come the terrible persecution of Armenian Christians between 1879 and 1915 resulting in over 1.5 million deaths. The word "genocide" was coined in 1944 to describe the massacre in 1915 (as well as the holocaust events of World War II). The history of these events in the Ottoman Empire were well publicized and known to preachers like A. G. Daniells and J. N. Loughborough who presented sermons on the Eastern Question.

Meanwhile, unfolding news in Italy would continue to cause and foster skepticism regarding the Papacy as the king of the north providing us with the backstory for why Uriah Smith may have switched from holding the view of the Papacy as king of the north to Turkey being such, as claimed by Were, even though the evidence appears to be—in this age of digitalization—lacking in its availability.

Never truly independent since Napoleon's conquest, Italy was made up of a smattering of small states waiting for the right person(s) to reunite them into a modern nation. The Vatican was among these states, and still maintained a small army of professional soldiers—which included the Swiss Guards that still exist to protect the Pope as his personal bodyguard. With the emergence of such personalities like Victor Emmanuel II (King of Sardinia-Piedmont since 1849), Camillo Paolo Filippo Giulio Benso (Count of Cavour, Isolabella, and Leri, and Prime Minister of Sardinia-Piedmont), Giuseppe Garibaldi (an Italian general and Republican who had financial support from Great Britain and the United States during the fight for reunification), and Pope Pius IX (the longest reigning Pope up to that time in history—1846-1878), history unfolded in such a manner as to indicate that the Papacy was not the king of the north. Events would transpire until Victor Emmanuel II would win by conquest the lands held by Pope Pius IX—famous for his statements regarding papal infallibility and assertions of the Virgin Mary's role in Roman Catholic doctrines—in 1870. Simply put, the Papacy had received its deadly wound in 1798, and continued to "bleed out" until it could no longer function as an internationally recognized sovereign state—having fallen under the civil jurisdiction of a whimsical Italian parliament. For eight years Pius IX would be known as the "Prisoner of the Vatican." Of these events, James White appears to make a case that prophecy was being fulfilled, or on the verge of fulfillment, writing:

Some very startling events relative to the papacy, filling up the prophecies uttered in this chapter concerning that power, have taken place within a few years of the present time. Commencing in 1798 where the great national judgment fell upon the papacy, what have been the chief characteristics of its

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

history? Answer: The rapid defection of its natural supporters, and greater assumptions on its own part. At the close of the 2300 days of chapter 8, in 1844, Judgment of another kind began to sit, namely, the investigative Judgment, in the heavenly sanctuary, preparatory to the coming of Christ. Dec. 8, 1854, the dogma of the Immaculate Conception was decreed by the pope. July 21, 1870, in the great Ecumenical Council assembled at Rome, it was deliberately decreed by a vote of 538 against 2 that the pope was infallible. In the same year, Napoleon [III], by whose bayonets the pope was kept upon his throne, was crushed by Prussia, and the last prop was knocked from under the papacy. Then Victor Emanuel, seizing his opportunity to carry out the long-cherished dream of a United Italy, seized Rome to make it the capital of his kingdom. To his troops, under General Cadorna, Rome surrendered, Sept. 20, 1870. Then the last vestige of the temporal power departed, nevermore, said Victor Emanuel, to be restored; and the pope has been virtually a prisoner in his own palace since that time. Because of the great words which the horn uttered, Daniel saw the beast destroyed and given to the burning flame. This destruction is to take place at the second coming of Christ and by means of that event; for the man of sin is to be consumed by the spirit of Christ's mouth, and destroyed by the brightness of his coming. 2Thess.2:8. What words could be greater, more presumptuous, more blasphemous, more insulting to high Heaven, than the deliberate adoption of the dogma of Infallibility, clothing a mortal man with the prerogative of the Deity, which was accomplished by papal intrigue and influence, July 21, 1870? Following in swift succession, the last vestige of temporal power was swept from his grasp. It was because of these words, and as if in almost immediate connection with them, that the prophet saw this power given to the burning flame. His dominion was to be consumed unto the end; implying that when the last vestige of this power was consumed as a civil ruler, the end is not far off.²⁵

Though James White thought he had fresh evidence to support his view on the Papacy coming soon to "his end," he really had no grounds for strong objections against the application of the Crimea War to Daniel 11:44. Enough time had passed since the Crimea War—nearly twenty years by the time the commentary on Daniel as a "stand alone" book was published—that a fanatical interest could not be fomented by decades old news. This could not have excited his concerns about moving too quickly on prophecy as yet unfulfilled. Certainly the Papacy had done nothing between 1798 and 1870 to give even a weak appearance of fulfilling Daniel 11:40-44. On the other hand, Turkey appeared to be fulfilling the prophecy.

We would certainly agree with White that the Papacy had fallen even lower than before the proclamation of the second angel's message proclaimed shortly after

²⁵ James White, *The Judgment Or, the Waymarks of Daniel to the Holy City* (Review and Herald, Battle Creek, Michigan, circa 1870), 14-16, emphasis added.

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

1844. This new evidence would certainly be the kind of revelation of a new and greater fall associated with the mighty angel of Revelation 18:1, 2. But, what James White did with these events is the very thing Uriah Smith did with events involving Russia and the Ottoman Empire, and then White rebukes Smith and others for focusing on unfulfilled prophecy as though it were the hope of greater future light while ignoring or taking for granted the present light on the pilgrim's pathway.

James White had valid concerns regarding the attempts to predict "the war now in progress between Turkey and Russia"—the Russo-Turkish War (1877-1878) as well as the terrible events affecting Christians in that region leading up to that conflict—had society hyperventilating on the Eastern Question as an imminent fulfillment of Armageddon. It severely curtailed offerings by which church debt might be reduced. But instead of offering a divergent view to curtail the enthusiasm, White should have been offering an increase in prayers for people to acquire gold refined in the fire, a spotless robe of Christ's righteousness, and the eyesalve of the Holy Spirit so that people under the influence of the Holy Spirit would have moved them to bring their tithes and offerings into the storehouse.

White's earliest published view [1847] may have been a reaction to what he saw as a dangerous practice implemented by Miller and Litch. Perhaps he thought of the resulting Great Disappointment, when "positiveness" of interpretation going unfulfilled can only end in broken and forsaken faith—since many forsook the movement after Christ did not return at that time. However, White appears to exaggerate the importance of his king of the north position in relation to his remark, "Positions taken upon the Eastern question are based upon prophecies which have not yet their fulfillment. Here we should tread lightly, and take positions carefully, lest we be found removing the landmarks fully established in the advent movement." At a time when White's health had been affected by overwork, he magnifies the papacy for the role of king of the north as though it were a landmark fully established before 1847. Only six years later Nichols' view, being more consistent with Miller and Litch as presented before the Great Disappointment, proves the landmark less settled than what White would have us believe—if Daniel 11 interpretations is what he even meant by "landmark," as Were appears to conclude.

Ellen White would—a decade later—address the dangers of resorting to the fear of removing landmarks when they really aren't landmarks. She also listed what the "old landmarks" are so as to clear up any confusion over the matter. At the 1888 Conference session there existed a spirit of rejection that distorted the truth about fundamental beliefs making up the "old landmarks."

There is a bracing of the mind, an opposition of the soul brought to the investigation of the Scriptures. This leaves such souls where Satan can impress them. 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

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

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. All this cry about changing the old landmarks is all imaginary.²⁶

If, for a moment, we were to give James White the benefit of the doubt that his "cry about changing the old landmarks" is not "imaginary", then what would such a landmark look like? Let us suppose that the timing of the seven last plagues in relationship to the close of probation is an old landmark fully established by the advent movement because of its connection to the Sanctuary question as part of the list of "old landmarks" supplied by Ellen White in her 1889 statement. We can easily enough determine the correctness and accuracy of this landmark by a quick review of those who taught on the subject.

In 1853 J. N. Andrews wrote on this topic in a question and answer format. At that time, James White served as Editor while Joseph Bates, Joseph Baker, and J. N. Andrews formed the publishing committee. Uriah Smith was a contributor to this issue, having submitted a poem titled "The Warning Voice of Time and Prophecy."

We understand that the Saviour ministered in the first apartment until the end of the 2300 days, and that the termination of that period marked the commencement of his ministration in the holiest of all. If the ministration of the Saviour in the first apartment had been on the principle of a day in the type answering to a year in the antitype, then it would have occupied only 364 years instead of more than 1800. We know of no means of marking the

²⁶ Ellen G. White, *The Ellen G. White 1888 Materials* (Washington, D.C.: Ellen G. White Estate, 1987), 518, emphasis added.

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

precise length of Christ's ministration in the most holy place; but regard it as the brief period which will terminate human probation, and end in the pouring out of God's wrath in the seven last plagues.²⁷

Two years later, Roswell F. Cottrell would contribute an affirming experience, of which we will only deal with in part:

The Lord is over-ruling all things for the good of his people, and for the spread of the third message. The subject of the prophecies is being agitated; the spirit of inquiry is in the minds of the lovers of truth, and it will not be satisfied with anything but the truth. It will not be hard to convince the candid that this government has something to do in the fulfillment of the prophecies that relate to the last days. That the vials of wrath containing the seven last plagues are the wrath without mixture threatened by the third angel; and consequently not one of them can be poured out till Mercy has ceased to plead, and probation is ended.²⁸

James White's position did not differ from those expressed earlier:

During the pouring out of the seven last plagues, and at the time of the shaking of the powers of the heavens, a large portion of the wicked will doubtless be destroyed. A portion still remain, to view scenes still more terrible, and to endure anguish more dreadful. The sign is soon in heaven. The once slighted, insulted, and crucified Saviour, now King of kings, and Lord of lords, is coming near the earth! His glory blazes everywhere! The saints hope and rejoice with trembling; but what an hour for the wicked! The tribes of the earth mourn. Amid the ruins of shivered creation they hold one general prayer-meeting. Kings and great men, rich men, chief captains and mighty men, free and bond, all, yes, all unite in the general wail. As the Son of Man in the glory of his Father, attended by all the holy angels, draws still nearer, consternation fills every breast. They hide in dens, and in the rocks of the mountains. Their only hope is to be concealed from the glory of that scene. They know it is too late to pray for mercy; that probation for the human family has ended forever.²⁹

²⁷ J. N. Andrews, "Questions by Bro. Frisbie; Answer," *The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* (Rochester, N. Y.: Review and Herald), Vol. III, No. 25, April 28, 1853, 200.

²⁸ R. F. Cottrell, "Communication from Bro. Cottrell." *The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* (Rochester, N. Y.: Review and Herald), Vol. VII, No. 5, September 4, 1855, 37. R. F. Cottrell, J. N. Andrews, and Uriah Smith made up the Publishing Committee.

²⁹ James White, *The Second Coming of Christ Or, A Brief Exposition of Matthew Twenty-Four* (Battle Creek, Mich.: Steam Press: Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Assoc., 1871), 43, 44, emphasis added.

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

J. N. Andrews' position remained unchanged in 1890:

The next event in the great day of God is the destruction of the living wicked by the seven last plagues. As these do not come until the wicked are accounted unworthy of the kingdom of God, their destruction comes as a part of the judgment work, and after the virtual decision of their cases. The fact is many times revealed in the Bible that before the final deliverance of the saints there comes a time of trouble such as never was. This is plainly marked as lying between the decision in the case of the righteous at the close of their probation, and the event of their deliverance....

So it is apparent that while Christ is finishing his work in the sanctuary, and while the third angel is giving the last message of mercy to man, the seven last plagues are withheld, though pending ready to be poured out. But when the work of probation is closed, and the intercession of Christ in heaven, and the voice of warning upon earth, are ended, then men drink from the cup of his indignation the wine of God's wrath without any mixture.³⁰

Uriah Smith's position also remained unchanged from the time he first contributed to, and then joined the publishing committee of, the church paper he served as editor for so many years.

The Chronology of the Plagues. - The description of this plague clearly reveals at once their chronology; for it is poured out upon those who have the mark of the beast, and who worship his image, - the identical work against which the third angel warns us. This is conclusive proof that these judgments are not poured out till after this angel closes his work, and that the very class who hear his warning, and reject it, are the ones to receive the first drops from the overflowing vials of God's indignation....

Consequently, these vials are not poured out till the close of the ministration in the tabernacle above, but immediately follow that event; for Christ is then no longer a mediator; mercy, which has long stayed the hand of vengeance, pleads no more; the servants of God are all sealed.³¹

What happens to this old landmark when we read the fanciful view contrived by a figurative hermeneutic? Louis Were places the last seven plagues as happening

³⁰ John Nevins Andrews, *The Judgment. Its Events and Their Order* (Oakland, California: Pacific Press Publishing Company, 1890), 88, 89, emphasis added.

³¹ Smith, *Daniel and The Revelation: Thoughts, Critical and Practical, on the Book of Daniel and the Revelation: Being an Exposition, Text by Text, of These Important Portions of the Holy Scriptures*, 684, 685, emphasis added.

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

before the close of probation, claiming that the "gathering to Armageddon (vs. 13-15) commences before probation closes. The decisions made before probation closes will determine whether or not we shall be destroyed in Armageddon..." and by this reasoning alone promotes a figurative, mystical rendering to a literal plain passage of Scripture.³²

We can then conclude that an "old landmark" was removed by Were since his position on the close of probation as it relates to the timing of the seven last plagues contradicts that of the pioneers, as well as what Ellen White wrote in 1888 and 1911:

The severity of the retribution awaiting the transgressor may be judged by the Lord's reluctance to execute justice. The nation with which He bears long, and which He will not smite until it has filled up the measure of its iniquity in God's account, will finally drink the cup of wrath unmixed with mercy.

When Christ ceases His intercession in the sanctuary, the unmingled wrath threatened against those who worship the beast and his image and receive his mark (Revelation 14:9, 10), will be poured out. The plagues upon Egypt when God was about to deliver Israel were similar in character to those more terrible and extensive judgments which are to fall upon the world just before the final deliverance of God's people.... Terrible as these inflictions are, God's justice stands fully vindicated.

These plagues are not universal, or the inhabitants of the earth would be wholly cut off. Yet they will be the most awful scourges that have ever been known to mortals. All the judgments upon men, prior to the close of probation, have been mingled with mercy. The pleading blood of Christ has shielded the sinner from receiving the full measure of his guilt; but in the final judgment, wrath is poured out unmixed with mercy.

In that day, multitudes will desire the shelter of God's mercy which they have so long despised.³³

While James White accused Smith of neglecting present light for a greater future light, he was falling back upon the conclusions of Martin Luther for identifying the king of the north—thereby effectually relying upon a dimmer light from the past than that of the present light—the "great and solemn events which we must know as

³² Were, *Bible Principles of Interpretation—Establish Truth and Safeguard Against Last-Day Errors*, 58.

³³ Ellen G. White, *The Great Controversy* (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1911), 627-629, emphasis added.

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

we stand on the very threshold of their fulfillment.”³⁴ Even more importantly, the assumption is presented in such a manner that James appears to take for granted this threshold as though there can be no importance placed upon the perspective that positions held regarding the Papacy as the king of the north are also “based upon prophecies which have not yet their fulfillment,” and subsequently are just as predisposed to take on the aura of “straying in the field of fancy.” In other words, those who hold to the Papal position are just as prone to fanciful interpretations and predictions as those who held to the Turkey position when it comes to painting any picture as to how prophecy may further develop. The conservative caution penned by White needs to be applied to both parties. Yet Louis Were's principles of interpretation consisting of double and triple applications create a great deal of permissiveness in the latitude of interpretations that appear fanciful, considering the figurative approach in making a symbolic allegory of everything.

No doubt some fanciful extrapolation occurred as Bible prophecy was forced into the reading of current events reported in the newspapers of the time period. One can safely conclude that the practice continues by both parties even as we look for validation of positions currently held by our contemporaries in making events placeholders in the juxtaposition of prophecy and history, i.e., the rise of Atheism, Communism, the number of Roman Catholics on the United States Supreme Court, or the need for an ambassador to be appointed to the Vatican. It is indeed a more delicate matter to contrive the fulfillment of prophecy in the current events of the freshly baked history than to rest upon the older loaves of history where time has more surely vindicated and established the truthfulness of our conclusions. But we must also recognize that events are more rapidly communicated today, more easily vetted because of digitalization of books into computerized libraries, and the ease in which we can then blog our conclusion via internet connections that are ever increasing in the speed by which news—genuine, alternative, and fake alike—is conveyed. In all fairness, it is just as easy for those promoting the papacy as the king of the north to stray and mislead as any accused holding contrary beliefs. We need to carefully scrutinize how White and Were are guilty of doing the very same thing even as they selected the history that suited their conclusions, and reasoned with an argumentative logic for the purpose of casting doubt on what Uriah Smith, A. T. Jones, J. N. Loughborough, and A. G. Daniells who were actively preaching with one voice regarding the Eastern Question, and that Ellen G. White plainly stated as truth.³⁵ That scrutiny must include the rules for interpreting prophecy in Scripture.

Louis Were has established for himself a reputation for hermeneutics—given the rules he has laid out in his booklet as accepted by his adherents. He even partially

³⁴ Ellen G. White, *Selected Messages*, Book 2 (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1958), 109.

³⁵ See “A Comparison and Contrast of James White and Uriah Smith on Daniel 11,” pp. 10, 20, for those statements made by Ellen White on the Eastern Question as truth. <http://www.daniel11prophecy.com/resources.html>

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

quotes what Ellen White wrote in *The Great Controversy* about the process William Miller used in his own methods of Bible study and interpretation.³⁶ Yet he uses a form of hermeneutics, giving his rules power which might supersede a certain principle, or more, of interpretation used by William Miller regarding the decision to treat a word or combination of words literally or symbolically. He provides proofs from the Scriptures and Spirit of Prophecy, making them lend authority in support of his interpretations, but, for the sake of space, we will list the rules alone, and then we can more easily compare them with the rules used by Miller, Himes, and Litch to determine their reliability.

Principle 1: The interpretation must reveal Christ.

Principle 2: Compare Scripture with Scripture for clearer light.

Principle 3: The things of Israel now belong to the church.

Principle 4: The Gospel is in every passage and prophecy.

Principle 5: The law of growth or development: the principle of repeat and enlarge—the repetition contains an explanation:... Thus the book of Revelation throws light upon all the preceding books and must in itself be interpreted with remembrance of all the books that have preceded it. Some have not done this and have consequently misinterpreted some of its important prophecies.

Principle 6: The law of the world-wide symbolized by the local: All the prophets employed the principle of the world-wide symbolized by the local.

Principle 7: The law of the significance of Bible names: A decided connection exists between the proper names of the Bible and its history and doctrines.

Principle 8: The law governing "spiritual" interpretations: God is the Author of "spiritual" interpretations. It is a mistake to think that "spiritual" interpretations take one into an unreal world, a world of fancy, conjecture, imagination, for they take one into a world of actuality—they are mental pictures—of spiritual truths which are *based upon things that have actually happened*.

Principle 9: Observe the deep, inner meaning—not alone what is on the surface:... However, the deeper meaning is not to be obtained by some

³⁶ Louis F. Were, *Bible Principles of Interpretation—Establish Truth and Safeguard Against Last-Day Errors* (A. F. Blackman, Printer, 125 Waverley Road, East Malvern), 9.

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

fanciful interpretation. That is not necessary, for somewhere in God's Word will be found the key of explanation.

Principle 10: The design of the Book of Revelation—All the laws of interpretation show that the gathering of the nations to "Armageddon" must commence before Probation closes:... There are other laws of interpretation which lead us to the same conclusion, and it is a corollary drawn from this fact that emphasizes the solemn truth that The Gathering to Armageddon Precedes the 6th Plague.

Principle 11: New Testament principles determine the interpretation of the latter portion of Daniel XI.

Principle 12: "Double" and "triple" applications of prophecy: "Rightly dividing the Word of Truth" (2 Tim. 2:15).

Principle 13: The principle of the "triple" application revealed in the Apocalypse.³⁷

With this outlay of principles for prophetic interpretation, we can better understand Louis Were's attitude toward Uriah Smith—going so far as to pronounce Smith's rules of hermeneutics to be arbitrary and superficial in nature, and leading to the pronouncement "false prophet". We should also note that the Bible laws of interpretation here mentioned are those established by Louis F. Were with the "proofs" selected from Ellen White's writings.

There are definite laws of interpretation, and when they are employed consistently anyone may understand prophecies pertaining to the future. But Uriah Smith, in arbitrarily deciding that Turkey was the king of the north, did not employ Bible laws of interpretation—he merely took a human superficial view. In the books of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Zechariah Babylon is said to be "north" and the king of Babylon the king of the north—see Ezek. 26:7; Jer. 25:9, etc. Had Uriah Smith permitted the Bible to explain itself he would not have blundered in his interpretation concerning the king of the north and there would have been no need for James White to utter the sound caution he gave to prevent Uriah Smith and others from becoming false prophets. Ever since Uriah Smith introduced this interpretation into our midst it has been a most fruitful source of false prognostications—because it is not the true interpretation of the Word of God.³⁸

³⁷ Louis F. Were, *Bible Principles of Interpretation—Establish Truth and Safeguard Against Last-Day Errors* (A. F. Blackman, Printer, 125 Waverley Road, East Malvern), 6-63.

³⁸ Were, *The King of the North at Jerusalem: God's People Delivered*, 3, 4, emphasis added.

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

Because of the objections Louis Were raises concerning Uriah Smith's approach to prophetic interpretation, we are compelled to spend some time understanding the differences between Were's and Smith's principles of interpretation. Truly, Smith relied upon the same rules of interpretation as used by William Miller, and accepted by many Protestants at the time of the Millerite movement. Essentially, every hermeneutical objection Were levies against Smith ought to be understood by us as being levied against Miller. Further more, in calling Uriah Smith, A. T. Jones, J. N. Loughborough, and A. G. Daniells false prophets, he implies that Ellen White is also a false prophet—for she certainly does call the teaching of the king of the north as Turkey "truth" and prayed that God would "make the truth plain" to others.³⁹ [The irony is that at the time she made this diary entry, she was living in Australia, and it was to Aussies that Elder Daniells preached a message Were declares to be patently false.] Were seems to have forgotten that as God's mercy was extended to the population of Nineveh the unfulfilled message of doom did not make Jonah a false prophet when the city was not destroyed at the end of forty days. Nor does his claim that Smith was arbitrary in his hermeneutics have any foundation whatsoever. If Smith was arbitrary, then so were Miller, Litch, and Clarke.

Simply by looking over the list of fourteen rules, along with their proof texts, we can see that William Miller was not arbitrary in his prophetic interpretation when he wrote a list of fourteen rules of Bible interpretation along with their proof texts. By special request, he had given them to the public so that all who wished to understand the Bible might benefit by the consistent use of these principles. For the sake of space, again, only the rules will be supplied here, along with Miller's preamble.

IN studying the Bible, I have found the following rules to be of great service to myself, and now give them to the public by special request. Every rule should be well studied, in connexion [sic] with the scripture references, if the Bible student would be at all benefited by them.

Rule 1: Every word must have its proper bearing on the subject presented in the Bible.

Rule 2: All scripture is necessary, and may be understood by a diligent application and study.

Rule 3: Nothing revealed in the scripture can or will be hid from those who ask in faith, not wavering.

³⁹ Ellen G. White, Ms189-1898, diary entry made Sunday, December 25, 1898, while evangelizing Newcastle, New South Wales, Australia.

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

Rule 4: To understand doctrine, bring all the scriptures together on the subject you wish to know; then let every word have its proper influence, and if you can form your theory without a contradiction, you cannot be in an error.

Rule 5: 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.

Rule 6: God has revealed things to come, by visions, in figures and parables, and in this way the same things are oftentime [sic] revealed again and again, by different visions, or in different figures, and parables. If you wish to understand them, you must combine them all in one.

Rule 7: Visions are always mentioned as such.

Rule 8: Figures always have a figurative meaning, and are used much in prophecy, to represent future things, times and events; such as mountains, meaning governments; beasts, meaning kingdoms. Waters, meaning people. Lamp, meaning Word of God. Day, meaning year.

Rule 9: Parables are used as comparisons to illustrate subjects, and must be explained in the same way as figures by the subject and Bible. Mark iv.13. See explanation of the ten virgins, Miller's Lectures, No.xvi.

Rule 10: Figures sometimes have two or more different significations, as day is used in a figurative sense to represent three different periods of time. 1. Indefinite. 2. Definite, a day for a year. 3. Day for a thousand years. If you put on the right construction it will harmonize with the Bible and make good sense, otherwise it will not.

Rule 11: 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 12: 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 13: 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

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

that history and prophecy doth agree, so that the true believing children of God may never be ashamed.

Rule 14: The most important rule of all is, that you must have faith. It must be a faith that requires a sacrifice, and, if tried, would give up the dearest object on earth, the world and all its desires, character, living, occupation, friends, home, comforts, and worldly honors. If any of these should hinder our believing any part of God's word, it would show our faith to be vain. Nor can we ever believe so long as one of these motives lies lurking in our hearts. We must believe that God will never forfeit his word. And we can have confidence that he that takes notice of the sparrow, and numbers the hairs of our head, will guard the translation of his own word, and throw a barrier around it, and prevent those who sincerely trust in God, and put implicit confidence in his word, from erring far from the truth, though they may not understand Hebrew or Greek.⁴⁰

How supportive is Ellen White in affirming the rules by which Miller studied, lectured, and published his conclusions? She would write:

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:

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

The above is a portion of these rules; and in our study of the Bible we shall all do well to heed the principles set forth.

⁴⁰ William Miller, *Miller's Works. Volume 1. Views of the Prophecies and Prophetic Chronology Selected from Manuscripts of William Miller; With a Memoir of His Life.* Edited by Joshua V. Himes (Joshua V. Himes, Boston, 1842), 20-23.

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

Genuine faith is founded on the Scriptures; but Satan uses so many devices to wrest the Scriptures and bring in error, that great care is needed if one would know what they really do teach. It is one of the great delusions of this time to dwell much upon feeling, and to claim honesty while ignoring the plain utterances of the word of God because that word does not coincide with feeling. Many have no foundation for their faith but emotion. Their religion consists in excitement; when that ceases, their faith is gone. Feeling may be chaff, but the word of God is the wheat. And "what," says the prophet, "is the chaff to the wheat?"⁴¹

Though Ellen White only listed about one-third of the rules, the omission of the others does not mean that she had rejected or changed them anymore than Jesus rejected or changed the moral law when He spoke only a partial listing of the ten commandments to the rich young ruler.⁴² She intended in 1884 that the same principles used in 1844 were just as valid forty years later. And while in Australia praying that God would "make the truth plain," she gives strong indication that Elder Daniells had submitted to "the same plan that Father Miller adopted." As we compare and contrast the plans, the rules, the principles, adopted by Miller and Were, can it be said that Louis Were is adhering to the same plan as Miller—or has he adopted a different scheme? It appears that, while claiming honesty and shoring up his principles and laws of interpretation with Scripture and Spirit of Prophecy, Were is "ignoring the plain utterances of the word of God."

One may make diligent study and attempt to categorize Were's list of principles with the label of each of Miller's rules. However, many of Were's principles, or laws, are so distinctly of a figurative nature where Scripture and Spirit of Prophecy are spiritualized—when in actuality the Bible and Ellen White's writings are literal, and should be understood as such—that one might well become concerned with the mystic influence of such an application. The mystic approach tends to give Were permission to reason in such a manner as to dismiss important insights provided by a literal interpretation. Were asks "how does the interpretation that Rev. 16:12-16 envisages a military war reveal Christ?"⁴³ While giving the appearance of adhering to his own rule, he forgets that Jesus said, "And ye shall hear of wars and rumours of wars: see that ye be not troubled: for all these things must come to pass, but the end is not yet.... Behold, I have told you before."⁴⁴ Also, we must acknowledge that the Bible reveals Christ, not only as infinite love, but also infinite justice.

⁴¹ Ellen G. White, "November 25, 1884—Notes of Travel," *The Review and Herald*, November 25, 1884, emphasis added.

⁴² KJV, Luke 18:18-26.

⁴³ Were, *Bible Principles of Interpretation—Establish Truth and Safeguard Against Last-Day Errors*, 7.

⁴⁴ KJV, Matthew 24:6, 25.

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

We already have read how Louis Were places the last seven plagues as happening before the close of probation, claiming that the "gathering to Armageddon (vs. 13-15) commences before probation closes. The decisions made before probation closes will determine whether or not we shall be destroyed in Armageddon..." and by this reasoning alone promoting a figurative, mystical rendering to a literal plain passage of Scripture.⁴⁵ This conclusion contradicts what Ellen White wrote. It also overlooks what else Ellen White wrote about the revelation of Christ as it relates to the infinite justice of God.

The severity of the retribution awaiting the transgressor may be judged by the Lord's reluctance to execute justice. The nation with which He bears long, and which He will not smite until it has filled up the measure of its iniquity in God's account, will finally drink the cup of wrath unmixed with mercy.

When Christ ceases His intercession in the sanctuary, the unmingled wrath threatened against those who worship the beast and his image and receive his mark (Revelation 14:9, 10), will be poured out. The plagues upon Egypt when God was about to deliver Israel were similar in character to those more terrible and extensive judgments which are to fall upon the world just before the final deliverance of God's people.... Terrible as these inflictions are, God's justice stands fully vindicated.

These plagues are not universal, or the inhabitants of the earth would be wholly cut off. Yet they will be the most awful scourges that have ever been known to mortals. All the judgments upon men, prior to the close of probation, have been mingled with mercy. The pleading blood of Christ has shielded the sinner from receiving the full measure of his guilt; but in the final judgment, wrath is poured out unmixed with mercy.

In that day, multitudes will desire the shelter of God's mercy which they have so long despised.⁴⁶

In the years leading up to the Great Disappointment, opposition to the rules of interpretation used by William Miller became more intense. The Millerites noted the growing trend in changes to Bible interpretation by the nominal denominations as the clergy resisted the Millerite message of the imminent second coming of Christ, and threw their time and energy toward influencing their parishes to accept new theology making gains among them.

⁴⁵ Were, *Bible Principles of Interpretation—Establish Truth and Safeguard Against Last-Day Errors*, 58.

⁴⁶ Ellen G. White, *The Great Controversy* (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1911), 627-629, emphasis added.

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

In 1844, due to a growing opposition and a polarization of positions between Millerites and other Christians, various Millerites associated the above described historical-critical trends with the term "Neology" as other evangelical Christians had done before. Regarding the views of Stuart and Chase, Millerites remarked that "one of the most alarming features of the present state of the churches, is, the railroad speed with which many of the most prominent divines are leaving the OLD LANDMARKS, and taking Neological ground." 4 Colver and Dowling were also accused of Neology. 5 According to Nathan N. Whiting, D.D., 7 a Baptist scholar and Millerite lecturer and editor, the term "Neology" could be equated with "Rationalism" and had once been applied to "the actual creed of a large portion of the members of the German church, who profess a nominal adherence to the Augsburg Confession of Faith, while they reject its fundamental principles" and maintain positions in contradiction to it. Now the term was described as "New Theology—departing from the old established principles of Biblical interpretation, and leaving the faith once delivered to the saints, for new doctrine," which had adopted "views on the prophecies in accordance with the philosophies of Germany and France." 1 It is evident that the Millerites had no sympathy with the hermeneutics employed by those who tended toward historical criticism.⁴⁷

Joshua Himes would have taken issue with Were's objection on grounds of arbitrary hermeneutics, and present as a counter-argument the Millerite position on Neology, for the figurative, spiritualistic, and mystic approach is a part and parcel of Neology.

Neology. We often hear the inquiry made, "What is Neology?" It is New Theology—departing from the old established principles of Biblical interpretation, and leaving the faith once delivered to the saints, for new doctrine.

It begins with denying the literal rendering of the word, and ends with a denial of the inspiration of the Scriptures. We accordingly find men in the church, in every stage of progress, from the most incipient germ, to the boldest scepticism. It is manifested in some, by a denial of the literal application of all those passages of Scripture which relate to the coming of Christ, and end of the world. In others, the fourth beast of Daniel is made to symbolize the divided Grecian kingdom, and its little horn, Antiochus Epiphanes; the prophetic time being confined by them to literal days, and the judgment scene id Dan. vii., and the resurrection in Dan. xii., being carried back to the death of Antiochus. While, therefore, we speak of the Neological view of the church, we include all the various phases that this doctrine assumes,—individuals being more or less Neological, as they depart from the

⁴⁷ Pieter Gerard Damsteegt, *Foundations of the Seventh-day Adventist Message and Mission* (Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich., 1977), 76, 77.

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

literal Scriptures, and forsake the old established principles of interpretation which the Boston Recorder acknowledges are "the foundation of Millerism."⁴⁸

Ellen White has warned us that the same history experienced by the Millerites would once again occur. She also assures us that what is as yet unfulfilled will indeed happen at the right time. What we are experiencing is a conflict between truth and error. What we ought to be doing is strengthening faith that the prophecy will be fulfilled at its proper time, in its proper order, even as we cooperate with God in the work of fitting our characters for heaven. Ellen White wrote:

All that God has in prophetic history specified to be fulfilled in the past has been, and all that is yet to come in its order will be. Daniel, God's prophet, stands in his place. John stands in his place. In the Revelation the Lion of the tribe of Judah has opened to the students of prophecy the book of Daniel, and thus is Daniel standing in his place. He bears his testimony, that which the Lord revealed to him in vision of the great and solemn events which we must know as we stand on the very threshold of their fulfillment.

In history and prophecy the Word of God portrays the long continued conflict between truth and error. That conflict is yet in progress. Those things which have been, will be repeated. Old controversies will be revived, and new theories will be continually arising. But God's people, who in their belief and fulfillment of prophecy have acted a part in the proclamation of the first, second, and third angels' messages, know where they stand. They have an experience that is more precious than fine gold. They are to stand firm as a rock, holding the beginning of their confidence steadfast unto the end.⁴⁹

With the assurance that all prophecy that remains unfulfilled will be fulfilled in its proper order, we can persevere through troubling controversies whether they be revived or new. So, at this juncture, we may proceed with the objections raised—first by James White, then by Louis Were—regarding the fulfillment of Daniel 11 by the Ottoman Empire, aka Turkey.

James White lays the groundwork for future doubts by those who would look to circumstances that appear overwhelmingly impossible to finite minds and feel that what had been presented as fulfilled prophecy had turned to rot and worms, and therefore must be false interpretation. He does this by using a line of reasoning that takes an extreme conclusion, forcing it upon the beliefs of those who would never accept such rationale. Here are the key paragraphs conveying White's main thrusts

⁴⁸ Joshua V. Himes, "The Lord is at Hand: FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES on which the SECOND ADVENT CAUSE IS BASED," *Signs of the Times and Expositor of Prophecy* (Vol. VII. No. 13. Boston, Whole No. 157, May 1, 1844), 100, italicized emphasis supplied, underline emphasis added.

⁴⁹ Ellen G. White, *Selected Messages*, Book 2, 109, emphasis added.

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

for overturning the conclusions of that group of Sabbath School participants used by Uriah Smith in *Daniel and the Revelation*.

Let us take a brief view of the line of prophecy four times spanned in the book of Daniel. It will be admitted that the same ground is passed over in chapters two, seven, eight, and eleven; with this exception that Babylon is left out of chapters eight and eleven. We first pass down the great image of chapter two, where Babylon, Persia, Greece, and Rome are represented by the gold, the silver, the brass, and the iron. All agree that these feet are not Turkish but Roman. And as we pass down, the lion, the bear, the leopard, and the beast with ten horns, representing the same as the great image, again all will agree that it is not Turkey that is cast into the burning flame, but the Roman beast. So of chapter eight, all agree that the little horn that stood up against the Prince of princes is not Turkey but Rome. In all these three lines thus far Rome is the last form of government mentioned.⁵⁰

And there is a line of historic prophecy in chapter eleven, 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." If the feet and ten toes of the metallic image are Roman, if the beast with ten horns that was given to the burning flames of the great day be the Roman beast, if the little horn which stood up against the Prince of princes be Rome, and if the same field and distance are covered by these four prophetic chains, then the last power of the eleventh chapter, which is to "come to his end and none shall help him," is Rome. But if this be Turkey, as some teach, then the toes of the image of the second chapter are Turkish, the beast with ten horns of the seventh chapter represents Turkey, and it was Turkey that stood up against the Prince of princes of the eighth chapter of Daniel. True, Turkey is bad enough off; but its waning power and its end is the subject of the prophet of John and not of Daniel.⁵¹

We can agree that, as the different visions were given to Daniel, each vision had its own independent interpretation. Daniel 2 reveals a mysterious, and at first, forgotten metallic image resembling a man. The interpretation is given in the same chapter as God reveals to Daniel what Nebuchadnezzar had initially forgotten. Let us, just for sake of dwelling on details, remember that we do not see a little toe grow to uproot three other toes. It is not germane to the information conveyed at this time, and yet it brings a potential paradigm shift to our understanding of how additional details are added in future visions given to Daniel and John as we consider how the sum of the visions inform our understanding of any single vision

⁵⁰ James S. White, "Unfulfilled Prophecy," *The Review and Herald*, November 29, 1877, Vol. 50, No. 22, 172, emphasis added.

⁵¹ James S. White, "Where Are We?" *The Review and Herald*, October 3, 1878, Vol. 52, No. 15, 116, 117, emphasis added.

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

considered independently of the others. It helps us to understand that the details of one vision are not necessarily provided to expand understanding of previous prophecies, but to make us aware of which historical events are applicable to the character actors involved in fulfilling prophecy. We may safely conclude that the ten toes of the metallic image do not necessarily translate into the very same ten kingdoms that existed at the time the little horn emerges at the expense of three kingdoms. Only Daniel 7 and 8 mention little horns that wax great. In chapter seven, the little horn represents Papal Rome. But in Daniel 8 the little horn represents pagan Rome. Furthermore, the interpretation for chapter seven's vision is given in the same chapter. But the explanation for the vision of Daniel 8 is given in following visions recorded in chapters nine, ten, eleven, and twelve. Different details are given in chapter eleven than those given in chapter seven, so that we can understand that the information given is just as different for us to comprehend as are the ten horns of chapter seven different than the ten toes of chapter two.

James White attempted to make the case that the information is expansive on previous explanations—no new players are introduced. Therefore, he ridicules the idea that Turkey could be the king of the north by his absurd conclusion that if Turkey is the king of the north during the time period covered in Daniel 11:36-45, then Turkey is also the beast of Daniel seventh, and the iron legs of Daniel second. To show how inconsistent this reasoning is, we can deduce that if Turkey must be the legs or the fourth beast in order to be king of the north in verses 36-45, then Turkey would also be the king of the north through out all of Daniel eleventh. Such an objection is simply unreasonable! If we were to take the same logic and apply it to how we ought to understand the unfolding events connected to the seven trumpets of Revelation chapters eight and nine, then the first two of three woes could not possibly be connected to the Turkish Muslims.

It is not enough to push a scarecrow down by creating a row of straw men to fall like dominoes, as James White did. We must be willing to see history unfold in such a manner that Daniel could be cryptically referring to two different powers that result from the religio-political intrigues of the pagan Roman creature that contorts and divides into two regions—western and eastern—where one becomes the seat of the beast (Rome) while the other remains the king of the north (Constantinople/Istanbul) by the very prediction that Daniel records in chapter 11, verse 24. After all, no emperor before Constantine had thought to become a Christian, though members of Caesar's household had done so. Nor had any emperor prior to that time moved the capitol of Rome over one thousand miles—seventeen hundred kilometers—away. Only for a short time of about sixty years did Ravenna serve as capitol of the West, but then to be brought back to Rome under the Popes of the Holy See.

If we for a moment believe that the prediction of Josiah Litch is correct in calculating the loss of Byzantine authority at the beginning of the second woe, then we should look for a fall by warfare, or a submission by entreaty, to mark the commencement of the demise of eastern Rome. In A. D. 1449, upon the death of Emperor John VIII

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

Palaiologos, there were no truly uncontested successors to assume the rule of Roman held lands under the domain of Constantinople because John had no children. One of his brothers, Constantine XI Dragases Palaiologos (aka Constantine Deacozes), then sent letter by envoy to Murad II (aka Amurath), the Turkish sultan, in order to rule Byzantium by permission of the Ottomans. The reason for this is because the other of John's brothers, Demetrios Palaiologos, had the support of both the Orthodox and Catholic churches. This point is extremely important because Constantine Deacozes did not send the envoy to Rome, where Popes for centuries claimed the right to grant to men crowns and authority to rule, for fear that the decision would go against him. And so he obtained his authority to rule from the Ottomans. His coronation occurred without his being crowned by the Orthodox Patriarch, Gregory III—an ecumenical leader who favored union with the Holy See. If Constantine had obtained permission from the Pope Nicholas V, and had been crowned by the Patriarch Gregory III, then we might quickly defer to James White's conclusion that the Papacy is the king of the north. But Constantine turned to the Muslim power to obtain his authority to rule. Therefore, we can only conclude that the Ottoman Muslims would be the next king of the north upon Constantine's death when Mehmed II would capture Constantinople only four years later.

The Papacy never really had any civic authority over Byzantium. Four centuries earlier we would note that Pope Gregory VII excommunicated and deposed kings for transgressions against the Holy See. Gregory VII would also set a precedent for organizing crusades against Muslim rulers by the example he set in attempting to send a military expedition to rescue the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem because of the bungling of Constantinople's military leaders—arguing that western Christians should come to the aid of eastern Christians.⁵² So, why would Daniel record an explanation couched in a prophetic time period that can only describe the move from Rome to Constantinople unless God was introducing in Daniel that historical player further expanded upon in Revelation ninth—used by God to punish apostate professors of Christianity?

James White wants Rome—the beast cast into the fire—to be the king of the north because he concluded that being cast into the fire is the fulfillment of “he shall come to his end, and none shall help him.” But, this conclusion is also flawed in its logic. Let us for a moment consider the whole passage concerning the beast being cast into the fire. The concept is taken from Revelation 19 and 20.

And I saw the beast, and the kings of the earth, and their armies, gathered together to make war against him that sat on the horse, and against his army. And the beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him, with which he deceived them that had received the

⁵² “Gregory VII's General Summons to the Defense of the Byzantine Empire (March 1, 1074),” <https://apholt.com/2016/11/14/pope-gregory-vii-on-the-plight-of-eastern-christians-prior-to-the-first-crusade/>.

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

mark of the beast, and them that worshipped his image. These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone. And the remnant were slain with the sword of him that sat upon the horse, which sword proceeded out of his mouth: and all the fowls were filled with their flesh....

And when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison, And shall go out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to battle: the number of whom is as the sand of the sea. And they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city: and fire came down from God out of heaven, and devoured them. And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever.⁵³

Daniel depicts a power that meets its solitary end, "none shall help him." But in Revelation, the beast does not meet its end in a solitary, completely helpless manner: "these both [beast and false prophet] were cast alive into a lake of fire." Not only that, but later the devil is cast into the lake of fire "were the beast and the false prophet are" because the devil deceived and helped them without lasting success. Furthermore, the end of the beast and false prophet occurs after the time of trouble mentioned in Daniel 12:1. But the language of Daniel indicates that the king of the north comes to his solitary end before Michael stands up.

Louis Were either did not know of these important historical nuances in his defense of James White, or he did not care to make them prominent in his writings because they expose weaknesses. Rather, he begins his objections by stating: "The Ottoman Empire, in the past, could not have been the king of the north: the Turkish Republic, in the present, could not be the king of the north. The facts of Turkish history will not fit the prophetic mould."⁵⁴ Just comparing this statement with the facts just previously presented demonstrates the inadequacy of Were's conclusion. Rather than supplying the reader with historical facts that would support his conclusion, he relies upon other arguments to make it appear that Turkish history does not fit. We shall attempt to understand the weaknesses of his arguments in their order.

1) "Those who still believe that this power is the king of the north, evidently appalled by all that is implied by the belief that Turkey will yet move its seat of government to Jerusalem, say little or nothing concerning this feature of their interpretation of Dan. 11:45. *Yet this is the climax of the prophecy.*"⁵⁵

⁵³ KJV, Revelation 19:19-21; 20:7-10, emphasis added.

⁵⁴ Louis F. Were, *The King of the North at Jerusalem: God's People Delivered* (Melbourne, Victoria, Australia: May 11, 1949), 18.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, emphasis supplied.

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

We should be surprised by this objection because it expresses a lack of faith. James White was overwhelmed by his burdens taken up when he had survived a series of strokes. His faith staggered because unsanctified, unsealed men objected to the financial needs of the church. That is why he warned, "But in exposition of unfulfilled prophecy, where the history is not written, the student should put forth his propositions with not too much positiveness, lest he find himself straying in the field of fancy." Yet Were would tempt Smith and others to be more positive in their predictions, as he then abandons the church's position and tempted others to also forsake it by this type of objection. However, if we were to consider the belief of a transfer of capitol to be impossible, the distance between Rome and Constantinople is only about 120 miles less than the distance between Constantinople and Jerusalem. The journey made by Constantine the Great from Rome to Constantinople/Istanbul is about 1,068 miles. To move a government that great a distance in 330 A. D. would have been a tremendous undertaking. Daniel recorded the interpretation of such an event in Daniel 11:24. And though there is no time prophecy on which to base another move of capitol as suggested by Smith is not so outlandish. Especially when Turkey has been making demands that Jerusalem be returned to them.⁵⁶ The ease by which countries can mobilize today is significant compared to the slowness of ancient travel. Any response by those who oppose Turkey's desire to reacquire Jerusalem would also be swift and monumental. Any doubts that Turkey could never fulfill the prophecy would be statements of unbelief in God Who "removeth kings, and setteth up kings."⁵⁷

In reality, Were is only echoing the objection of James White in this matter: "We close this article with the inquiries: Viewing the past and present, is there not more probability that the seat of the beast will be moved to our country, than that the seat of the Turkish government will be moved to Palestine?"⁵⁸ By heaping scorn upon Smith's interpretation, White and Were are in danger of fastening the minds of their readers in unbelief likened to the ridicule heaped upon Lot when he warned his sons, sons-in-law, and daughters of the coming destruction of Sodom. After all, if God can bridge an impassable gulf between us through the righteous merits of His only Begotten Son, then what is a little matter of a few hundred miles here on this earth? We must recognize that prophecy is more than history that awaits fulfillment. Prophecy given by God is a promise waiting for fulfillment. The fourteenth rule of father Miller must be applied. We must have the attitude of Habakkuk.

Let us for a moment, before moving on to Were's next objection, consider what Ellen White wrote about prophecy, predictions, promises, and how the character of God revealed in His people will bring Him glory. In a nutshell, this is what the delayed

⁵⁶ For a sample of some who are making these demands, watch the three brief video clips at <http://www.jerusalemcaliphate.com>.

⁵⁷ KJV, Daniel 2:21.

⁵⁸ White, "Unfulfilled Prophecy," *The Review and Herald*, November 29, 1877, Vol. 50, No. 22, 172.

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

fulfillment of this prophecy is all about! The circumstances are the apostasy of God's people, God's expression for justice, Moses' intercession for mercy, and God's promise of pardon—not only in Moses' day, but also in ours.

It was upon his knowledge of the long-sufferance of Jehovah and of His infinite love and mercy, that Moses based his wonderful plea for the life of Israel when, on the borders of the Promised Land, they refused to advance in obedience to the command of God. At the height of their rebellion the Lord had declared, "I will smite them with the pestilence, and disinherit them;" and He had proposed to make of the descendants of Moses "a greater nation and mightier than they." Numbers 14:12. But the prophet pleaded the marvelous providences and promises of God in behalf of the chosen nation. And then, as the strongest of all pleas, he urged the love of God for fallen man. See verses 17-19.

Graciously the Lord responded, "I have pardoned according to thy word." And then He imparted to Moses, in the form of a prophecy, a knowledge of His purpose concerning the final triumph of Israel. "As truly as I live," He declared, "all the earth shall be filled with the glory of the Lord." Verses 20, 21. God's glory, His character, His merciful kindness and tender love—that which Moses had pleaded in behalf of Israel—were to be revealed to all mankind. And this promise of Jehovah was made doubly sure; it was confirmed by an oath. As surely as God lives and reigns, His glory should be declared "among the heathen, His wonders among all people." Psalm 96:3.⁵⁹

God's glory will be fulfilled in us. The sealing should have been finished by now, but, in and by His mercy, the commandment is proclaimed to hold back the winds of strife until the sealing is complete.

2) "The prophecy of Dan. 11:43 says the king of the north: 'The Libyans and Ethiopians shall be at his steps.' In Ex. 11:8, margin, the same expression is employed when referring to the Israelites acting under the government of Moses. See also, Judg. 4:10; I Kings 20:10, margin; 2 Kings 3:9, margin, etc. The Ethiopians were never under the government of Turkey; they were never at the steps of Turkey. Gibbon says, that after the seventh century, 'Compassing by the enemies of their religion, the Ethiopians slept for near a thousand years, forgetful of the world by whom they were forgotten.'"⁶⁰

Context is everything. Were quoted Gibbon so far as it benefits his objection. However, he purposefully omitted the very next sentence—paragraph even—obscuring the time frame of Gibbon's statement, as we shall soon see. The events

⁵⁹ Ellen G. White, *Prophets and Kings* (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1917), 312, 313, emphasis added.

⁶⁰ Were, *The King of the North at Jerusalem: God's People Delivered*, 18, 19.

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

recorded by Gibbon do not include the Papal Bull that granted the Portuguese the right to attack Muslims, who, upon observing the friendship developing between Portugal and Ethiopia, would want to prevent such a lucrative trading alliance.

They were awakened by the Portuguese, who (A.D. 1525—1550) turning the southern promontory of Africa, appeared in India and the Red Sea, as if they had descended through the air from a distant planet. In the first moments of their interview, the subjects of Rome and Alexandria observed the resemblance, rather than the difference, of their faith; and each nation expected the most important benefits from an alliance with their Christian brethren. In their lonely situation, the Ethiopians had almost relapsed into the savage life. Their vessels, which had traded to Ceylon, scarcely presumed to navigate the rivers of Africa; the ruins of Axume were deserted, the nation was scattered in villages, and the emperor, a pompous name, was content, both in peace and war, with the immovable residence of a camp.... But the public danger soon called for the instant and effectual aid of arms and soldiers to defend an unwarlike people from the Barbarians who ravaged the inland country, and the Turks and Arabs who advanced from the sea-coast in more formidable array. Ethiopia was saved by 450 Portuguese, who displayed in the field the native valour of Europeans, and the artificial powers of the musquet and cannon. In a moment of terror, the emperor had promised to reconcile himself and his subjects to the Catholic faith; a Latin patriarch represented the supremacy of the pope; the empire, enlarged in a tenfold proportion, was supposed to contain more gold than the mines of America; and the wildest hopes of avarice and zeal were built on the willing submission of the Christians of Africa.⁶¹

It should here be noted that Gibbon wrote extensively on the history of Rome, and not of Ethiopia. We cannot be certain of the borders of Ethiopia in the time of Daniel, or precisely how they fluctuated during the nearly thousand years Ethiopia was safe from Roman Catholic persecution (538-1525). So, Were could not possibly rely upon Gibbon for a history of interaction between Ethiopia and the Ottoman Empire, except in this one instance nearly two hundred and fifty years before Daniel 11:43 was fulfilled by the overwhelming Ottoman response to the invasion of the French in 1798. Yet we have this observation made by a commentator who lived through the Napoleonic Wars: "*The Libyans and the Ethiopians*] *The Cushim*, unconquered *Arabs*, all sought their friendship; and many of them are tributary to the present time [1825]."⁶² One does not have to be conquered to be a follower, as Were attempts to establish by his Bible word study. Tributes may be levied to protect

⁶¹ Edward Gibbon, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, Vol. III (London: W. W. Gibbings, 1890), 368.

⁶² Clarke, *The Holy Bible: Containing the Old and New Testaments ... : with a Commentary and Critical Notes Designed to Help to a Better Understanding of the Sacred Writings*, Volume 4, Daniel 11:42.

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

sovereignty and independence much the same way Byzantium prevented invasions during the nearly thousand years it outlasted the fall of the West. Ignoring Adam Clarke, Were casually dismisses history that does not fit into his desired objective to vindicate James White as a means for establishing his own views.

3) "The prophecy also declares (Dan. 11:40): 'At the time of the end shall the king of the south *push* at him.' In support of the belief that Turkey is the king of the north, it is said that in 1798 'Egypt did "push," or make a comparatively feeble resistance' against France. When we permit the Bible to be its own expositor, we learn from the use Daniel has already made of the word 'push' that it is employed to describe a power that is vigorous and successful in its campaign."⁶³

We accept that Daniel 8:4 (Were mistakenly published Daniel 7:4 as the source verse in his next sentence) describes a "pushing" that is successful in its results. But, if we accept the Bible as its own expositor we don't rest upon one verse only to ascertain the meaning of a word as Were appears here to do. The word has more to do with initiating aggression. Note how Moses passed down legislation regarding the ox that gores, or pushes, to the point of injury or death.

"If an ox gore a man or a woman, that they die: then the ox shall be surely stoned, and his flesh shall not be eaten; but the owner of the ox shall be quit. But if the ox were wont to push with his horn in time past, and it hath been testified to his owner, and he hath not kept him in, but that he hath killed a man or a woman; the ox shall be stoned, and his owner also shall be put to death."⁶⁴

Ezekiel gives another example of aggression in this parable warning us against a harsh attitude toward those who are weaker than us:

Therefore thus saith the Lord God unto them; Behold, I, even I, will judge between the fat cattle and between the lean cattle. Because ye have thrust with side and with shoulder, and pushed all the diseased with your horns, till ye have scattered them abroad; Therefore will I save my flock, and they shall no more be a prey; and I will judge between cattle and cattle. And I will set up one shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David; he shall feed them, and he shall be their shepherd.⁶⁵

While many instances in the Bible give the impression that "pushing" results in victory, such is not always the case. When King Ahab sought support from King

⁶³ Were, *The King of the North at Jerusalem: God's People Delivered*, 19, emphasis supplied.

⁶⁴ KJV, Exodus 21:28, 29, emphasis added.

⁶⁵ KJV, Ezekiel 34:20-23, emphasis added.

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

Jehoshaphat we read about the false prophets who indicated success would result from initiating aggression. Instead, defeat followed, and Ahab was slain.

And Zedekiah the son of Chenaanah made him horns of iron: and he said, Thus saith the Lord, With these shalt thou push the Syrians, until thou have consumed them. And all the prophets prophesied so, saying, Go up to Ramothgilead, and prosper: for the Lord shall deliver it into the king's hand.⁶⁶

The simple fact of history is that Egypt initiated aggression against France that it could not sustain just like Ahab initiated warfare against the Syrians that ended with his death. Napoleon's battle tactics on land proved superior—despite the naval debacle on the Nile—and much of Egypt came under the temporary occupation of France.

4) “The belief that in 1798 Turkey was the ‘king of the north’ and Egypt the ‘king of the south’ seems very incongruous, because Egypt was then included in Turkish territory. Writing of Napoleon’s invasion of Egypt in 1798, H. G. Wells says: ‘Moreover, Egypt was a part of the Turkish Empire.’—Outline of History, Vol. II, page 584. Why should Turkey and territory governed by her vassal be regarded as two separate powers?”⁶⁷

An emphasis should be made here, since Were wrote “seems very incongruous” where no incongruity exists once one is well informed on the history of Egypt. The facts are that Arab Muslims first gained control of Egypt from the Byzantine Empire in the mid 7th century. Its loss to Eastern Rome’s ability to feed its population cannot be underestimated or overstated. Egypt was the bread basket of the Mediterranean world. Now it would feed a different military force. Eventually, Egypt and Syria would come under Mameluk domain.

The Mamelukes had controlled Egypt from about A. D. 1250 until the Turks invaded. It became a province of the Ottoman Empire in A. D. 1517. During the Ottoman dominance, Egyptian infrastructure deteriorated, leading to unsuccessful revolts. From 1687 to 1784 Egypt suffered through no less than seven famines—the last of which caused death to approximately one-sixth of the population.⁶⁸ A plague and

⁶⁶ KJV, I Kings 22:11, 12, emphasis added.

⁶⁷ Were, *The King of the North at Jerusalem: God's People Delivered*, 19, emphasis supplied.

⁶⁸ Donald Quataert, *The Ottoman Empire, 1700–1922* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 115. Also, Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, “[Icelandic Volcano Caused Historic Famine In Egypt, Study Shows](#)”, *Science Daily*, November 22, 2006.

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

famine weakened Egypt resulted in an economically and financially weakened Ottoman Empire. By the late 18th century the Mamelukes would resurge in political and military strength because the Ottomans refused to strengthen their military presence by conscripting Egyptians. Ibrahim Bey and Murad Bey became politically and militarily stronger, providing impetus for successful revolt against the Turks. While Egypt had been an Ottoman province, it was no longer under direct Ottoman control. French merchantmen had complained to the Directorate because of Mameluke interference and disruption of their trade. Napoleon's desire to repeat Alexander the Great's success combined with Egypt's aggressive "pushing" at French business interests would lead to the events fulfilling prophecy.

So why should Egypt be considered the king of the south from about 1790 to 1798? It was a province of the Ottoman Empire that had declared its independence. And though the Turks overran it in an effort to dislodge the French, the Ottoman Empire simply couldn't afford to maintain a large military presence to uphold its authority. So, they allowed Egypt to remain autonomous once the French were defeated in 1801 and after an additional four years of revolution havoc, on condition that it pay tribute. Muhammad Ali Pasha would fill the vacuum in 1805, eventually establishing a dynasty that would rule Egypt until the 1952 revolution led by Mohamed Naguib and Gamal Abdel Nasser Hussein.

The revolt that began in 1790 may be likened to the emergence of the beast rising from the earth in Revelation 13. Do we commence with the understanding that the United States of America fulfills prophecy at the time its government is fully secured, or at the time independence is declared? Can the same principle be consistently applied to Egypt in 1798? Cause for Were's incongruity is sufficiently evaporated by the course of events that culminate in Egypt waging a war against the Ottoman Empire so as to facilitate the fulfillment of prophecy on August 11, 1840.

5) "Another incongruity appears when applying the term 'king of the north' or 'king of the south' to the powers conquering the respective territories. By this principle, when France occupied Egypt it should have become 'the king of the south'—thus there would not be three powers to engage in the so-called 'triangular' war of 1798, in supposed fulfillment of Dan. 11:40!"⁶⁹

France certainly had a measure of success against the Mamelukes, but one cannot necessarily conclude that Napoleon had conquered Egypt. Temporary control, or occupation, does not a conquest make. The description made by Smith is accurate, especially in light of the fact that Napoleon had returned administrative power of Egypt to a new "Divan" (council) in Cairo that replaced the military commission before commencing his excursion to the Red Sea in search of the "Canal of the Pharaohs."

⁶⁹ Were, *The King of the North at Jerusalem: God's People Delivered*, 19.

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

The fact that a triangular interaction occurred in Daniel 11:40 is nothing new to the interpretation given as a whole. We can see more than just the king of the north and the king of the south as players in verses 13, and 14.

For the king of the north shall return, and shall set forth a multitude greater than the former, and shall certainly come after certain years with a great army and with much riches. And in those times there shall many stand up against the king of the south: also the robbers of thy people shall exalt themselves to establish the vision; but they shall fall.⁷⁰

The introduction of Rome into the interpretation begins a triangular interaction where Rome does not become the king of the south simply by Julius Caesar's occupation of Egypt. Neither should one try to force the title upon France for its occupation. However, once Rome gains complete control of the territories of both the north and the south, we do see Octavian identified as going to battle against the king of the south—Egypt, still ruled by Cleopatra, but with Antony as her Roman supervisor to guarantee the grain due to Rome as tribute—in Daniel 11:25 as the prophet records that part of the interpretation which establishes the beginning point of the 360 years Rome would be capitol until the ending point seen in the establishment of Constantinople. And while Rome's authority would embrace the territories held by both the king of the north and the king of the south, it would not be until the capitol was move to and established in Constantinople preparing the way for the fall of the Eastern Roman power at its appointed time by reason of the Ottoman Turks' victory that the designation of king of the north would again be employed in Daniel 11:40.

Later on, Were would object to the "triangular war" phrase because it didn't include Britain's role in the conflict. Simply put, Britain was an ally of the Ottoman Empire in this war. As an ally, Britain would become a part of the overwhelming of French troops that took place when the Ottoman Empire responded to the French threat.

6) "When interpreted militarily, the prophecy declares that the king of the north, subsequent to an attack from the king of the south, would 'enter also into the glorious land.' But Turkey had conquered Palestine in the 16th century and was still in possession of it in 1798. This further illustrates the utter misapplication of the prophecy to Turkey. Instead of Turkey establishing her government at Jerusalem she lost the whole of Palestine in the first World War."⁷¹

When Napoleon learned of the Ottoman mobilization of troops to recapture Egypt, he responded by invading Palestine. Acre, where he met his first defeat in three years, is located in the northern parts of Palestine. And so Turkey had to retake "the glorious land" before it could retake Egypt.

⁷⁰ KJV, Daniel 11:13, 14.

⁷¹ Were, *The King of the North at Jerusalem: God's People Delivered*, 22.

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

Were complicates his objection by bringing up the loss of Palestine at the close of World War I. But, he fails to connect to these events the command to hold back the winds of strife so that God's people may be sealed. Furthermore, the removal of the capitol from Constantinople/Istanbul to Ankara is not a failure to fulfill prophecy, but the precursor for when it is fulfilled. It demonstrated that the capitol can be moved in modern times. Keep in mind that Daniel 11:45 remains unfulfilled to this day—whether one believes Turkey to be the king of the north, or the papacy as such. One should also keep in mind that, at the time of this writing, nearly seventy years have passed since Louis Were wrote this book claiming that Smith is wrong, and James White is right. But in all the time that has transpired, the papacy has not fulfilled one particle of Daniel 11:40-45 since 1798—a period of 220 years. But, of Daniel 11:40-44, Turkey has fulfilled its role, and once the winds of strife are released, and the sixth plague is poured out—with the drying up of the waters of the Euphrates representing the peoples in the region of the Euphrates—Turkey will come to its end without help for the “crime” of establishing itself as a Caliphate at Jerusalem. But even this conclusion is based on generalities Smith employs when referring to the king of the north as “Turkey”—implying that the king of the north is a regional or national system rather than an individual that exploits the system. This individual could come to his end before the close of probation—at the moment Michael stands up for His people—, before the time of trouble that involves the seven last plagues.

7) “Daniel 11:41 declares that ‘Edom shall escape out of his hand.’ In fulfillment of prophecy (such as Obadiah 18, etc.), the Edomites as a separate people have not existed for over a thousand years—how, then, could a non-existent people escape out of the hands of Turkey? How the Edomites escape out of the hands of the Papacy will be shown later.”

The objection Were raises here simply doesn't make sense when one comprehends the simple mistake of mistaken identity. Were transfers identity to a people group who are genetically related to Esau instead of being true to the identity of a nation whose boundaries are well established in the mind of Daniel. When Daniel wrote, “Edom shall escape out of his hand,” he intended for the reader to understand that the invader would bypass a territory bounded and described as Edom, and not a people identified as Edomites who could exist where ever in the world they should chose to reside. Daniel is not predicting that a people group would escape by reason of discrimination based upon their genetic identity. He is referring to invaders who are so focused upon their singular objective that they pass by Edom as a territory unimportant to their mission.

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

8) "Today our Godly scholars revere the memory of Pastor James White for, after years of research and weighing all the evidence, the majority accept the truth maintained by him that the Papacy is indeed the king of the north."⁷²

It is fascinating that Louis Were would make such a statement of victory after all the negative statements used against Smith—given the simple fact that the only vindication of import must be that provided by fulfilled prophecy rather than the "vote," per se, of a majority of scholars. The irony of it all is that, while Were appears to vindicate White's position on the king of the north being the Papacy, he does nothing to vindicate or embrace White's statements regarding the "glorious mountain." Where are the majority of scholars promoting White's conclusion that the "glorious mountain" is the United States of America? We need to understand more on this issue in order to understand how it resolves any alleged erroneous conclusion by Smith.

James White wrote:

Palestine has had the curse of God resting upon it ever since the death of the Son of God. Whatever it may have been, it is not now at the time the prophecy speaks to us any such a country. If there is any portion of our world that God has forsaken more than another, it is that which drank up the blood of prophets, the Son of God, and his holy apostles.

But the western continent is now at the time of the fulfillment of the prophecy just such a land. Here, stretching between the Atlantic and the Pacific is a country which is the desire of all nations. Even the poor Chinaman with all his idolatry and filth flocks to our comparatively delightful land by thousands.⁷³

Ellen White supports the fact that the curse of God rests upon what we call "The Holy Land." She wrote:

Men and women may study the will of God with profit. Let young men and young women, while the dew of youth is upon them, begin to study the word of God, which expresses his will. The steps of Christ are certainly marked out in the word. Go where they can be found today. Do not seek to go back to the land where Christ's feet trod ages ago. Christ says: "He that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life." We can know far more of Christ by following him step by step in the work of redemption, seeking the lost and the perishing, than by journeying to old Jerusalem. Christ

⁷² Were, *The Truth Concerning Mrs. E. G. White, Uriah Smith, and The King of The North*, 34.

⁷³ White, "Unfulfilled Prophecy," *The Review and Herald*, November 29, 1877, Vol. 50, No. 22, Page 172

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

has taken his people into his church. He has swept away every ceremony of the ancient type. He has given no liberty to restore these rites, or to substitute anything that will recall the old literal sacrifices. The Lord requires of his people spiritual sacrifices alone. Everything pertaining to his worship is placed under the superintendence of his Holy Spirit. Jesus said that the Father would send the Holy Spirit in his name to teach his disciples all things, and to bring all things unto their remembrance that he had said unto them. The curse rests upon Jerusalem. The Lord has obliterated those things which men would worship in and about Jerusalem, yet many hold in reverence literal objects in Palestine, while they neglect to behold Jesus as their advocate in the heaven of heavens.⁷⁴

When the sin-cursed earth is purified from every stain of sin; when the Mount of Olives is rent asunder, and becomes an immense plain; when the holy city of God descends upon it,—the land that is now called the Holy Land will indeed become holy. But God's cause and work will not be advanced by making pilgrimages to Jerusalem. The curse of God is upon Jerusalem for the rejection and crucifixion of his only begotten Son. But God will cleanse away the vile blot.⁷⁵

We must see "the glorious mountain" as God sees it—a literal place, consecrated by the prayers, sweat, and blood of Jesus as He prayed many times in the Garden of Gethsemane, chosen for Christ's ascension, and for the final resting place of the New Jerusalem.

At length the little company reach the Mount of Olives. This place had been peculiarly hallowed by the presence of Jesus while he bore the nature of man. It was consecrated by his prayers and tears. When he had ridden into Jerusalem, just prior to his trial, the steeps of Olivet had echoed the joyous shouts of the triumphant multitude. On its sloping descent was Bethany, where he had often found repose at the house of Lazarus. At the foot of the mount was the garden of Gethsemane, where he had agonized alone, and moistened the sod with his blood.⁷⁶

As the place of His ascension, Jesus chose the spot so often hallowed by His presence while He dwelt among men. Not Mount Zion, the place of David's city, not Mount Moriah, the temple site, was to be thus honored. There Christ

⁷⁴ Ellen G. White, "Higher Education," *The Review and Herald*, February 25, 1896, emphasis added.

⁷⁵ Ellen G. White, "Lay Hold of the Hope," *The Review and Herald*, June 9, 1896, emphasis added.

⁷⁶ Ellen G. White, *The Spirit of Prophecy*, Volume 3 (Battle Creek, MI: Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association, 1878), 250, 251, emphasis added. Only one year after James wrote his statement on "the glorious mountain."

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

had been mocked and rejected. There the waves of mercy, still returning in a stronger tide of love, had been beaten back by hearts as hard as rock. Thence Jesus, weary and heart-burdened, had gone forth to find rest in the Mount of Olives. The holy Shekinah, in departing from the first temple, had stood upon the eastern mountain, as if loath to forsake the chosen city; so Christ stood upon Olivet, with yearning heart overlooking Jerusalem. The groves and glens of the mountain had been consecrated by His prayers and tears. Its steep had echoed the triumphant shouts of the multitude that proclaimed Him king. On its sloping descent He had found a home with Lazarus at Bethany. In the garden of Gethsemane at its foot He had prayed and agonized alone. From this mountain He was to ascend to heaven. Upon its summit His feet will rest when He shall come again. Not as a man of sorrows, but as a glorious and triumphant king He will stand upon Olivet, while Hebrew hallelujahs mingle with Gentile hosannas, and the voices of the redeemed as a mighty host shall swell the acclamation, Crown Him Lord of all!⁷⁷

According to Louis Were, Futurists are interested in focusing on a literal fulfillment of prophecy according to their rules of interpretation as a means to throw off the minds of souls from the truth about the Papacy's identity as the antichrist. He calls Smith a Futurist for this reason. But Uriah Smith and others see the literal fulfillment of Palestine as "the glorious mountain" because the Spirit of Prophecy and Scriptures indicate the holiness of Christ's consecrated prayers, tears, and blood on the Mount of Olives make it so.

9) "The Futuristic system is based upon the denial of this plain, New Testament teaching. *The belief that Turkey comes to his end at Jerusalem* (Dan. 11:46 [sic]), *with the whole of the interpretation regarding a war between nations in Palestine as 'Armageddon,' is part of the Futuristic system* and is a contradiction of the principles upon which our message is established. Futurists still build their doctrines upon a belief in a literal, Palestinian fulfillment of the prophecies pertaining to Israel."⁷⁸

The "plain, New Testament teaching" to which Were refers is one of those principles of interpretation he contrived, and then shored up with quotes from the Spirit of Prophecy to give it the scent of authenticity.

Principle 3: The things of Israel now belong to the church... that the promises to literal Israel were to be fulfilled in the experiences of the church... "I was also shown that those who are trying to obey God . . . are God's chosen

⁷⁷ Ellen G. White, *The Desire of Ages* (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1898), 829, 830, emphasis added.

⁷⁸ Were, *The King of the North at Jerusalem: God's People Delivered*, 51, emphasis in italics supplied. Emphasis underlined is added. Also, "Dan. 11:46" is attributed to a typing error, since it is hard to believe that Louis Were really thought there is a verse 46.

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

people, *His modern Israel*" (2T.108,9). The principle that Israel's history is typical or prophetic of the experiences of the church is continually employed in the Spirit of Prophecy.... While Old Testament language is employed in the New Testament when referring to the church, the same phraseology is *spiritualized* and applied in a *world-wide* sense. These terms are not prefaced with the word "*spiritual*" because other plain statements clearly state that the church has taken the place of literal Israel.... However, so often when speaking of last-day events, expositors have failed to apply the New Testament principle. Because of the "Israel" imagery so abundantly used in the Revelation, futurists say that it is a book largely pertaining to the literal Jew in Palestine.... The prophecies of the Apocalypse can be understood only when interpreted in relation to the church.⁷⁹

Essentially, this principle gives permission to the reader to spiritualize any part of Daniel 11 that refers to events from the time of the crucifixion of Christ moving on forward. Those who don't use this principle of hermeneutics are then labeled as "Futurists" under the influence of a "Jesuit-fostered system of interpretation."

Unless wholly under the leadership of the Holy Spirit, we will all misinterpret the Bible; and at times, as we have shown, Uriah Smith walked contrary to the light given through Spirit of Prophecy. His 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".⁸⁰

What Were is attempting to do is make Smith *appear* to be a Futurist. If he can make the allegation stick, then the effect is that Smith must have fallen under the influence of the "Jesuit-fostered system of interpretation" that would result in one becoming either a preterist (where all prophecies were fulfilled in the past by reckoning literal time, and not a year for a day) or a futurist because both originated with Jesuit priests attempting to vindicate the Pope while misdirecting Protestant charges of the Pope being the Antichrist.

But, to make Smith a Futurist, Were has to first redefine futurism because the genuine Futurist doesn't believe in the Sanctuary doctrine or that the time prophecies of Daniel are all confined within the 2300 day/year period. The genuine

⁷⁹ Were, *Bible Principles of Interpretation—Establish Truth and Safeguard Against Last-Day Errors*, 11-14, emphasis in italics supplied. Emphasis underlined is added.

⁸⁰ Louis F. Were, *Mrs. E. G. White, Uriah Smith, and The King of The North*, 23, emphasis in italics supplied. Emphasis underlined is added. [CHAPTER SIX: MRS. E. G. WHITE WROTE A NUMBER OF TESTIMONIES CONCERNING URIAH SMITH.] (An abridged PDF copy of this booklet places the page number at 10. <https://drive.google.com/file/d/11szMo6kqO9W1h1gGobjm2cbb2ysBmqLM/view>.)

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

Futurist cuts off the seven years at the end of the 490 day/year period and places it at the very end of time (not to be confused with the "time of the end" which is the end of time prophecies found in Daniel) which they then designate as the time of tribulation which God's people escape by the secret rapture, but those who are not raptured get a second probation. However, if Were succeeds in making Uriah Smith a futurist then there are entangling, unintended consequences.

Consistently applying Were's reasons for why Smith is a Futurist—and consequently under the influence of the Jesuits—we would have to conclude that Adam Clarke was under Jesuit influence for suggesting that Turkey would literally be furious over news from Russia and Persia since he predicted a future event in 1825 which was fulfilled in 1853—twenty-one years after his death in 1832. Also, we would have to conclude that Josiah Litch was under Jesuit influence for predicting that Ottoman power was virtually ended on August 11, 1840 because he also taught that Turkey was the king of the north. And since Litch also developed the idea of a pre-advent judgment, which is the basis for Seventh-day Adventists understanding of the investigative judgment, one might be tempted to think that such a concept must also be as much influenced by Jesuits as was Litch's "futurism". Furthermore, William Miller, whose preaching led Litch to publish on these matters, must also have been influenced by the Jesuit system of interpretation.

The only way that we can begin to navigate through this minefield of accusation is to look at what Louis Were wrote when he first published a series of articles exposing the errors of the Futurists.⁸¹ He was sincerely concerned for souls who might be deceived by such a devious interpretation that worked toward a removal of anything that made the Papacy out to be the Antichrist. So he began his series of articles with an explanation as to why Futurism was invented, then continued by quoting a series of authors who denounced the genuine article.

Satan, however, anticipating the fulfillment of these prophecies, devises false interpretations of them, referring their fulfillment to the future, and thus blinds eyes to the messages which God is sending at that particular time. Once people are persuaded that these things are future, and hence do not directly concern them they are indifferent to the stirring messages due for their time....

The Rev. Joseph Tanner, B.A., in his book "Daniel and the Revelation," pages 16, 17, says: "So great a hold did the conviction that the Papacy was the antichrist gain upon the minds of men, that Rome at last saw she must bestir herself, and try, by putting forth other systems of interpretations, to counteract the identification of the Papacy with antichrist.

⁸¹ We don't have time or space for all the articles in detail. They can be downloaded in PDF from the General Conference Archive website using the "Magazines and Journals" in the menu. <http://documents.adventistarchives.org/default.aspx>

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

"Accordingly, towards the close of the century of the Reformation, two of the most learned doctors set themselves to the task, each endeavouring by different means to accomplish the same end, namely, that of diverting men's minds from perceiving the fulfillment of the prophecies of the antichrist in the papal system. The Jesuit Alcasar devoted himself to bringing into prominence the preterist method of interpretation, . . . and thus endeavoured to show that he prophecies of antichrist were fulfilled before popes ever ruled at Rome, and therefore could not apply to the Papacy. On the other hand, the Jesuit Ribera tried to set aside the application of these prophecies to the papal power by bringing out the futurist system, which asserts that these prophecies refer properly, not to the career of the Papacy but to that of some future supernatural individual, who is yet to appear, and to continue in power for three and half years. Thus, as Alford says the Jesuit Ribera, about A.D. 1580, may be regarded as the founder of the futurist system in modern times.

"It is a matter for deep regret that those who hold and advocate the futurist system at the present day, Protestants as they are for the most part, are thus playing into the hands of Rome, and helping to screen the Papacy from detection as the antichrist...."⁸²

I have selected three brief extracts from the commentaries of recognised conservative denominations to illustrate how all Protestant churches once held this belief as a *fundamental of Protestantism*. Dr. Adam Clarke (Methodist), in his notes on Dan. 7: 25, "He shall speak great words against the Most High," says: "To none can this apply so well and so fully as to the pope of Rome."⁸³ [Here Were makes Clarke a scholar untainted by the Jesuit system of interpretation. But we have already noted how he unintentionally paints Clarke as such.]

Dr. H. Grattan Guinness in his "Romanism and the Reformation," pages 250-260, has irrefutably shown that futurism came from Rome to oppose the inspired declarations of the Reformers that the Papacy was the antichrist. Space will permit of but a few extracts from this masterly work. He writes of the Reformation: "From the first, and throughout, that movement was energised and guided by the prophetic Word. Luther never felt strong and free to war against the papal apostasy till he recognised the pope as

⁸² Louis F. Were, "Futurism and the Anti-Christ of Scripture: A Solemn Warning and an Earned Appeal to Prophetic Students," *Signs of the Times Australia*, Vol. 46, No. 23, Warburton, Victoria, June 8, 1931, 9.

⁸³ Louis F. Were, "Futurism and the Anti-Christ of Scripture: Unanimity of Early Protestantism," *Signs of the Times Australia*, Vol. 46, No. 24, Warburton, Victoria, June 15, 1931, 10, emphasis supplied.

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

antichrist. It was then he burned the papal Bull. Knox's first sermon, the sermon which launched him on his mission as a Reformer, was on the prophecies concerning the Papacy. The Reformers embodied their interpretations of prophecy in their confessions of faith, and Calvin in his 'Institutes.' ...

"To resist the use to which Scripture prophecy was put by the Reformers is no light or unimportant matter. The system of prophetic interpretation, known as *futurism*, *does resist this use*. It condemns the interpretations of the Reformers. It condemns the views of all these men, and of all the martyrs, and of all the confessors and faithful witnesses of Christ for long centuries....

"And *whose interpretation of prophecy does it justify and approve? That of the Romanists*. Let this be clearly seen. Rome felt the force of these prophecies, and sought to evade it. It had no way but to deny their applicability. It could not deny their existence in Scripture. They were there plainly enough. But it denied that these prophecies referred to the Roman Church and its head. It pushed them aside. It shifted them from the entire field of mediaeval and modern history. As to Babylon the Great, it asserted that it meant Rome pagan, not Rome papal. Rome pagan shed all the blood referred to in Revelation 17 and 18. Rome Christian had shed none of it. Prophecy was eloquent about the deeds of the Caesars, but silent as to those of the popes; and this though the persecution perpetrated by the popes far exceeded those of the Caesars. Prophecy expended its strength in warning the church of the perils from heathenism, which it perfectly understood, and was speechless as to the far greater perils arising from the Christian apostasy on which it needed the fullest warning and instruction. It was eagle-eyed as to the dangers without, but blind to the dangers from within. It guarded and guided the church of the three first centuries, but *left the church of the next thousand years and more without a lamp to light its footsteps....*

"Is this the position you adopt? Is this the conclusion you defend? Are these the views you advocate? You, a Protestant, and this, *after all that has been written upon the subject*, and all the blaze of light which history and experience have poured upon it? If it is, *look to it that you be not found fighting against the truth*, warring against the Word of God, resisting the testimony of the prophetic spirit, hindering the work of the Reformation, promoting the progress of the apostasy, opposing Christ, and helping antichrist."⁸⁴

It is true that some of the primitive Fathers of the Catholic Church agree in several points with the futuristic scheme, including a future personal antichrist; but, as is well known to Bible students who have made a thorough

⁸⁴ Ibid., 10, 14, 15, emphasis supplied.

investigation of the use of prophecy, the fulfillment of a prophecy is only known in detail when it becomes history. Those living in the days when spiritual darkness was creeping over the earth could only speculate as to the meaning of the prophecies regarding the antichrist and of things then future. But when a prophecy is fulfilled or is fulfilling, then God awakens the minds of men to study that particular prophecy and to observe its fulfillment in current history....

Jesus' reply shows how much He based His work on the fulfillment of the prophecies regarding Himself. The answer (in effect) came back: "I am fulfilling the prophecies outlined for the Messiah." But John, who had imbibed much of the erroneous theories of the "orthodoxy" of the time, had read into the prophecies what was not there regarding the coming One, as all do who prematurely detail futurity by prophecy. Christ told the messengers to return and show John "again," that the fulfillment of prophecy was His badge of authority, and he urged the friends of John to tell John what He was doing, and to ask John to see how these things actually did fulfill every specification of the Messiah's work.

All the movements of Scripture were started *by an appeal to the pronouncements of the prophets.* It is surprising, to those who have not previously studied the Scriptures closely, to observe how the preachers mentioned in the Bible drew the attention of their hearers to the fact that certain prophecies were meeting fulfillment in their day, and that God, who alone could foretell the future, was now speaking to them in these fulfillments. So, in harmony with this principle, the Reformers pointed to the unfolding history of the Papacy as the positively clear fulfillment of prophecy.⁸⁵

[Quoting from Dr. H. G. Guinness, "*The Approaching End of the Age,*"] "A moment's reflection will show that in the past, while the beginnings of the ages and dispensations had general promises and predictions only, *chronological prophecy was always permitted to throw its solemnly helpful guiding light on the close.* The first prediction of this character ever given was that of the 120 years to elapse prior to the Flood, that great *close* of the antediluvian age. The second—the 400 years to the Exodus, marked the *close* of the entire patriarchal dispensation; the third—the 65 years to elapse before Ephraim's overthrow, led up to the *close* of the kingdom of the Ten Tribes; and the fourth — the 70 years' captivity of Judah, marked out by its commencement the *close* of Jewish monarchy, and by its termination, the

⁸⁵ Louis F. Were, "Futurism and the Anti-Christ of Scripture: Clouding the Real Issue," *Signs of the Times Australia*, Vol. 46, No. 25, Warburton, Victoria, June 22, 1931, 9, 10, italicized emphasis supplied. Underlined emphasis added.

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

close of the Babylonian empire; the fifth—the 490 years to Messiah the Prince, led up to the *close* of the Jewish dispensation. . . .

“God graciously provided the help of chronologic prophecy to sustain to the end the faith and hope of His people. They who in this day despise that aid, or make it void by a fanciful, unhistoric, futurist interpretation, cast aside an invaluable weapon for the special conflict of these closing days.”—*lb.*, pages 354, 355.⁸⁶

Just with the evidences provided by these articles, does Smith really fit the description of a Futurist who helps screen the “Papacy from detection as the antichrist”? Are Smith’s statements in any way “unhistoric, futurist interpretation”? Louis Were has taken up the same reasoning as James White to make it appear that if one accepts Turkey as the king of the north, then one must be guilty of making Turkey the legs of iron, Turkey the beast with ten horns coming out of the sea, Turkey the little horn, etc., etc., which in our minds should already be established as absurd. Were had quoted Rev. E. Nangle to show that “the supposition that the words ‘man of sin’ designate an official succession, or class, is *not* an unwarranted assumption.”⁸⁷ In other words, the antichrist could be a class or system, of which the Papal system is first among peers—but would not exclude any other that behaves with the same *modus operandi* such as changing God’s law, or persecuting God’s people—as Islam certainly has done.

We should already be in agreement that the interpretations, given for those visions in their respective chapters, uphold the identities of the players (whether individual or corporate in nature) introduced at those times. The little horn that uproots three is none other than the Papal power. It can be no other. But the king of the north is a descriptive, a title, that is applied consistently by Smith through out his interpretation as literal throughout. The literal interpretation cannot arrive at the conclusion that the king of the north is the Papacy. In order to arrive at that conclusion Were that must contrive a hermeneutical system that allows him to interpret prophecy in a figurative, spiritualized, mystical method. Were accuses Smith of being a Futurist. But he has acted more like a Futurist than Smith, since he contrived a system that Ellen White did not bring together. We already read how Ellen White had recommended the rules that William Miller used. Note what Were wrote in in the last of his 1931 series of articles on Futurism: “And so futurism finds

⁸⁶ Louis F. Were, “Futurism and the Anti-Christ of Scripture: Blunting the Edge of Practical Truth,” *Signs of the Times Australia*, Vol. 46, No. 26, Warburton, Victoria, June 29, 1931, 9, italicized emphasis supplied. Underlined emphasis added.

⁸⁷ Louis F. Were, “Futurism and the Anti-Christ of Scripture: Fanciful and Unwarranted Interpretations,” *Signs of the Times Australia*, Vol. 46, No. 28, Warburton, Victoria, July 13, 1931, 9, emphasis supplied.

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

it necessary to introduce unheard-of things—special rules of interpretations to establish its claims.”⁸⁸

Even though we have a point of contention regarding hermeneutics, the greatest point of contention is whether or not to apply identifications already established in, and connected to, a different vision by the interpretation supplied in the given chapter of Daniel. Is it proper to force an identified character from one vision given in Daniel 2, or Daniel 7 onto characters presented in Daniel 11 that may or may not have a different delineation of events, and which may or may not introduce a different player that also demonstrates similar characteristics of the Papacy, but has different qualifications and restraints that are not fully revealed to Daniel, and yet are more fully revealed to John in the Revelation as they relate to the three woes? After all, Islam has persecuted God's professed people. Islam has also changed the Sabbath from the seventh day to the sixth. And, if one were familiar with the origins of Islam, one would know that this religion started out as a possible Christian reform movement in response to errors already adopted by apostate Christians, but it was also perceived at that time to be yet another Christian heresy.

The Christian world into which Islam so unexpectedly burst in the seventh century C.E. had undergone a succession of divisions, controversies, and power struggles such that east and west were at serious odds, and each contained within its regions deep tensions and disagreements. It is little wonder that the new religion of Islam, arising out of the heart of Arabia, appeared to those who knew of its existence as another Christian heresy, not unlike the many other heresies that had wrinkled the face of Christendom since its inception. The fact that within a century of the death of the Prophet Muhammad in 632 Islam had spread across much of the known world was for many Christians inexplicable, frightening, and theologically incomprehensible.⁸⁹

To put forward the idea that the Ottoman Empire was the king of the north was not original with Smith. Nor is it consistent with the teachings of genuine Futurists. Smith does not come up with a fanciful and unwarranted hermeneutic that ignores historical events by reason of its figurative and spiritualistic application. It is Were that must contrive a system of interpretation that appears plausible at first glance. But, if it can be proven that Were makes “none effect the counsel of God by [his] tradition,”⁹⁰ by causing Ellen White to “deny her own teachings,”⁹¹ while giving the

⁸⁸ Louis F. Were, “Futurism and the Anti-Christ of Scripture: Futurism Introduces Unheard-of Rules,” *Signs of the Times Australia*, Vol. 46, No. 29, Warburton, Victoria, July 20, 1931, 12.

⁸⁹ Jane I. Smith, “Islam and Christendom,” *The Oxford History of Islam*, John Esposito, ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Printing Press, 2000), 305.

⁹⁰ Ellen G. White, Manuscript 16, 1889.

⁹¹ Ellen G. White, *Elder Daniels and the Fresno Church* (1890), 6.

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

appearance of supporting her writings as Elder Daniels once did while pastoring in Fresno, California, would Were not be giving false witness himself? The plea that Ellen White made to the church is that her writings and Scripture would not be abused so as to confuse people regarding the truth.

For Christ's sake do not confuse the minds of the people with human sophistry and skepticism, and make of none effect the work that the Lord would do. Do not, by your lack of spiritual discernment, make of this agency of God a rock of offense whereby many shall be caused to stumble and fall, "and be snared, and be taken."⁹²

Louis Were started out right in his Bible and missionary work, he was a faithful ordained minister who, in a moment of concern for woman he had been apparently dating before he met and married his second wife, was excessively and wrongly treated by certain church leaders who removed him from pastoral work without first working redemptively to correct a perceived wrong. We do not fully know their knowledge or motives for dealing with their brother in Christ in what appears to be a vindictive, unredemptive manner where no allowance for correction and growth in the grace of God was permitted. It is easy to understand then how Were would attempt to vindicate James White's position on the Papacy being the king of the north. Sometimes, when having been through a bitter experience, bitterness can exist in the heart—unrecognized, or repressed. This may have led Were to be overly harsh in his own criticisms of Uriah Smith's shortcomings and mistakes, and so condemning of those who he deemed could not have a right understanding of righteousness by faith so long as they held to Smith's position on the king of the north. Yet we will soon see that Ellen White strongly recommended that Daniel and the Revelation be sold as though it were a new book, that the author was led of God, and that our students should read it for the knowledge God intended them to have. But first we need to address where Louis Were went wrong so we might avoid the same pitfalls.

When Ellen White was alive, she wrote about how we ought to deal with those in whom we see grievous defects and errors. Let us spend some time reading her counsel, apply it to what we have read so far in this critique, and resolve to live by it from now and until eternity.

The reputation of a fellow-laborer is to be sacredly guarded. If one sees faults in another, he is not to magnify them before others, and make them grievous sins. They may be errors of judgment, that God will give divine grace to overcome. If he had seen that angels, who are perfect, would have done the work for the fallen race better than men, he would have committed it to them. But instead of this he sent the needed assistance by poor, weak, erring

⁹² Ellen G. White, *Testimonies for the Church*, Volume 5 (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1889), 691.

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

mortals, who, having like infirmities as their fellow-men, are best prepared to help them.⁹³

Ellen White wrote of her own attitude towards those who had sinned against her husband before he died, teaching us how we are to deal with each other in relationship to those who are living and dead.

The last time that I had spoken there was on the Sabbath following my husband's funeral. At that time many considered it almost presumptuous for me, in my feeble condition, to make the effort; but my great desire to speak words of entreaty and warning to the church, led me to venture. Had those words been heeded, the difficulties which have since occurred would not have been. The burden of my message was an admonition to the church to be pitiful, courteous, kind, and compassionate, to love one another as Christ had loved them. I urged them to put away their unkind thoughts toward their brethren, to cease talking of the faults and errors of others, and to search carefully their own hearts, correct their own defects of character, and purify their own souls by obedience to the truth. I entreated all to cherish a forgiving, Christlike tenderness for one another, and to guard the reputation of their brethren, remembering that the tongue is an unruly member, which, if not sanctified, if not restrained, may do great injury to those whom God loves and whom he is using to do his work.

Whatever may have been our course toward the dead, they are beyond the knowledge of our sorrow or repentance. Our regret for wrongs done to them can be evinced only by a reformation in our spirit and action toward the living. Let none repeat the errors of the past. The spirit of Christ will lead us to think kindly of our brethren. It is the work of Satan to seek some stain upon the character of Christ's followers, to talk of their faults, and magnify their errors. Satan is an accuser of the brethren, and all who engage in this work show that they are actuated by the same spirit. All our prayers will be in vain while we cherish feelings of envy, jealousy, suspicion, and enmity. We shall be forgiven only as we forgive. It is no better than mocking God to engage in religious worship with hearts thinking evil, and full of bitterness toward our brethren or our fellow-men.⁹⁴

She had this counsel written to Elder W. H. Littlejohn for writing of the errors of apostles, reformers, and those involved in the pioneering of the Sabbath keeping, second advent movement, and how such articles and books would effect the work God desires us to do.

⁹³ Ellen G. White, *Historical Sketches of the Foreign Missions of the Seventh-day Adventists* (Basle: Imprimerie Polyglotte, 1886), 120.

⁹⁴ Ellen G. White, "November 6, 1883—Notes of Travel," *The Review and Herald*, November 6, 1883, emphasis added.

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

My respected brother, the Lord bids me to tell you that you have erred in wisdom in presenting in our church paper the articles which you have written on "The Danger of Taking Extreme Views" [The Review and Herald, April 3, 10, 1894]. You have not had discernment, or you would not have expressed the sentiment that you have, or presented the subject matter of your articles in the light in which you have presented it. Our enemies will regard the examples which you have given as extreme, and the sentiments which you have expressed as rich morsels to feed upon, as weapons to destroy faith in the work which God is doing through His agents at this time. Let none of our brethren imagine that they are doing God's service in presenting the deficiencies of men who have done good, grand, acceptable work, in laboring to unfold the message of mercy to fallen men, for the salvation of perishing souls. Suppose that these brethren have weak traits of character which they have inherited from their deficient ancestors, shall these deficiencies be hunted up and made prominent?

Shall men whom God has chosen to carry out the reformation against the papacy and idolatry be represented in an objectionable light? The banner of the ruler of the synagogue of Satan was lifted high, and error apparently marched in triumph, and the reformers through the grace given them of God, waged a successful warfare against the host of darkness. Events in the history of the reformers have been presented before me. I know that the Lord Jesus and His angels have with intense interest watched the battle against the power of Satan, who combined his hosts with evil men for the purpose of extinguishing the divine light, the fire of God's kingdom. They suffered for Christ's sake scorn, derision, and the hatred of men who knew not God. They were maligned and persecuted even unto death, because they would not renounce their faith. If anyone presumes to take these men in hand, to lay before the world their errors and mistakes, let him remember that he is dealing with Christ in the person of His saints.

Elder Littlejohn, you have undertaken to point out the defects of reformers and pioneers in the cause of God. No one should trace the lines which you have done. You have made public the errors and defects of the people of God, and in so doing you have dishonored God and Jesus Christ. I would not for my right arm have given to the world that which you have written. You have not been conscious of what would be the influence of your work.

Our enemies cannot controvert the truth, and therefore they are eager to catch at anything they can get, by which, through their falsehoods and their perversions, they can make of no effect the truth of God in those foreign fields where the people are unacquainted with Seventh-day Adventists. You have given them a chapter wherein it will be easy for them to find that which they can magnify and distort in such a way as to create mountains out of molehills. The Lord did not call upon you to present these things to the public

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

as a correct history of our people. Your work will make it necessary for us to put forth labor to show why these brethren took the extreme position that they did, and call up the circumstances that vindicate those upon whom your articles have laid suspicion and reproach.

You were not in the early experience of the people of whom you have written, and who have been laid to rest from their labors. You have given but a partial view, for you have not presented the fact that the power of God worked in connection with their labors even though they made some mistakes. You have made prominent before the world the errors of the brethren but have not represented the fact that God worked to correct those errors and to set the objectionable matters right. Opposers will be glad to multiply the matter which has been furnished to their hand by our people. You have arrayed the errors of the early apostles, the errors of those who were precious in the eyes of the Lord in the days of Christ.

In presenting the extreme positions that have been taken by the messengers of God, do you think that confidence will be inspired in the work of God for this time? Let God by inspiration trace the errors of His people for their instruction and admonition, but let not finite lips or pens dwell upon those features of the experience of God's people that will have a tendency to confuse and cloud the mind. Let no one call attention to the errors of those whose general work has been accepted of God. The articles you have presented are not of a character to leave a true and fair impression upon the minds of those who read them concerning our work and our workers. What need was there for you to give sanction to the statements of the haters of truth, and to justify them in their representations of the errors of God's people? Could you see the harm that these articles may do, you would, I should hope, have sincere repentance before God.⁹⁵

Can it be said that Louis Were followed this counsel? When we as a people scatter instead of gathering where Christ has gathered, it may well be said of us that we are insubordinate. It is not because Smith was wrong in his interpretation that the second coming of Christ was delayed. Ellen White wrote that the prophecies of Daniel chapter eleven had nearly reached their fulfillment. She describes the response of the wicked to God's merciful grace. She writes of how we are to work for the good of the unrepentant.

As in the days that were before the Flood, the impenitent see no cause for alarm. They eat, they drink, they marry and are given in marriage. The event has been long foretold, but time has passed on, and many distinctly say, "My

⁹⁵ Ellen G. White, *Manuscript Releases*, Volume Thirteen (Silver Spring, MD: Ellen G. White Estate, 1990), 271-273. (Written June 3, 1894, from Granville, N. S. W., Australia, to W. H. Littlejohn, Battle Creek, Michigan.)

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

Lord delayeth His coming." It is because the work has not been done for the wicked that time delays.

God's long forbearance is wonderful. The Master is treated with disrespect, He receives but little thanksgiving for His bestowment of blessings. The world is mad. They do not consider that His long forbearance toward the wicked is a part of His great plan, that judgments will surely come. But the long-suffering God will do His work. He will discriminate with justice and accuracy.⁹⁶

Let not human pride hurt your record. Do not you suppose the Lord sees and is acquainted with the favorable and unfavorable presentations? Has not the Lord an oversight over His own work? You may suppose, my brethren, that you have to do all the devising, all the strengthening, and all the organizing, and I ask you, Is it not best to show that you have confidence in God? Is it not best to consider that our God is manager—that He is director? You must not be anxious to develop too fast. The hand of providence is holding the machinery. When that hand starts the wheel then all things will begin to move.

How can finite man carry the burdens of responsibility for this time? His people have been far behind. Human agencies under the divine planning may recover something of what is lost because the people who had great light did not have corresponding piety, sanctification, and zeal in working out God's specified plans. They have lost to their own disadvantage what they might have gained to the advancement of the truth if they had carried out the plans and will of God. Man cannot possibly stretch over that gulf that has been made by the workers who have not been following the divine Leader.

We may have to remain here in this world because of insubordination many more years, as did the children of Israel, but for Christ's sake, His people should not add sin to sin by charging God with the consequence of their own wrong course of action. Now, have men who claim to believe the Word of God learned their lesson that obedience is better than sacrifice? "He hath showed thee (this rebellious people), O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" (Micah 6:8).

Now the Lord will not be pleased with those men whom He hath appointed to do a certain work, to take on many lines of work and carry them until they become so wearisome that it breaks their strength. You, nor any other

⁹⁶ Ellen G. White, *Manuscript Releases*, Volume Ten (Silver Spring, MD: Ellen G. White Estate, 1990), 275, 276, emphasis added. (Manuscript 151, 1898, 6. –Notes of the Queensland Camp Meeting, copied November 2, 1898.)

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

agency, cannot heal the hurt that has come to God's people by neglect to lift up His standard and occupy new territory. The churches should now be acting in their strength, with capabilities, talents, and means, carrying the work, reaching higher and broader in capacity to stand before the world in the power of invincible truth.

But if all now would only see and confess and repent of their own course of action in departing from the truth of God, and following human devising, then the Lord would pardon. Warnings have been coming, but they have been unheeded. But a few who may now seek to bridge the gulf that stands so offensively before God must make haste slowly, else the standard bearers will fail, and who will take their place?⁹⁷

Soon grievous troubles will arise among the nations.—trouble that will not cease until Jesus comes. As never before, we need to press together, serving him who has prepared his throne in the heavens, and whose kingdom ruleth over all. God has not forsaken his people, and our strength lies in not forsaking him.

The judgments of God are in the land. The wars and rumors of wars, the destruction by fire and flood, say clearly that the time of trouble, which is to increase until the end, is very near at hand. We have no time to lose. The world is stirred with the spirit of war. The prophecies of the eleventh of Daniel have almost reached their final fulfilment.⁹⁸

But who reads the warnings given by the fast-fulfilling signs of the times? What impression is made upon worldlings? What change is seen in their attitude? No more than was seen in the attitude of the inhabitants of the Noachian world. Absorbed in worldly business and pleasure, the antediluvians "knew not until the Flood came, and took them all away." Matthew 24:39. They had heaven-sent warnings, but they refused to listen. And today the world, utterly regardless of the warning voice of God, is hurrying on to eternal ruin.⁹⁹

So why have we been wandering around in the wilderness all these years, or held in captivity as was Daniel? It is because of the unbelief and indolence of God's people. Yet God is in control. He will accomplish His purpose, and for His glory alone.

⁹⁷ White, *Ibid.*, 277, 278, emphasis added. (To Prof. P. T. Magan during the early months of his endeavor to establish the college at Berrien Springs, Mich. Written at South Lancaster, Mass., December 7, 1901.)

⁹⁸ Ellen G. White, "The Day of the Lord Is Near, and Hasteth Greatly," *The Review and Herald*, November 24, 1904, Article B, emphasis added.

⁹⁹ Ellen G. White, *Testimonies for the Church*, Vol. 9 (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1909), 14.

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

The Lord has allowed matters in our day to come to a crisis, in the exaltation of error above truth, that He, the God of Israel, might work mightily for the greater elevation of His truth in proportion as error is exalted.¹⁰⁰

What should we do to rectify our wanderings, and come out of captivity? Would it not benefit us to return to the counsel of the Spirit of Prophecy and hold fast to the truth? What is it that Ellen White counseled us to do regarding the prophecies of Daniel and Revelation?

God desires the light found in the books of Daniel and Revelation to be presented in clear lines. It is painful to think of the many cheap theories picked up and presented to the people by ignorant, unprepared teachers. Those who present their human tests and the nonsensical ideas they have concocted in their own minds, show the character of the goods in their treasure house. They have laid in store shoddy material. Their great desire is to make a sensation.

The truth for this time has been brought out in many books. Let those who have been dealing in cheap sentiments and foolish tests, cease this work and study *Daniel and the Revelation*. They will then have something to talk about that will help the mind. As they receive the knowledge contained in this book, they will have in the treasure house of the mind a store from which they can continually draw as they communicate to others the great, essential truths of God's Word.

The interest in *Daniel and the Revelation* is to continue as long as probationary time shall last. God used the author of this book as a channel through which to communicate light to direct minds to the truth. Shall we not appreciate this light, which points us to the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, our King?...

Young men, take up the work of canvassing for *Daniel and the Revelation*. Do all you possibly can to sell this book. Enter upon the work with as much earnestness as if it were a new book. And remember that as you canvass for it, you are to become familiar with the truths it contains. As you ponder these truths, you will receive ideas that will enable you not only to receive light, but to let light shine forth to others in clear, bright rays.

Now is come the time of the revelation of the grace of God. Now is the gospel of Jesus Christ to be proclaimed. Satan will seek to divert the minds of those who should be established, strengthened, and settled in the truths of the first, second, and third angels' messages. The students in our schools should

¹⁰⁰ Ellen G. White, *Selected Messages*, Book 2 (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1958), 371.

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

carefully study *Daniel and the Revelation*, so that they shall not be left in darkness, and the day of Christ overtake them as a thief in the night. I speak of this book because it is a means of educating those who need to understand the truth of the Word. This book should be highly appreciated. It covers much of the ground we have been over in our experience. If the youth will study this book and learn for themselves what is truth, they will be saved from many perils.¹⁰¹

When Louis Were wrote his articles on Futurism in 1931, the editors of the Signs of the Times Australia placed this advertisement in connection with the sixth article:

NOTE.—The book "Daniel and the Revelation" by Pastor Uriah Smith, and "Our Day in the Light of Prophecy" by Pastor W. A. Spicer, are without rivals in dealing with prophecies fulfilled and fulfilling. A smaller work, "The Papacy in Prophecy," by J. A. Stevens, will show how wonderfully the Papacy has fulfilled or is fulfilling all the specifications of antichrist. These may all be obtained from the publishers of this journal.¹⁰²

Perhaps it is time that *Daniel and the Revelation* was once again considered to be "without rivals" by our church leadership and scholars, given the ringing endorsement of Ellen White and our church leaders prior to 1944. Perhaps it is time that the 1944 edition be set aside, and the book be restored with all the information pertaining the Ottoman Empire and even include those current events that point to fulfillment in the near future.

In conclusion, we have discovered a potential reason for Louis Were's attempt to vindicate James White's position on the king of the north, and his harshness in dealing with Uriah Smith's position. Injustice plants the seeds of bitterness. Lengthy delay in the fulfillment of prophecy breeds unbelief and skepticism in predicted outcomes. Such doubt can only drive the desperate to contrive a new method of hermeneutics that only add to the confusion by reason of its apparent plausibility. James White is not vindicated in his position merely because the majority of scholars and church leaders now appear to hold his view. Reproved by the Lord, according to his son Willie White, for bringing distrust and disunity at a time when the church was supposed to press together, James White sank down in discouragement because of the financial burdens that were not being met at a time of apparent fanaticism. Ellen White never endorsed James White's position of "the glorious mountain" being the United States of America. She did endorse the

¹⁰¹ Ellen G. White, *Manuscript Releases*, Volume One (Silver Spring, MD: Ellen G. White Estate, 1981), 62-64, emphasis added. ("Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation," March 3, 1901. —Manuscript 174, 1899, 1-8.)

¹⁰² Louis F. Were, "Futurism and the Anti-Christ of Scripture: Fanciful and Unwarranted Interpretations," *Signs of the Times Australia*, Vol. 46, No. 28, Warburton, Victoria, July 13, 1931, 11, emphasis supplied.

A Critique of Louis F. Were's Objections to Smith's Position on the Eastern Question
By David H. Thiele

hermeneutic system of William Miller, which Uriah Smith also used. The corollary position is that the people presenting the three angels' messages, as well as the Loud Cry, will not adopt any other hermeneutic system than what William Miller used.

Lastly, we need to be selling *Daniel and the Revelation* as though it were a new book. Not the 1944 edition with all its deletions of thousands of words pertaining to the Ottoman Empire and the religion of Islam, but an edition that retains those statements, as well as updates the current events that point to the fulfillment of Daniel 11:45.

May God help us to repent of our pride, help us to actively and intentionally seek to acquire the characteristics and temperament of Christ's character, and to advance in the truth as it is in Jesus—Who is the ultimate fulfillment of prophecy.