

**Statement No. 9**  
**Expect Some Changes in Understanding**  
**Statement Sponsor**  
**Tim Roosenberg**

**Statement:** Smith's understanding of Daniel 11 and Miller's understanding of Daniel 8 led to disappointment. Both had truth but needed adjustments rather than to be thrown out.

Revelation 10 and EGW both indicate that our understanding of Daniel will be sweet but lead to disappointment, and it must be presented again with an improved understanding. The Millerites focused on the cleansing of the Sanctuary but thought it was the second coming of Christ to this earth. They also miscalculated the date because of the missing year zero and thought the cleansing would happen in 1843. EGW said this about them: "God designed to prove His people [Millerites]. His hand covered a mistake in the reckoning of the prophetic periods." {CIHS 81}, "To these [Millerites] the truth was opened point by point, and entwined with their most hallowed recollections and sympathies.... Truth was made to shine forth, beautiful in its simplicity," {2SM 109.4} She also said that the Loud Cry would be a repeat of the 1840-44 message. That does not mean an exact repetition but a general repetition of a revised or corrected version of it because we would not repeat the errors or the date setting. (See the parallel between 1840-44 and the Loud Cry in statement 1 above.)

I believe the same is true of Smith's views on Daniel 11. His presentations led to a prophetic disappointment in the Adventist church following WW1. I believe he was right on many things. He and James White did argue and EGW cautioned James against making a public fight. At this time I believe that James was right on the King of the North but Uriah was right on a place for Islamic power in the closing conflict. It would seem that if it weren't for both of them having some truth she would have sided with one of them. She did focus on the end-time role of the Papacy in her book *The Great Controversy* and did not name Turkey at the end of the conflict. However, by not opposing Smith she left the door open for seeing Islam in Daniel's prophecies. I believe that if we change Smith's definition of North and South to the contextual original invasion/occupation routes, then everything will fall into place. We really are not all that far apart in the general sense. We believe that at the end there will be a conflict involving Islam (which may involve Turkey), against the Papacy (possibly also involving secularism/atheism). The Papacy will be established as the world leader, we will have the Loud Cry, Sunday laws, and persecution, followed by the close of probation, plagues and the return of Jesus. The macro picture is similar but details differ. So changing the details should be considered relatively "minor" changes. If we keep this in mind, harmony between us will be easier to achieve.