

UNHOLY WAR

...and the
King of the
South is...

JOHN C. WITCOMBE

Unholy War

...and the King of the South is...

JOHN C. WITCOMBE



HELENA, MONTANA

Page layout by [Page One Communications](#)
Cover design by Lars Justinen–[Justinen Creative Group](#)

e-book generated by [Ultimate Ebook Creator](#)

Printed in the United States of America
All Rights Reserved

Contact the author by visiting: [JerusalemJihad.com](#)
Also available in paperback

ISBN: 9781311513731

Unholy War?

It's Not What You Think!

I FIGURED THE TITLE of this booklet might pique your curiosity! You'd like to know what this "Unholy War" is all about. Well, it's not about the Middle East conflict. It's about the war of conflicting ideas within God's Church. From women's ordination, Creation, or Revelation's trumpets, to the identity of the kings of Daniel 11—the war goes on. And when war is within the Church, it's unholy—because God wants us all to speak the same thing:

Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment.—1 Corinthians 1:10.

This booklet is going to only address one small battle—the identity of the king of the south in Daniel 11:40. If harmony can be achieved on this front, it will give us warriors courage to believe that unity in God's Church can be achieved on all fronts.

The prophecy of Daniel 11:40-45 speaks of events that will occur at the time of the end. Verse 45 is a prophecy connected closely with the close of probation, thus it relates to the Second Coming of Jesus—one of the 28 fundamental beliefs of the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

Fundamental Belief #25, on the Second Coming of Christ, states:

"The almost complete fulfillment of most lines of prophecy, together with the present condition of the world, indicates that Christ's coming is imminent."—25th Fundamental Belief.

Speaking of "the almost complete fulfillment" of one significant line of prophecy, Ellen White penned the following words:

The world is stirred with the spirit of war. The prophecy of the *eleventh chapter of Daniel has nearly reached its complete fulfillment*. Soon the scenes of trouble spoken of in the prophecies will take place.—*Testimonies*, vol. 9, p. 14, emphasis supplied.

Notice the prominence of this 25th fundamental belief—a belief that is closely connected to Daniel 11:45:

The doctrine of the Second Advent is the very keynote of the Sacred Scriptures.—*The Great Controversy*, p. 299.

The return of Jesus Christ to our world will not be long delayed. This is to be the keynote of every message.—Letter 39, 1898.

To present the keynote of Scripture apart from the prophecies of Daniel and Revelation is not possible. And to believe that God would have every messenger giving this keynote be in tune with every other messenger is only reasonable. The discordant notes currently being played amount to an unholy war that needs to come to an end so that we can all be in one accord—ready for the outpouring of the latter rain.

What follows in this small booklet is an attempt to lay out a clear path to unity and an invitation for all to “press together, press together, press together.”—*Review and Herald*, September 12, 1893.

At a Daniel 11 Prophecy Symposium held in 2011—and at each of three following Prophecy Symposiums sponsored by one of our unions in the North American Division—an effort was made toward finding unity between three divergent views of Daniel 11:40-45.

King of the South: The Key to Unlocking Daniel 11

Why are there significant differences of interpretation on this important prophecy of Daniel 11? I would suggest that it all comes down to how we interpret the phrase, *king of the south* in verse 40.

The first presenter at our Prophecy Symposium in 2011 provided a figurative (symbolic) interpretation of this phrase, teaching that the king of the south is a figure for **atheism**.

The second presenter also gave a figurative interpretation of this phrase, teaching that it is a figure for **Islam**.

The third presenter (yours truly) took Uriah Smith’s position. In his book, *Daniel and the Revelation*, Smith takes this phrase, *king of the south*, “as it reads” and explains it “according to its obvious meaning,” giving a literal interpretation, teaching that the king of the south was literally the **king or civil leader of Egypt**, which was the southern geographical region of Alexander’s divided Empire.

One of the reasons people come to different conclusions on what they believe the Bible is teaching on any issue is, pure and simple, because they don’t follow the same rules of interpretation. A set of rules for interpreting the Bible exists—rules the prophet has counseled us to use:

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; . . . 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.—*Review and Herald*, November 25, 1884.

Rule 11

If Miller’s 11th rule were to be carefully followed, I believe that the Seventh-day Adventist Church would speak with one voice regarding the last 6 verses of Daniel 11.

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.—William Miller.

Ellen White expresses Rule 11 this way:

The language of the Bible should be **explained according to its obvious meaning**, unless a symbol or figure is employed. . . . If men would but **take the Bible as it reads**, if there were no false teachers to mislead and

confuse their minds, a work would be accomplished that would make angels glad and that would bring into the fold of Christ thousands upon thousands who are now wandering in error.—*The Great Controversy*, p. 598, emphasis supplied.

Let's see how this important rule of interpretation helps us understand both Daniel 2 and Daniel 11.

In Daniel 2 we find a vision of a composite image made up of gold, silver, brass, iron and clay. The interpretation given in the text itself makes it clear that this image is foretelling coming civil kingdoms that would rise to power. Looking back through history, we can name those kingdoms:

Head of Gold: Babylon

Chest of Silver: Medo-Persia

Belly and Thighs of Brass: Greece

Legs of Iron: Rome

Feet and Toes of Iron and Clay: What do they represent?

Some prophetic expositors interpret the feet of iron and clay as being apostate religion united with civil governments. Another interpretation taught by many is that the feet and toes represent the nations that arose from divided Rome.

How can we know which interpretation is the correct biblical interpretation? It all comes down to how the word *kingdom* should be interpreted in verses 41 and 42:

And whereas thou sawest the feet and toes, part of potters' clay, and part of iron, the **kingdom** shall be divided; but there shall be in it of the strength of the iron, forasmuch as thou sawest the iron mixed with miry clay. And as the toes of the feet were part of iron, and part of clay, so the **kingdom** shall be partly strong, and partly broken. And whereas thou sawest iron mixed with miry clay, they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men: but they shall not cleave one to another, even as iron is not mixed with clay.—Daniel 2:41-43.

Is the term *kingdom* to be interpreted then in the same literal manner as it is interpreted from the beginning of the prophecy—as indicating literal civil kingdoms? Or should we change its literal interpretation and give it a figurative interpretation since the time of the feet and toes is after the Cross, at a time when the Church is no longer the literal nation of Israel?

If the term *kingdom* in verses 41 and 42 of chapter 2 can be interpreted literally as a civil power, as we interpret the four preceding *kingdoms* in this chapter—and “if it makes good sense as it stands”—then it must be interpreted that way.

According to Miller's 11th Rule, we do not have the option of interpreting it figuratively if we are looking for the correct biblical interpretation.

Clearly, it is evident that the previous usage of the term *kingdom* requires a literal interpretation. In verse 41 and 42, there is nothing in the text itself to indicate that we should change from a literal interpretation of the term *kingdom* at this point in the prophecy. So we stay with a literal, civil interpretation, even

though the literal Jewish nation had come to an end and the church, at the time of the feet and toes, is now worldwide.

Therefore, our historicist understanding of the feet and toes of iron and clay as having to do with the division of Rome into the modern nations of Europe is correct. Without this interpretation, the identification of the little horn of chapter 7 as being the papacy would not be evident.

Ellen White clearly supports the view that the various image parts, including the feet and toes of iron and clay, represent literal civil kingdoms of the world:

The image shown to Nebuchadnezzar in the visions of the night represents the kingdoms of the world. The metals in the image, symbolizing the different kingdoms, became less and less pure and valuable, from the head down. The head of the image was of gold, the breast and arms of silver, the sides of brass, and the feet and toes iron mingled with clay. So the kingdoms represented by them deteriorated in value.—*Review and Herald*, February 6, 1900.

This is the interpretation that is presented in every prophecy-based Adventist evangelistic series.

Metaphorical Applications

We should note that Ellen White also makes use of several **metaphorical** applications of the image that go beyond the **literal** biblical interpretation of the text. I have found three such metaphorical applications she draws from the image:

1. The image represents the “deterioration of religion”:

While representing the kingdoms of this earth, the image that was revealed to Nebuchadnezzar also fitly represented deterioration of religion. We grow weak morally and spiritually, just in proportion as we forget God.—*Review and Herald*, February 6, 1900, emphasis supplied.

Notice that the metaphorical application does not replace the biblical interpretation: “While representing the kingdoms of this earth...”

2. The feet of iron and clay represent “God’s sacred work”:

We have come to a time when God's sacred work is represented by the feet of the image in which the iron was mixed with the miry clay. God has a people, a chosen people, whose discernment must be sanctified, who must not become unholy by laying upon the foundation wood, hay, and stubble.—*SDA Bible Commentary*, vol. 4, p. 1168.

Perhaps the iron represents the foundational truths of our denomination, and the clay could be the spurious teachings indicated by the wood, hay, and stubble. This is not the biblical interpretation that we would teach in an evangelistic meeting—it is simply a metaphorical application of the text.

3. The feet of iron and clay represent “the mingling of churchcraft and statecraft”:

The mingling of churchcraft and statecraft is represented by the iron and the clay. This union is weakening all the power of the churches. This investing the church with the power of the state will bring evil results.—*SDA Bible Commentary*, vol. 4, p. 1168.

Now Ellen White is saying that the feet of iron and clay represent, not God's sacred work, but the evil one's work in uniting the power of the state to the churches in Protestant America. Is this an interpretation or simply a metaphorical application? To be a legitimate interpretation, every specification of the prophecy must fit—which in this case, it doesn't. Notice that verse 43 says, "but they shall not cleave one to another," and we know that church and state will be cleaving together to enforce a national Sunday law. She wrote: "This *union* is weakening all the power of the churches." Union is the very opposite of what the text actually teaches. Therefore, her use of the text is clearly a metaphorical application rather than an interpretation.

With the word *kingdom* in chapter 2, as it relates to the image itself, we stay with a literal, geographical, civil interpretation from start to finish. Even in the feet and toes, which come into play after the literal Jewish nation had come to an end and the Church at this time is worldwide, the word *kingdom* is still interpreted as referring to literal, civil powers.

With this information in mind, let's look at Daniel 11. Can you think of any term in chapter 11 that, like the word *kingdom* in chapter 2, is found from start to finish throughout the prophecy?

North and South, Alexander's Empire, and Applying Rule 11

What about the terms *north* and *south*? The reference to these two compass directions begins in verse 5 and goes clear through to the very last verse. These terms—*north* and *south*—refer to two of the four geographical divisions of Alexander's Empire.

They are included in the **four heads** of the leopard in chapter 7, the **four horns** of the goat in chapter 8, and the **four winds** of heaven in verse 4 of chapter 11. These represent the four geographical regions into which Alexander's four generals divided his Empire. In Daniel 11 these four geographical regions are reduced down to two—north and south.

If, in Daniel 11, we would maintain a literal interpretation of the terms *north* and *south* from beginning to end—just as we maintain a literal interpretation of the term *kingdom* in Daniel 2—we would discover the interpretation of Daniel 11:40-45, where the time period corresponds with the same time period as the kingdom of the feet and toes of Daniel 2.

The Consistency of Miller's Rule

What would be the literal interpretation of the phrases *king of the north* and *king of the south*?

All three presenters at the Prophecy Symposium agree that these phrases—*king of the north* and *king of the south*—refer to literal kings ruling from these two literal geographical territories, south (Egypt) and north (Asia Minor), in these first 15 verses. They all agree on the names of the kings as listed in Uriah Smith's book, *Daniel and the Revelation*.

Verse 5: King of the South (Ptolemy I Soter)

Verse 7: King of the North (Seleucus II)

Verse 9: King of the South (Ptolemy Euergetes)

Verse 11: King of the South (Ptolemy IV Epiphanes)

Verse 13: King of the North (Antiochus III)

Verse 14: King of the South (Ptolemy V)

Verse 15: King of the North (Antiochus III)

Verse 40: King of the South (literal or figurative?)

It is in verse 40 that most prophetic expositors switch from a literal interpretation to a figurative interpretation for the phrase *king of the south*. And when you choose to go figurative you can go in any number of directions. But if we're going to abruptly change from a literal to a figurative interpretation, we had certainly be prepared to make a clear and convincing case for doing so. My current and settled conviction is that such a case has not been made. My view is that the reasons for staying consistent and for applying Miller's Rule 11 are far stronger and more logical than any arguments proposed for abandoning a literal application in favor of a figurative approach.

Some choose a figurative interpretation because, they say, verse 40 takes place after the literal nation of Israel had come to an end. Yet in Daniel 2:41, 42 they don't go figurative with the term *kingdom* for their interpretation, even though the kingdom of the feet and toes also comes into play when the literal nation of Israel, as God's Church, no longer exists.

So when it says *king of the south* in verse 40, if we are following Miller's 11th Rule, it should mean the same thing as it meant in verses 5 through 15. It would refer to a civil ruler reigning over the territory of Egypt. This was the clear teaching of prominent leaders in our Church, such as A.T. Jones:

Finally, in verse 40, he comes again, and "at the time of the end," too, to "the king of the south" and "the king of the north." The territories of the northern and of the southern division of Alexander's dominion remain respectively the kingdoms of the north and the south unto the end, and from beginning to end, whatever power might occupy these respective territories would be the king of the north or of the south. Whatever power therefore which, at the time of the end, occupies the territory of Thrace and Bithynia, originally held by Lysimachus, will be the king of the north as certainly as was the power of Lysimachus itself.—A.T. Jones, June 8, 1896, *The Bible Echo*, p. 171.

Litch and Smith in Agreement

When Josiah Litch, in 1841, interpreted Daniel 11:40, he most likely would have been using William Miller's Rules of Interpretation and would have first sought for a literal interpretation of these terms—*king of the north* and *king of the south*. He found a perfect fit from the historical records, just as he had found for the previous mention of these terms (1841 JoL, APEC 98). Miller's 11th Rule said that he must go with a literal view if a literal view "makes good sense as it stands." Uriah Smith and his fellow Bible students followed the same rule and came to the same conclusion as had Josiah Litch.

Yielding Up Differences of Opinion

If we all stayed consistently literal with our interpretation of these two terms, *north* and *south*, I believe that we would begin to see value in the interpretation that Uriah Smith's book, *Daniel and the Revelation*, presents on Daniel 11:40-45. We as a church would once again speak with one voice on this most significant prophecy found in Daniel 11.

Christ is leading out a people, and bringing them into the unity of the faith, that they may be one, as He is one with the Father. Differences of opinion must be yielded, that all may come into union with the body, that they may have one mind and one judgment.—*Testimonies*, vol. 1, p. 324.

Good counsel—but who’s going to yield their differences of opinion? How can we identify the “one mind and one judgment” of the body with which we are to come into union?

Let’s see if the following statements from the pen of inspiration can help us with these practical questions:

It is true that there are prophecies yet to be fulfilled. But very erroneous work has been done again and again, and will continue to be done by those who seek to find new light in the prophecies, and who begin by turning away from the light that God has already given. . . . But the Lord does not lay upon those who have not had an experience in His work the burden of making a new exposition of those prophecies which He has, by His Holy Spirit, moved upon His chosen servants to explain.—*Manuscript Release*, vol. 17, p. 15.

The name of one of those chosen servants was Uriah Smith. We are told that God used him as a “channel”; the book he wrote was called “God’s helping hand”, and this book would continue to be “God’s helping hand” until the close of probation. No other book would be taking the place of this one:

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?—*Manuscript Release*, vol. 1, p. 63, emphasis supplied.

Elder Smith and Elder Littlejohn can communicate the reasons of our faith in a clear and understanding manner which will interest and instruct minds, and if they have a living connection with Jesus, power will attend their labors. **God has entrusted to Brother Smith the treasures of His truth**, but he has naught wherein to boast because of this. He must walk humbly with God, and God will work with him and for him. He needs to drink deep draughts of the living water, not occasionally but continually, **that he may present the fulfillment of prophecy with power and fervency**.—*1888 Materials*, p. 513, emphasis supplied.

Everything that can be done should be done to circulate *Thoughts on Daniel and Revelation*. I know of *no other book that can take the place of this one*. **It is God's helping hand**.—*Manuscript Release*, vol. 21, p. 444, emphasis supplied.

Words can’t be plainer:

There *must* be no long discussions, *no presenting of new theories* in regard to prophecies that God has already *made plain*.—*Review and Herald*, November 27, 1900, par. 13, emphasis supplied.

And we find these prophecies spelled out plainly for us in Uriah Smith’s book:

Those who are preparing to enter the ministry, who desire to become successful students of the prophecies, will find *Daniel and the Revelation*

an invaluable help. They need to understand this book. *It speaks of past, present, and future, laying out the path so **plainly** that none need err therein. . . .* The great, essential questions which God would have presented to the people are found in *Daniel and the Revelation*. There is found solid, eternal truth for this time. Everyone needs the light and information it contains.—*Manuscript Release*, vol. 1, p. 61, emphasis supplied.

Why should we go back to the 1800s for our understanding of Daniel 11:40-45? Maybe God has given to our generation a new interpretation of this important prophecy.

In every age there is a new development of truth, a message of God to the people of that generation. The old truths are all essential; new truth is not independent of the old, but an unfolding of it. It is only as the old truths are understood that we can comprehend the new.—*Christ's Object Lessons*, p. 128.

As you can see, any new development of truth will simply be an unfolding of the old. The old must first be understood and accepted. New truth will not discard the old and take us in an entirely new direction.

According to the Spirit of Prophecy, God used Uriah Smith as a channel, and Smith's book as His helping hand, to make abundantly plain the major lines of prophecy that are found in Daniel and Revelation. And as it relates to these great lines of prophecy, it is reasonable to believe that Smith's book represents the mind and judgment of the body with which we are to come into union, especially when you consider how this book came together.

How Uriah Smith's Book Came to Be

Here is the history on how Uriah Smith's book came together. James White writes:

Connected with the Battle Creek Sabbath-school is a large and flourishing Bible-class conducted by Bro. Uriah Smith. This class has once passed through the entire book of Revelation, free from the spirit of debate, all coming to the same conclusion on almost every point, and confident that they had found a better harmony than they had before seen, and clearer light on some portions of the book. Sabbath, May 17, the class commenced the book again, with the intention of taking one chapter for each lesson. In this investigation we take a deep interest, and design to report in the Review, by way of a few thoughts on one chapter each week. Should we be called away for a few weeks, the class propose to leave the book of Revelation, in our absence, for some other portion of the Scriptures, until we return. Judging from past investigation of this book by the brethren and sisters of the Bible-class, we hope in expressing our views to express theirs also, yet we choose to be alone responsible for what we may say.—James White, June 3, 1862, *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald*, p. 4.

Being from home much of the time we are able to progress but slowly with the Revelation. Bro. Smith has consented to conclude the book, commencing with chapter x.—James White, October 21, 1862, *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald*, p. 164.

In 1867 James White writes in reference to Smith's book:

These thoughts are not the fruit of one brain. In the time of the end the Revelation was to be unsealed and opened. And from, the open book, light has been shining. William Miller saw much. Others since have seen more. . . . This . . . is a book of thoughts, clothed in the author's happy style, plain, yet critical and practical, coming down to the spiritual wants of the common people, yet elevated and dignified. This standard work should be in the library of every believer.—James White, *The Review and Herald*, July 16, 1867, emphasis supplied.

In *Ministry* Arthur White wrote:

In 1872, five years after *Thoughts on the Revelation* was printed, a companion volume, *Thoughts on Daniel*, was issued and announced for sale on December 31, 1872. This, too, quite largely represented the *joint study of able Bible students*. After passing through several editions as single volumes, the two companion books in 1881 appeared as a combined work, *Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation*.—Arthur White, *Ministry*, January 1945, emphasis supplied.

Ellen White recognized the thorough investigation that this “joint study of able Bible students” made in order to come to a united position on the prophecies of Daniel and Revelation:

By a thorough investigation of the prophecies we understand where we are in this world's history; and we know for a certainty that the second coming of Christ is near. The *result of these investigations* must be brought before the world through the press [Smith's book *Daniel and the Revelation*]. . . . We have not given heed to fables, but to the “sure word of prophecy.” We are now living in the *full blaze of the light of Bible truth*.—*Testimonies*, vol. 4, p. 592 (1881), emphasis supplied.

At one time, we were largely united in our understanding of the seven trumpets of Revelation and the prophecies of Daniel 11:40-45. And why shouldn't we have been united? Were we not “living in the full blaze of the light of Bible truth”?

In the *Desire of Ages, Patriarchs and Prophets*, and in ***Daniel and the Revelation***, there is precious instruction. These books must be regarded as of special importance, and every effort should be made to get them to the people.—Letter 229, 1903.

Especially should the book ***Daniel and the Revelation*** be brought before people as the very book for this time. This book contains the message which all need to read and understand. Translated into many different languages, it will be a power to enlighten the world.—*Manuscript Release*, vol. 1, p. 60.

Why I Wrote *Jerusalem Caliphate and the Third Jihad*

In January of 2010 I read an original version (1912) of Uriah Smith's *Daniel and the Revelation*. As I read his commentary on Daniel 11:45 I immediately saw the relevancy of what he wrote to what was happening in our world today.

I don't believe I would have seen this if I had been reading from the revised 1944 version of *Daniel and the Revelation*. In the 1912 version there were 3,677 words used to provide commentary on verse 45; in the 1944 version there are only 159 words—a 96 percent reduction.

Hoping to reignite interest in Smith's book, *Daniel and the Revelation*, I wrote a book entitled *Jerusalem Caliphate and the Third Jihad* (JCTJ). It uses the interpretation of Daniel 11 and Revelation 9 as found in Uriah Smith's book to introduce the third angel's message to non-Adventist readers—Muslims, Jews, Evangelicals, and the secular news-observing person.

The title reflects the interpretation of Daniel 11:45 as found in *Daniel and the Revelation* (1912 edition). In JCTJ, Smith's interpretation is simply updated to match the current geopolitical landscape we find in the Middle East today. This interpretation has high value in today's current Mid-East crisis climate and will create reader interest in this book.

JCTJ follows an important principle of evangelism found in the following words:

The subject was of special interest, and the people listened with the most earnest attention. It seemed to be **just what they wanted to hear**.—Ellen White, *Review and Herald*, September 6, 1877, emphasis supplied.

Leading off with issues that are of current interest to all those paying attention to the news, JCTJ focuses on what people want to hear.

The subject that "was of special interest" back in 1877 was Uriah Smith's presentation on the "Eastern Question" (Daniel 11:45). JCTJ reintroduces the topic of the Eastern Question to the twenty-first-century reader. This book is written to show that Smith's interpretation is reasonable and extremely relevant to the world we live in today.

The "Eastern Question"

In the latter half of the 1800s most of our pioneers taught that the king of the north in Daniel 11:40-45 was the Turkish Ottoman Empire. Our pioneers believed that the Ottoman Empire would, through some set of circumstances, find themselves established in Jerusalem in fulfillment of Daniel 11:45: "And he shall plant the tabernacles of his palace between the seas in the glorious holy mountain; yet he shall come to his end, and none shall help him."

This teaching was part of the "Eastern Question" topic that is mentioned some 364 times in the *Words of the Adventist Pioneers* compilation found on the EGW Writings CD.

James White took exception to the view of most of the pioneers regarding the Eastern Question. In a sermon and in an article (*Where Are We?*, *Review and Herald*, Oct. 3, 1878, p. 116), he taught that the Eastern Question had nothing to do with Bible prophecy, by presenting the view that the papacy was the king of the north in Daniel 11:40-45.

His son, Willie White, did not think that his father actually believed what he presented on Daniel 11. He thought perhaps James White presented this conflicting view because of budget concerns. Willie White wrote:

In father's efforts to arouse our brethren to clear of the B. C. College debt, and to raise money for the B. C. San. and for the European Mission, and for the proposed British Mission, and other things, he had met the plea, "It is too late, Eld. White to plan for all these things. TOO LATE, TOO LATE." And when he heard Eld. Smith's presentation, fear seized his soul, and he threw in his exposition on Daniel 11, not so much that he really believed it, as that he thought it would 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 collapsed.—Letter from Willie White to Elder John Vuilleumier, March 6, 1919.

James White and Uriah Smith were united in their views on the Sabbath, state of the dead, and the sanctuary message—on the pillars of truth. They spoke with one voice on these topics. But the unity God is calling for goes beyond the main pillars, reaching even to what we as a church teach on Daniel 11:40-45—as we see from this incident. Our church had a published position on these verses of Daniel 11 that was being taught in our schools and in our public evangelism. The Spirit of God reproved James White for introducing a differing view and creating disunity back then. Would He not do the same today?

But what about *unity in diversity*—can't we teach diverse views of the prophecies as long as we are united in Christ? Let's understand what this phrase is and what it is not. It isn't diversity of message while united in Christ, but rather diversity has to do with members having differing gifts and methods of presenting the message. Unity in diversity simply means church members giving one united message in many different ways.

Unity in diversity is God's plan. Among the followers of Christ there is to be the blending of diverse elements, one adapted to the other, and each to do its special work for God. Every individual has his place in the filling up of one great plan bearing the stamp of Christ's image. . . . One is fitted to do a certain work, another has a different work for which he is adapted, another has a still different line; but each is to be the complement of the others. . . . The Spirit of God, working in and through the diverse elements, will produce harmony of action. . . . There is to be only one master spirit--the Spirit of Him who is infinite in wisdom, and in whom *all the diverse elements meet in beautiful, matchless unity*.—*Our High Calling*, p. 169, emphasis supplied.

Although possessing different temperaments and dispositions, they will see eye to eye *in all matters of religious belief*. They will **speak** the same things; they will have the same judgment; they will be one in Christ Jesus.—*Historical Sketches*, p. 124, emphasis supplied.

We shall see eye to eye ere long, but to become firm and consider it your duty to present your views in decided opposition to the faith or truth as it has been taught by us as a people, is a mistake, and will result in harm, and only harm, as in the days of Martin Luther. Begin to draw apart and feel at liberty to express your ideas without reference to the views of your brethren, and a state of things will be introduced that you do not dream of. My husband had some ideas on some points differing from the views taken by his brethren. I was shown that however true his views were, God did not call for him to put them in front before his brethren and create differences of ideas.—*Manuscript Release*, vol. 15, p. 21.

James White's son, Willie, would later offer his recollection of his father's views:

During the few months preceding this meeting, I had read *Daniel and Revelation* by Elder Uriah Smith. I loved the writer; I admired his style; I loved his teaching; and I was shocked when Elder White presented another view regarding the king of the North. One day I said to him, "Father, I have just read Elder Smith's book and his exposition seems clear to me. Do you really believe that Rome is the king of the North?" His answer was, "I think Elder Smith is going too fast in his exposition, and I thought it was time to present something to check the current of belief that what is transpiring was the beginning of Armageddon."—Letter from Willie White to Elder Froom, December 12, 1930.

Before we go on, we need to make something abundantly clear: 1 Corinthians 1:10 does not beseech us to all *think* the same thing, but to *speak* the same thing. There will be differences of thinking on any number of minor issues, such as the meaning of the "daily," or who comprises the 144,000. All minds cannot see alike.

There will even be differences of thinking on major issues. But when it comes to major issues that relate to the fundamental beliefs of the Seventh-day Adventist Church or to the great lines of prophecy that we are to present to the world, we must *speak* the same thing. God gave a vision to Ellen White informing her that even on the interpretation of Daniel 11:40-45, we could not present differences of ideas before the Church—and certainly not before the world. Apparently, James White could not see what the vast majority of the Church understood on this prophecy. It was okay for him to *think* differently, but it was not okay for him to *speak* or write publicly upon his differing views.

The view that had been and continued to be publicly presented was the published view that was found in Smith's book. James White's papal view was not to be presented to the Church. He had already written part one in the *Review* on his papal view of Daniel 11:40-45, when he was told to stop (*Where Are We?*, *Review and Herald*, Oct. 3, 1878, p. 116). Part two was never written.

As I have pointed out, there are several views on the final verses of Daniel 11 that are being presented to the Church today, and God said that we must not do that. Only one view is to be presented. Which view should it be? How is it to be decided? How was it decided back in 1878? God made the decision for us through the vision He gave to Ellen White.

Now, back to the Eastern Question.

Uriah Smith clearly related the prophecy of Daniel 11:45 to the Eastern Question in his book, *Daniel and the Revelation* (pre-1944 editions). If this view was unbiblical speculation, it is unlikely that Ellen White would have given endorsements to his book and to his public presentation of the Eastern Question, as she did in this church paper article:

Sunday morning the weather was still cloudy, but before it was time for the people to assemble the sun shone forth. Boats and trains poured their living freight upon the ground, as was the case last year. Elder Smith spoke in the morning upon the Eastern Question. The subject was of special interest, and the people listened with the most earnest attention. It seemed to be just what they wanted to hear.—*Review and Herald*, September 6, 1877, par. 11.

Ellen White repeats this statement in volume four of the *Testimonies*, page 279. For it to be included in the *Testimonies*, we can be sure that there is something of significance here. There must be more to this than simply weather reporting.

God inspired His messenger to give a glowing report of a public presentation on the Eastern Question. The Eastern Question that Uriah Smith presented to those thousands of people had to do with Daniel 11:45.

If the last six verses of Daniel 11 are not about the Middle East, but are rather about the global papacy, then God was completely silent in regard to the Eastern Question. And we are told:

Matters of vital importance have been plainly revealed in the Word of God. These subjects are worthy of our deepest thought. But we are not to search into matters on which God has been silent.—*Selected Messages*, Book One, p. 173.

If the Eastern Question is not in the Bible, then it certainly should not be presented in our public efforts. Thus, when she wrote: “Elder Smith spoke in the morning upon the Eastern Question. The subject was of special interest,” we can have confidence that the Eastern Question is a valid subject for presenting in our public efforts.

Willie White, Ellen White’s son, saw significance in the fact that his mother commented in the *Testimonies* on Uriah Smith presenting the Eastern Question:

I do not know of any utterance of mother’s that tells us about the King of the North. The two things that most nearly approach to it, are the statement in *Testimonies*, v. 9, p. 14 and *Testimonies*, v. 4, p. 279. Here, in reporting the Danvers campmeeting, she wrote: “Eld. Smith spoke in the morning on the Eastern Question. The subject was of special interest, and the people listened with the most earnest attention.” These things are not proofs, but they seem to me to be very interesting indications.—Letter from Willie White to Elder John Vuilleumier, March 6, 1919.

And from what his mother wrote, we should take note when Willie White speaks:

It was also shown me that my son, W.C. White, should be my helper and counselor, and that the Lord would place on him the spirit of wisdom and of a sound mind. I was shown that the Lord would guide him, and that he would not be led away, because he would recognize the leadings and guidance of the Holy Spirit. . . . The Lord has selected him to act an important part in His work. For this purpose was he born.—*Manuscript Release*, vol. 21, pp. 141, 142.

Another respected pioneer, J. N. Loughborough, saw significance in the fact that Ellen White commented on Smith’s presentation of the Eastern Question:
March 25, 1915

College Place, Washington

Dear Brother,

Your letter of recent date received. Yesterday I mailed to you a copy of the book on the sealing message. And I have sent a dime to the Pacific Press requesting them to mail to you a copy of “Prophetic Gift in the Gospel Church.” As to where you can get information on “the king of the North,” I

think you will find it in Bro. Daniel's book on "The World War." Brother Uriah Smith laid no claims to "inspiration," but his view on the king of the North is well established by Sister White in speaking of one occasion when he spoke on the "Eastern Question." This you can read in Volume 4 of the Testimonies, page 278-279 where she called the discourse "a subject of special interest," etc. It would bother those holding another view than what he advocated to find a word from her favoring their views.

One Brother who had intimated in his writing on the subject that the king of the North might be the pope, told me that Sister White told him he "never should have intimated any such thing, and that his idea would only create confusion." This was not put in print, but it was what he told me in Autumn 1878.

Yours in the blessed hope,
J. N. Loughborough

No Major Errors in Smith's Book

Many Seventh-day Adventists today have lost confidence in Smith's book, believing that there are major errors in its prophetic interpretation. Notice carefully what Ellen White said about "our important books":

In some of our important books that have been in print for years, and which have brought many to a knowledge of the truth, there may be found matters of minor importance that call for careful study and correction.—*Selected Messages*, Book One, p. 165.

Smith's book qualifies as one of these important books. Yes, let's correct the minor issues, but these corrections will not change the interpretation of any major line of prophecy. Many of these corrections were made in the 1944 revision of *Daniel and the Revelation*.

Let such matters be considered by those regularly appointed to have the oversight of our publications. Let not these brethren, nor our canvassers, nor our ministers magnify these matters in such a way as to lessen the influence of these good soul-saving books. Should we take up the work of discrediting our literature, we would place weapons in the hands of those who have departed from the faith and confuse the minds of those who have newly embraced the message. The less that is done unnecessarily to change our publications, the better it will be.—*Selected Messages*, Book One, p. 165.

Even a minor correction should not be magnified, because it would lessen the influence of Smith's book. We can, with confidence, present any of the prophetic interpretations found in *Daniel and the Revelation* and know that we have heaven's approval.

Uniting on the Platform of Truth!

God's hand has been on this movement from the beginning. He guided our Church to the pillars of truth we hold through the 22 Sabbath Conferences held in the formative years of this movement (1848-1852). Jesus was about to return, and He saw to it that truth was restored to His Church. This was a movement of prophecy, and God wanted His Church to have a book that would clearly teach the truth regarding the prophecies of Daniel and Revelation. So God once again used a group of people who studied together the prophecies of

Daniel and Revelation over a ten-year period (1862-1872) to establish a united position that we would present to the world. God used Uriah Smith's book as His "helping hand" to publish these views to the world.

In brief, these views regarding Daniel 11:40-45 are as follows:

Verses 40-43 were fulfilled in the Napoleonic Egyptian Campaign (1798-1801).

Verse 44 was fulfilled in the Crimean War (1853-1856).

Verse 45 is yet to be fulfilled.

This final waymark, before the close of probation, will be fulfilled by the king of the north planting the tabernacles of his palace in the glorious holy mountain located between the seas. If this were to be fulfilled today (2015), using the interpretation found in *Daniel and the Revelation* and updated to the current geo-political landscape, we could expect to see the following take place:

So here it is—verse 45, the only verse of chapter 11 that has not found a fulfillment in the historical records. Here is a reasonable interpretation of what is yet to transpire, based upon a literal reading of the text and using the same interpretive approach that has so clearly revealed the historical fulfillment of the previous 44 verses:

And he (the king of the north—a leader from the territory where present-day Turkey is located) **shall plant** (place or establish) **the tabernacles of his palace** (a religious/political entity—Islamic Caliphate?) **between the seas** (Mediterranean and Dead Seas) **in the glorious holy mountain** (Mount of Olives); **yet he** (the king of the north) **shall come to his end, and none shall help him** (something will happen that brings the rule of the king of the north to an end).—*Jerusalem Caliphate and the Third Jihad*, p. 47.

This view of Daniel 11:45 does not take the place of the understanding our Church has of the papacy's role in end-time events. Everything *The Great Controversy* teaches regarding the work of apostate Protestantism uniting with the papacy to bring persecution to God's people, over the Sunday law, will take place just as the book of Revelation teaches. Ellen White never took her support for the role of the papacy in the last days from Daniel 11:40-45.

When Smith's interpretation of Daniel 11:45 is fulfilled, the world will know that Seventh-day Adventists were the only ones who correctly interpreted the prophecies of these end-time events. They will know that we have continuously taught these views, through Smith's book, since the late 1800s. Confidence will be established in the Seventh-day Adventist view of prophetic interpretation, and great interest, lasting right up to the close of probation, will be reignited in Smith's book:

The **interest** in *Daniel and the Revelation* is to **continue as long as probationary time shall last**.—*Manuscript Release*, vol. 1, p. 63, emphasis supplied.

Yes, Jesus really does want His Church to speak with one voice. The Father and His Son speak with one voice, and Jesus prayed that this same unity would be found in His Church.

He wouldn't entreat us to "all speak the same thing" if this weren't possible. And to make it possible, He endorsed a list of rules for interpreting the Bible

that William Miller compiled; then He endorsed the book Uriah Smith wrote that followed those very rules.

Don't you think it is time to put an end to the unholy war of every man teaching what is right in his own eyes? Yes, I know that "unholy war" is an unusual way to describe the disunity in God's Church—perhaps a bit strong. But what will it take to open our eyes to the seriousness of our situation? I believe it's time to let go of our private interpretations and unite on the prophetic platform of truth that God firmly established at the beginning of this movement.

Dear reader, do you know of any other path we could take whereby God's people could be perfectly united in the presentation of our prophetic message?

The early rain fell upon the Church after they were all in one accord. Soon, we too will be in one accord: "The 144,000 were all sealed, and perfectly united."—*Early Writings*, p. 15. The latter rain will only fall upon those who are perfectly united, all speaking the same thing.

Today, we must understand the specifications of the great lines of prophecy so that we can present them to the world. Conditions on Planet Earth, especially as they relate to Daniel 11:45, reveal that the close of probation is fast approaching. "Get ready, get ready, get ready."—*Early Writings*, p. 64.

Prophecy has been fulfilling, line upon line. The more firmly we stand under the banner of the third angel's message, the more clearly shall we understand the prophecy of Daniel; for the Revelation is the supplement of Daniel. . . . There are others besides yourself, and more than one or two, who like you think they have new light, and are all ready to present it to the people. But it would be pleasing to God for them to accept the light already given and walk in it, and base their faith upon the Scriptures, which sustain the positions held by the people of God for many years.—*Selected Messages*, bk. 2, p. 114.

[Appendix A](#)

. . . and the King of the South is . . .

Who is the king of the south in Daniel 11:40? Is he the leader of Egypt, as he was in the first half of the chapter, or does that phrase now refer to someone or something else?

If we say it represents *atheism*, as some do, and if we understand the fulfillment of verse 40 as referring to France taking the pope captive—“And at the time of the end shall the king of the south [atheistic France] push at him [papacy receiving deadly wound in 1798]”—then France would have had to have been an atheistic nation in 1798.

Was France an atheistic country in 1798? Was atheism the driving motive that led France to put an end to the pope’s supremacy over the state? What does history tell us?

In 18th-century France, ninety-five percent of the population were adherents of the Catholic Church; most of the rest were Protestant Huguenots, who, although greatly outnumbered by the Catholics, nonetheless retained powerful positions in French local governments. . . . The dechristianisation of France reached its zenith around the middle of 1794 with the fall of Robespierre. By early 1795 a return to some form of religion-based faith was beginning to take shape and a law passed on February 21, 1795 legalized public worship, albeit with strict limitations.—(<http://tinyurl.com/ytdcj6>).

The short 18th century period of time where the French atheists came to power is called “The Reign of Terror”. Such brutality had not been seen in Christendom before. . . . For a short while after the bloodthirsty destruction and failure of the French Revolution Atheism was shunned by the political and philosophical classes.—(<http://tinyurl.com/kggsqmm>).

France did experiment with atheism for a short period of time just prior to the beginning of the time of the end (1798), just as Revelation 11 predicted. A *Ministry* article states:

. . . he [Napoleon] knew that some of the revolutionaries in France believed that, so far as religion was concerned, the revolution had been a failure. General Clarke had told him toward the end of 1796 that "France has become once more Roman Catholic, and we may be on the point of needing the Pope himself in order to enlist clerical support for the Revolution, and thereby the support of those districts which the clergy again controls.”—*Ministry*, June, 1979.

State promotion of atheism as a public norm first came to prominence in Revolutionary France (1789-1799).—Latreille, A. FRENCH REVOLUTION, New Catholic Encyclopedia v. 5, pp. 972–973 (Second Ed. 2002 Thompson/Gale).

It is clear that atheism was not a factor of Revolutionary France throughout its entire 10 year existence. Revolutionary France and atheistic France are not

one and the same thing. Atheistic France only occupied a short period of time within the period of time known as Revolutionary France. After the time period of atheistic France (The Reign of Terror) came to an end, the French Directory came into power from November 2, 1795 until November 10, 1799.

During the French Revolution, a campaign of dechristianization happened which included removal and destruction of religious objects from places of worship and the transformation of churches into "Temples of the Goddess of Reason", culminating in a celebration of Reason in Notre Dame Cathedral. Unlike later establishments of anti-theism by communist regimes, the French Revolutionary experiment was short (7 months), incomplete and inconsistent.—http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/State_atheism

Here is the pretext that France used for taking the pope captive. Notice that atheism had nothing to do with the infliction of the deadly wound:

Bonaparte then put Duphot in charge of organizing the troops of the Cisalpine Republic. He rose to Général de brigade in the armée d'Italie on 30 March 1797. He then went to Rome with the French ambassador Joseph Bonaparte, where they both tried to incite a Republican revolt, especially by holding a Republican festival at Joseph's palace. This caused a riot and Duphot was fatally shot in December 1797 by papal troops. His death gave Bonaparte the pretext he needed to occupy Rome, abolish the Papal States and set up the Roman Republic.—

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mathurin-L%C3%A9onard_Duphot

In The Great Controversy we find evidence for the fact that official atheism had been overturned sometime before the pope was taken captive:

According to the words of the prophet, then, a little before the year 1798 some power of satanic origin and character would rise to make war upon the Bible. And in the land where the testimony of God's two witnesses should thus be silenced, there would be manifest the atheism of the Pharaoh and the licentiousness of Sodom. . . . This prophecy has received a most exact and striking fulfillment in the history of France. During the Revolution, in 1793, "the world for the first time heard an assembly of men, born and educated in civilization, and assuming the right to govern one of the finest of the European nations, uplift their united voice to deny the most solemn truth which man's soul receives, and renounce unanimously the belief and worship of a Deity. . . . The atheistical power that ruled in France during the Revolution and the Reign of Terror, did wage such a war against God and His holy word as the world had never witnessed. . . . **It was in 1793 that the decrees which abolished the Christian religion and set aside the Bible passed the French Assembly. Three years and a half later a resolution rescinding these decrees, thus granting toleration to the Scriptures, was adopted by the same body.** The world stood aghast at the enormity of guilt which had resulted from a rejection of the Sacred Oracles, and men recognized the necessity of faith in God and His word as the foundation of virtue and morality.—*The Great Controversy*, p. 269-287 (emphasis supplied).

In three years and a half, the atheistic experiment of the state of France had come to an end. France could no longer be officially considered an atheistic state by the year 1798.

It cannot be said that it was an atheistic country that, in 1798, took away the power of the pope. France simply wanted to break the power that the church had exercised over the state for the previous 1260 years. So it would not be historically correct to say that atheism gave the deadly wound to the papacy. Thus, the figurative interpretation of the king of the south being atheism does not fit the record of history.

So then, is *Islam* the king of the south in Daniel 11:40? To be king of the south requires that the king rule from the territory of the south. Islam, through its caliph and caliphate, ruled from Constantinople from 1453 until 1922. This capital was located in the northern territory. Therefore, when Islam had a leader (it currently has no leader), he did not meet the necessary requirements to be considered king of the south.

Just who is the king of the south in Daniel 11:40?

The Ottoman Empire took control of Egypt, the territory of the king of the south, in 1512 and ruled until 1879. Therefore, there was no king of the south because the Sultan, who was the king of the north, ruled that territory. And without a king of the south at the time of the end (1798), verse 40 could not be literally fulfilled. But as providence would have it, Igrahim and Murad—Mamluk rulers—wrested Egypt from the Ottoman Empire and were co-ruling Egypt from 1791 up until the invasion of Napoleon. So there was indeed a king of the south in 1798 to push against the invasion of Napoleon. For more information, see Appendix D (King of the South) in *Jerusalem Caliphate and the Third Jihad*.

[Appendix B](#)

Ellen White's Daniel 11 Statement

Let's look more closely at the one statement Ellen White makes regarding Daniel 11:

We have no time to lose. Troublous times are before us. The world is stirred with the spirit of war. Soon the scenes of trouble spoken of in the prophecies will take place. The prophecy in the eleventh of Daniel has nearly reached its complete fulfillment. Much of the history that has taken place in fulfillment of this prophecy will be repeated. In the thirtieth verse a power is spoken of that "shall be grieved, and return, and have indignation against the holy covenant: so shall he do; he shall even return, and have intelligence with them that forsake the holy covenant." [Verses 31-36, quoted.]—Letter 103, 1904.

Verses 30 through 35 speak of pagan and papal Rome and their persecution of the Christian Church during the Dark Ages. Much of the history of this persecution will be repeated just before the Second Coming of Jesus.

Ellen White also says that the history of verse 36 will be repeated.

What power is spoken of in verse 36 is the big question. If it is atheistic France as many of our pioneers taught, will that history be repeated in the final days of earth's history? In what we saw demonstrated in the mid-1790s in France where it appeared that the Spirit of God had taken leave of this nation and men acted more like demons than men in the orgy of killing and wickedness that shocked all of Europe; will this experience be repeated in the future? Yes it will. Notice how the quotation continues:

Scenes similar to those described in these words will take place. We see evidence that Satan is fast obtaining the control of human minds who have not the fear of God before them. Let all read and understand the prophecies of this book, for we are now entering upon the time of trouble spoken of: [Daniel 12:1-4, quoted.] The Spirit of the Lord is being withdrawn from the world. It is no time now for men to exalt themselves.—Letter 103, 1904.

You will see that she quotes Daniel 12:1-4 which deals with a time of trouble such as this world has never seen. It is in this time that the Spirit of the Lord will be withdrawn from man and the whole world will repeat the history of what took place there in France:

. . . the spirit of unrest, of riot and bloodshed; the world-wide dissemination of the same teachings that led to the French Revolution--all are tending to involve the whole world in a struggle similar to that which convulsed France.—Education, p. 228.

So I see a very good reason for Ellen White to quote verse 36 in connection with 30-35. Not only will God's people be persecuted, in addition, the Spirit of the Lord will be withdrawn from man and the history of what took place in atheistic France will be repeated.

To read into this statement the idea that Ellen White was changing the published view of the church that France was the power of verse 36 and that now we should see it as being the papacy—is not warranted.

Appendix C

History of Daniel 11:40-45 in Adventism

The teaching in the Seventh-day Adventist Church on Daniel 11:40-45 can be divided into three periods.

First Period

During the first period, which extended from about 1841 to about 1872, Seventh-day Adventists had two views to choose from:

1. Literal View: In 1841 Josiah Litch published a verse-by-verse exposition on the entire chapter of Daniel 11 (1841 JoL, APEC 88-103). The position brought forth from his research was that the king of the north in Daniel 11:40 was the Ottoman Empire, and the king of the south was Egypt. Verse 40 was fulfilled by the Napoleonic/Egyptian/Ottoman Empire war of 1798.

2. Figurative View: In *A Word to the Little Flock*, James White wrote in 1847: “Michael is to stand up at the time that the last power in chap. 11, comes to his end, and none to help him. This power is the last that treads down the true church of God: and as the true church is still trodden down, and cast out by all christendom, it follows that the last oppressive power has not ‘come to his end;’ and Michael has not stood up. This last power that treads down the saints is brought to view in Rev. 13:11-18. His number is 666.”—(1847 JW, WLF 8.4).

There is no record showing how it was that James White came up with his view that the king of the north was the papacy. We do know that the Protestant churches inherited this view from the days of the Reformation.

In the foreword to his [Martin Luther’s] translation of Daniel, he identified the Antichrist of Daniel 11 as the papacy; the ‘small horn’ of Daniel 7 was the invading Turks.— (<http://tinyurl.com/msgk3wt>).

You can see in this next reference that Martin Luther switched from a literal view of the kings of the north and south to a figurative view for Daniel 11:40-45:

After the latter-day Roman king’s promotion of the ‘strange god’ of the Mass (at Daniel 11:39), in Daniel 11:40—comments Luther—“there follows how the Papacy will fall and sink.... We cannot here understand King Ptolemy of Egypt to be the ‘king of the south’—just as little as we can understand King Antiochus to be the ‘king of the north’.... By ‘the king of the north’—as throughout the chapter—we are here to understand the Antichrist alias the Pope. His adversary is the right, spiritual King...of Holy Christianity—Christ [the ‘King of the south’] as a ‘Counter-Saviour’ against the Pope.... ‘At the time of the end, shall the King of the south push at him’ [the Pope]. That is, when the wrath of God is coming to an end, and the Pope too is also more about to come to his end, Christ will give a ‘push’ [to the Pope]—and somehow stir up several godly Christians against him!”— (<http://tinyurl.com/15rebgo>).

There is no documentation showing that either James White or anyone else did a careful verse-by-verse exposition to explain how it was that the king of the north transitioned from being the leader of the northern portion of Alexander’s former empire to being the papacy in verse 40. In fact, there was very little said

about Daniel 11 in the published writings in the early years of the Seventh-day Adventist movement.

Not until 1862-1872 did our Church do a careful verse-by-verse study, such as Josiah Litch had done back in 1841. Our church published Smith's book, *Daniel and the Revelation*, with this verse-by-verse exposition, showing why it was reasonable and biblically consistent to view the king of the north in Daniel 11:40 as being the Ottoman Empire.

Second Period

The second period began around 1872 and ended around 1940. During this period the view published in *Daniel and the Revelation* was the predominantly accepted and publicly presented view of our denomination.

Third Period

The third period began around 1940 and continues to the present. Louis F. Were was instrumental in bringing back the Reformation figurative view that the papacy was the king of the north.

Today we have Uriah Smith's view still being published and sold in Adventist Book Centers, along with several figurative interpretations that have recently come on the scene.

Now that the figurative papal view has been given prominence, should the literal view developed in 1841, affirmed in 1872, and taught for decades be brought forth for reconsideration? The very fact that Smith's book is still being published and read, while new figurative views are being promoted, creates a situation where we can no longer speak with a united voice on Daniel 11:40-45. This is not as heaven would want it to be. What should be done? Because of the current popularity of the figurative papal view that is now widely taught in our Church, for the sake of unity, should our literal view be hushed?

There is instructive counsel in the following letters. The topic of discussion was the law in Galatians—was it moral or ceremonial? In February of 1887 Ellen White counseled that this discussion should be put aside for the sake of unity:

My husband had some ideas on some points differing from the views taken by his brethren. I was shown that however true his views were, God did not call for him to put them in front before his brethren and create differences of ideas. While he might hold these views subordinate himself, once they are made public, minds would seize [upon them], and just because others believed differently would make these differences the whole burden of the message, and get up contention and variance. There are the main pillars of our faith, subjects which are of vital interest, the Sabbath, the keeping of the commandments of God. Speculative ideas should not be agitated, for there are peculiar minds that love to get some point that others do not accept, and argue and attract everything to that one point, urging that point, magnifying that point, when it is really a matter which is not of vital importance, and will be understood differently. Twice I have been shown that everything of a character to cause our brethren to be diverted from the very points now essential for this time, should be kept in the background.—1888 *Materials*, p. 24. (Written February 18, 1887, from Basel, Switzerland, to E. J. Waggoner and A. T. Jones.)

Then, less than two months later, Ellen White gave the counsel that open discussion was now in order:

Now, my brother, things that you have said, many of them are all right. The principles that you refer to are right; but how this can harmonize with your pointed remarks to Dr. Waggoner, I cannot see. I think you are too sharp. And then when this is followed by a pamphlet published of your own views, be assured I cannot feel that you are just right at this point to do this unless you give the same liberty to Dr. Waggoner. . . . I want to see no Pharisaism among us. The matter now has been brought so fully before the people by yourself as well as Dr. Waggoner, that it must be met fairly and squarely in open discussion. I see no other way, and if this cannot be done without a spirit of Pharisaism, then let us stop publishing these matters and learn more fully lessons in the school of Christ. I believe now that nothing can be done but open discussion. You circulated your pamphlet; now it is only fair that Dr. Waggoner should have just as fair a chance as you have had. I think the whole thing is not in God's order. But, brethren, we must have no unfairness. We must work as Christians. If we have any point that is not fully, clearly defined, and [that] can bear the test of criticism, don't be afraid or too proud to yield it.—*1888 Materials*, pp. 32-35. (Written April 5, 1887, from Basel, Switzerland, to "Dear Brethren [G. I.] Butler and [Uriah] Smith.")

This lack of unity on our prophetic message "is not in God's order." But it only seems fair to bring back into notice the literal understanding our church once unitedly taught on Daniel 11:40-45. Could it be that verse 45 is about to be fulfilled, and for this reason it is the will of God that prominence be given to this important prophecy?

[Appendix D](#)

United In Spirit and Truth

In our home we have no dissension, no words of impatience. My workers are different in temperament, and their ways and manners are different, but we blend in action and stand **united in spirit**, seeking to help and strengthen one another. -- Letter 252, 1903. {Ev 102.5}

I told him just how his case was shown to me, and also told them all that the messengers of God should be perfectly **united in their views of Bible truth** and should consult with each other, and should not advance any new view until they first went to the messengers and examine those views with the Bible, and if they were correct let all the messengers spread them, and if they were error lay them to one side. Then the gospel seed would be sown in union and raised in strength; and all the messengers East and West, North and South, would be telling the same story. {3MR 401.3}

Unholy war in the church occurs when disunity in Bible truth gives rise to disunity in spirit.

Ephesians 4:1-3 "I therefore, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called, With all lowliness and meekness, with longsuffering, forbearing one another in love; Endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace."

While we are pressing together to come into unity of truth we must, at all times, remain united in spirit. In fact, without unity of spirit it will be impossible to achieve unity in truth. If we are not united in spirit we will manifest intolerance toward those who hold a different view of truth. And this is the definition of the sin of bigotry.

While we will endeavor to keep the "unity of the Spirit" in the bonds of peace, we will not with pen or voice cease to protest against bigotry.--EGW'88 356, 357 (1889). {LDE 48.1}

The most cruel, and the most incurable thing is bigotry and prejudice and it lives just as firmly in human hearts today as when Christ was upon the earth. {1888 800.1}

Bigotry, love of one's own opinion and way, has been called zeal for God, but it is of the earth, earthy. {ST, February 24, 1890}

It was the sin of bigotry that caused Israel to reject their Messiah. And it was bigotry that delayed the second coming of Jesus in 1888.

Of one thing I am certain, as Christians you have no right to entertain feelings of enmity, unkindness, and prejudice toward Dr. Waggoner, who has presented his views in a plain, straightforward manner, as a Christian should. If he is in error, you should, in a calm, rational, Christlike manner, seek to show him from the Word of God where he is out of harmony with its teachings. If you cannot do this you have no right as Christians to pick flaws, to criticize, to work in the dark, to prejudice minds with your objections. This is Satan's way of working. Some interpretations of Scripture given by Dr. Waggoner I do not regard as correct. But I believe him to be perfectly honest in his views, and I would respect his feelings and treat him as a Christian gentleman. I have no reason to think that he is not as much esteemed of God as are any of my brethren, and I shall regard him as a Christian brother, so long as there is no evidence that he is unworthy. The fact that he honestly holds some views of Scripture differing from yours or mine is no reason why we should treat him as an offender, or as a dangerous man, and make him the subject of unjust criticism. We should not raise a voice of censure against him or his teachings unless we can present weighty reasons for so doing and show him that he is in error. No one should feel at liberty to give loose rein to the combative spirit. {1888 163, 164}

We must maintain unity even if we are not all able to see Bible truth in the same light.

While all their hopes are centered in Jesus Christ, while His Spirit pervades the soul, then there will be unity, although every idea may not be exactly the same on all points. {Lt37-1887 (February 18, 1887) par. 27}

Christ prayed that His disciples might be one, even as He and His Father were one. In what does this unity consist? That oneness does not consist in everyone having the same disposition, the very same temperament, that makes all run in the very same channel. All do not possess the same degree of intelligence. All have not the same experience. In a church there are different gifts and varied experiences. In temporal matters there is a great variety of ways of management, and yet none of these variations in manner of labor, in exercise of gifts, need create dissension and discord and disunion. One man may be conversant with the Scriptures, and some particular portion of the Scripture is especially appreciated by him because he has seen it in a certain striking light. Another sees another portion as very important, and thus one and another present the very points to the people that appear of highest value. This is all in the order of God. One man blunders in his interpretation of some portion of the Scripture, but shall this cause diversity and disunion? God forbid. We cannot then take a position that the unity of the church consists in viewing every text of Scripture in the very same shade of light. {Lt29-1889 (November 8, 1889) par. 14}

We must “keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace” while we press together in our efforts to all speak the same thing. If we lay aside bigotry we can have unity. Unity will allow brethren to study together and this, in time, could lead us to the place where we would be speaking the same thing.

1 Corinthians 1:10 Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that **ye all speak the same thing**, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment.

Although possessing different temperaments and dispositions, they will **see eye to eye in all matters of religious belief. They will speak the same things**; they will have the same judgment; they will be one in Christ Jesus. {Historical Sketches, p. 124}

[Appendix D](#)

Smith and White United on the King of the South

The published position of both James White and Uriah Smith show that they were in complete unity on the identity of the king of the south:

Advent Review and Sabbath Herald

By Uriah Smith

July 22, 1858

"There is scarcely so uniform an agreement among interpreters concerning any part of the apocalypse as respecting the application of the fifth and sixth trumpets, or the first and second wo, to the Saracens and Turks. It is so obvious that it can scarcely be misunderstood. Instead of a verse or two designating each, the whole of the ninth chapter of the Revelation, in equal portions, is occupied with a description of both.

"The Roman Empire declined, as it arose, by conquest; but the Saracens and the Turks were the instruments by which a false religion became the scourge of an apostate church; and hence, instead of the fifth and sixth trumpets, like the former, being marked by that name alone, they are called woes. It was because the laws were transgressed, the ordinances changed, and the everlasting covenant broken, that the curse came upon the earth or the land.

"We have passed the period, in the political history of the world, when the western empire was extinguished; and the way was thereby opened for the exaltation of the papacy. The imperial power of the city of Rome was annihilated, and the office and the name of the emperor of the west was abolished for a season. The trumpets assume a new form, as they are directed to a new object, and the close coincidence, or rather express identity between the king of the south, or the king of the north, as described by Daniel, and the first and second wo, will be noted in the subsequent illustration of the latter. The spiritual supremacy of the pope, it may be remembered, was acknowledged and maintained, after the fall of Rome, by the emperor Justinian. And whether in the character of a trumpet or a wo, the previous steps of history raise us, as on a platform, to behold in a political view the judgments that fell on apostate Christendom, and finally led to the subversion of the eastern empire."

James White used these exact words in a book he published in 1859: *The Sounding of the Seven Trumpets of Revelation 8 and 9*.

Both of these men were quoting Josiah Litch who had written these paragraphs in 1842. So all three of these men taught that the powers of the king of the north and king of the south in the time of the end dealt with the same powers spoken of in Revelation 9—that is, Islamic powers. We know that Josiah Litch and Uriah Smith were in perfect agreement regarding Daniel 11:40. For James White to quote these paragraphs in his book tells us that he too agreed with Litch and Smith in 1859. This tells us that all our pioneers were in agreement on Daniel 11:40. When James White gave his conflicting view in 1878 we can believe his son's testimony that his father didn't really believe what he presented on that occasion but was desperate to relieve the debt on

several institutions. He was reprovved by the Lord for what he did. We should not use this isolated incidence to destroy the unity of our pioneers on the significant prophecy of Daniel 11. James White's published book lets us know that Litch, White and Smith were all in agreement on the identities of the kings of the north and south in Daniel 11:40.

Appendix E

The Loud Voice of the Three Woes

First Angel: “And I saw *another angel* fly in the midst of heaven . . . Saying with a *loud voice*. . .”—Revelation 14:6, 7.

Second Angel: “*And there followed another angel*, saying, Babylon is fallen. . .”—Revelation 14:8.

Third Angel: “*And the third angel followed them*, saying with a *loud voice* . . .”—Revelation 14:9.

Why isn't the first angel identified as the first angel? Why is it identified as *another angel* flying in the midst of heaven?

Because there was an angel that flew in the midst of heaven before this one. God is showing us that we are to make a connection between these three angels of Revelation 14 and the angel that first flew through the midst of heaven. We find this angel in Revelation 8:

“And I beheld, and heard *an angel flying through the midst of heaven*, saying with a *loud voice*, Woe, woe, woe, to the inhabitants of the earth by reason of the other voices of the trumpet of the three angels, which are yet to sound!”—Revelation 8:13.

They are all represented as flying in the midst of the heavens and speaking with a loud voice. From the similar wording used in all of these verses and from the fact that the first angel of Revelation 14 is called another angel we can see that the three woes are to link with the three angel's messages of Revelation 14.

What's the connection? Before we look at the link, let's first find out who these angels are who we see flying in the midst of heaven. The Greek word for angel is “aggelos” which simply means a messenger. John the Baptist was called an aggelos. So these angels represent human messengers who will be preaching these messages.

“The angels are represented as flying in the midst of heaven, proclaiming to the world a message of warning, and having a direct bearing upon the people living in the last days of this earth's history. No one hears the voice of these angels, for they are a symbol to represent the people of God who are working in harmony with the universe of heaven.”—*Selected Messages*, vol. 2, p, 387.

So what is the connection between the preaching of the three messages of Revelation 14 and the preaching of the three woes mentioned in Revelation 8?

The “1843” prophetic chart of the Millerite movement and the two prophetic charts (1850, 1863) of the Seventh-day Adventist Church all illustrate the three woe angels. Charles Fitch designed his chart in May of 1842. In 1850 Otis Nichols redesigned the chart, adding the angel of Revelation 8:13 flying through the midst of heaven announcing the three woes. Also added are the three angels of Revelation 14. The first two are looking back signifying that these two had been given in the past and the third angel is looking forward. He places the third angel and the third woe under the same time period. Then in 1863 the

chart was again revised by James White. It still has the Revelation 8:13 woe angel along with a depiction of the three woe angles and the three angels of Revelation 14.

The first angel's message was sounding throughout the world from 1837 through 1844 with the second angel's message joining it in 1843. It was the time prophecy of the first woe which connects directly to the time prophecy of the second woe that, when fulfilled on August 11, 1840, gave great power to the sounding of the first and second angel's messages. It was this connection that gave the messages their loud voice. In 1905 J.N. Loughborough wrote:

"This striking fulfillment of the prophecy had a tremendous effect upon the public mind. It intensified the interest of the people to hear upon the subject of fulfilled and fulfilling prophecy. Dr. Litch said that within a few months after August 11, 1840, he had received letters from more than one thousand prominent infidels, some of them leaders of infidel clubs, in which they stated that they had given up the battle against the Bible, and had accepted it as God's revelation to man. . . . Instead of Elder Miller now standing, as he had previous to 1840, 'almost alone' in declaring the message, about three hundred joined him in publicly proclaiming the termination of the twenty-three-hundred-day period . . ."—*The Great Second Advent Movement: Its Rise and Progress*, pp.132, 133.

Ellen White confirms this history:

"At the very time specified, Turkey, through her ambassadors, accepted the protection of the allied powers of Europe, and thus placed herself under the control of Christian nations. The event exactly fulfilled the prediction. When it became known, multitudes were convinced of the correctness of the principles of prophetic interpretation adopted by Miller and his associates, and a wonderful impetus was given to the advent movement. Men of learning and position united with Miller, both in preaching and in publishing his views, and from 1840 to 1844 the work rapidly extended."—*The Great Controversy*, p. 335.

Do you see the connection? Do you now see why the angel of the first angel's message is called another angel rather than the first angel? The preachers, by linking the prophecies of the first and second woe to the first and second angel's messages, gave a loud voice to their preaching. With this being the case, it is reasonable to expect to see the message of the third woe giving power to the third angel's message when linked together.

Just as it was a prophecy connected with the first and second woe, that when fulfilled, gave power to the first and second angel's messages, so it could likely be a prophecy connected with the third woe, that when fulfilled, would help swell the message of the third angel.

Is there a prophecy that is connected with the third woe? To answer this question we would first need to clearly identify the third woe. And to do that I would invite you to go to thirdwoe.com (Password: 1844) and on the *Documents* page you will find a document entitled *Third Woe Symposium Presentation*. In this presentation I show that the third woe is the third Jihad that the world is about to encounter.

This understanding of the third woe fits well with Uriah Smith's teaching on Daniel 11:45. In fact, that is how I came to this understanding. If we take

Smith's view of Daniel 11:45 and place it into the 21st century, he is teaching that Turkey will establish the Islamic Caliphate in Jerusalem, thus fulfilling verse 45. I believe that the climax of the third woe will follow the fulfillment of Daniel 11:45. The prophecy of Daniel 11:45 and the third woe of Revelation fit hand in glove.

If the Third Jihad is the third woe and if the prophecy of Daniel 11:45 is directly related then we have with this third woe a relevant, current affairs issue to present to the world just as Josiah Litch had with the second woe. We could once again use to great advantage the message of the woes as did our pioneers.

“And I saw *another angel* fly in the midst of heaven . . . Saying with a *loud voice*. . .”—Revelation 14:6, 7.

We see in this loud-voiced angel flying in the midst of heaven a divine directive from God to be this messenger and give to the world the three angel's messages. We know that this is our mission.

But what about the loud-voiced angel flying in the midst of heaven brought to view in Revelation 8:13? Doesn't that angel also represent the people of God? Is not this verse also a divine directive from God to declare the message of the three woes? What reason can we offer heaven for neglecting this clear directive? When have you heard, in an evangelistic series on 3ABN or Hope TV, a sermon connecting the three woes with the three angel's messages? As evidenced by the evangelistic charts, our pioneers did not fail to do this.

Satan saw what happened when the angel flying through the midst of heaven crying with a loud voice, Woe, woe, woe united with the first and second angel's message. He is not about to let that happen with the third angel's message. He will do all in his power to keep the message of the third woe apart from the message of the third angel. He will do everything he can to keep the messengers of the third angel from understanding the third woe. However, he is not going to win this battle! Revelation 8:13 tells us that he won't. Join me in sounding the message of the three woes with a loud voice and help fulfill this important commission revealed to us in Revelation 8:13:

“And I beheld, and heard an angel flying through the midst of heaven, saying with a loud voice, Woe, woe, woe, to the inhabitants of the earth by reason of the other voices of the trumpet of the three angels, which are yet to sound!”—Revelation 8:13.

[Appendix F](#)

Ellen White's Position on Daniel 11:40-45

Did Ellen White ever endorse the interpretation of Daniel 11:40-45 as we find it presented in Uriah Smith's book, *Daniel and the Revelation*?

Willie White, Ellen White's son, saw significance in the fact that his mother commented in the Testimonies on Uriah Smith's presentation on the Eastern Question (1877):

I do not know of any utterance of mother's that tells us about the King of the North. The two things that most nearly approach to it, are the statement in *Testimonies*, v. 9, p. 14 and *Testimonies*, v. 4, p. 279. Here, in reporting the Danvers campmeeting, she wrote: "Eld. Smith spoke in the morning on the Eastern Question. The subject was of special interest, and the people listened with the most earnest attention." These things are not proofs, but they seem to me to be very interesting indications.—Letter from Willie White to Elder John Vuilleumier, March 6, 1919.

A summary of this lecture Ellen White was commenting on was reported in the Boston Evening Journal, August 27, 1877. The report shows clearly that Elder Smith's Eastern Question lecture was related to the prophecy of Daniel 11:45. See: <http://tinyurl.com/qzk2p6x> (second page, fifth column).

If Willie White thought that that statement provided an interesting indication, what do you suppose he might have said if he had recalled the following two statements discovered in the collection of letters and manuscripts recently released (July 16, 2015) by the White Estate?

The evening meeting was largely attended. Elder Smith spoke with great clearness, and many *listened with open eyes, ears, and mouths. The outsiders seemed to be intensely interested in the **Eastern question***. He closed with a very solemn address to those who had not been preparing **for these great events in the near future**.—Lt55-1884 (August 24, 1884) par. 7, emphasis supplied.

Elder Daniells speaks this evening upon the **Eastern Question**. May the Lord give His Holy Spirit to inspire the hearts to **make the truth plain**.—Ms189-1898 (December 25, 1898) par. 9, emphasis supplied.

I believe that Willie White would have seen significance to the fact that Ellen White connected the word *truth* to the interpretation that Elder Daniells was giving in his presentation on Daniel 11:45 (Eastern Question).

Significant also is Ellen White's indicating that the Eastern Question was connected with "great events in the near future" for which people needed to prepare. Those great events, directly connected to Daniel 11:45, are listed in the very next verse—the close of probation, the great time of trouble and the Second Coming of Jesus. Elder Smith's presentation to those many intensely interested, open-mouthed "outsiders" was showing how the prophecy of Daniel 11:40-44 related to recent history and how events in the Middle East could develop into fulfilling verse 45—the final, unfulfilled waymark of Daniel 11 that heralds the imminent closing of human probation.

In three separate years—1877, 1884, and 1898—Ellen White spoke of the Eastern Question. It seems from the plain reading of these statements that Ellen White endorsed the interpretation that Smith and Daniells were giving to Daniel 11:45. If this is true, then we too can present the interpretation of Daniel 11:36-45 as taught in Smith's book *Daniel and the Revelation* with confidence, knowing that we are teaching truth.

We need to speak with one voice on the great lines of prophecy. Perhaps God saw that we needed to hear from His messenger regarding this prophecy in order to bring us all into unity, and so, in God's providence, these statements were just released.

How do we know that the Eastern Question that Daniells was presenting was all about Daniel 11:40-45?

You will find what Elder Daniells taught regarding the Eastern Question starting on page 49 of his book, *The World War: Its Relation to the Eastern Question and Armageddon*, which you can read here:

<http://tinyurl.com/ouvknwy>

The Eastern Question for Elder Daniells was all about Daniel 11:40-45. This was also the focus of the chapter entitled, "The Eastern Question," in the book, *Bible Readings for the Home Circle*: <http://tinyurl.com/qc7ucph>

The following statements from two separate General Conference Session Secretary's reports provide additional evidence that Daniel 11 was the focus of the message Elder Daniells and Elder Smith were giving when they presented the Eastern Question:

For many years we have watched the Eastern question narrowing down toward the final fulfillment of Daniel 11.—May 14, 1909, W.A. Spicer, GCB 12.10.

Elder Allen Moon, president of the Lake Union Conference, in a recent letter had this to say about using newspapers: "Knowing your interest in the use of the public press in calling attention to revealed truth and the principles of righteousness, I will forward a few facts which seem to bear testimony in favor of making use of this means in reaching the sincere seeker after truth. In our little city (South Bend, Ind., which has a population of about fifty-three thousand) we have two daily papers. Both of these have, during the past winter, published articles treating on the peculiar views held by Seventh-day Adventists, notably an article on the *Eastern Question, showing the unfolding of the prophecies of Daniel 11 in the events transpiring in the land of the Turk*. It was stated that this prophecy contained an outline in advance of history now being made by the events of the Balkan war. The article was printed in full, and attention called to it in the editorial. The result of the publication of the various articles in these two dailies has been to bring our people into prominence, and to set in motion a train of inquiry regarding other points of faith. The editor of one of the papers regarded these questions of such importance and interest to his readers that he looked up some Adventist people, and by telephone asked for further articles on special subjects.—May 21, 1913, W.A. Spicer, GCB 80.10, emphasis supplied.

A synopsis of George B. Starr's sermon on the Eastern Question can be read from a Chicago newspaper, 1886, last column (<http://tinyurl.com/qf9h32p>).

This gives us more insight as to what Daniells and Smith were presenting when speaking of the Eastern Question.

Notice also that Ellen White associated war with the final verse of Daniel 11:

The world is stirred with the spirit of war. The prophecies of the eleventh of Daniel have almost reached their final fulfillment.—*Review and Herald*, Nov. 24, 1904.

The readers of the *Review and Herald* in 1904 would have understood what she meant by that statement. They knew of her support for the book *Daniel and the Revelation*, and they knew that it taught that there was only one more verse in Daniel 11 to be fulfilled.

Read the first blog posted at this site: <http://daniel1145.com/index.php/blog>

And listen to what the President of Turkey (king of the north) said in the first video posted at this site: <http://daniel1145.com/index.php/news-videos>

I think you will see from these posts that Daniel 11:45 could very well be on the verge of being fulfilled.

Contact John Witcombe at: pastorjcw@gmail.com

This booklet—along with several papers that have been written in support of Uriah Smith’s position on the trumpets and on Daniel 11—can be downloaded at: thirdwoe.com (Password: 1844).

A 50 minute lecture on the Eastern Question presented by Pastor Ken LeBrun at the 2015 Northeast Washington Campmeeting can be viewed at: <https://youtu.be/nCUUb781ejU>

Here is a presentation I gave on the Eastern Question: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LLe0XYREUt4&t=205s>

Uriah Smith’s book, *Daniel and the Revelation* can be purchased or downloaded at: daniel1145.com


Here is my website for the public: <http://www.jerusalemcaliphate.com/>

For quantity pricing, contact the author.

Cover design by Lars Justinen—Justinen Creative Group
Prophecy Waymarks Publications—June, 2015

Back Cover

Jerusalem Caliphate and the Third Jihad was written for the purpose of promoting the circulation of Uriah Smith's book—*Daniel and the Revelation*. Both books are available online in paperback and e-Book format.



“Everything that can be done should be done to circulate ***Thoughts on Daniel and Revelation***. I know of no other book that can take the place of this one. It is God’s helping hand.”—Ellen White, Manuscript 76, 1901.

John Witcombe is a district pastor in the Montana Conference of Seventh-day Adventists and an avid student of Bible prophecy.