

The Daniel 11 River

Daniel 11 is the longest stream of prophetic events in the Bible. It ends in a prophecy that is directly connected to a most important event in the great controversy—the close of human probation. Did God give to His church an understanding of this last verse, Daniel 11:45, back in the formative years of this remnant movement? I believe the answer can be found in a statement Ellen White wrote in 1899.

“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.” Ms, 174, 1899.

The reason why interest in *Daniel and the Revelation* is to continue as long as probationary time shall last is because God used the author of this book as a channel through which to communicate light to direct our minds to the true prophetic interpretation of all the major streams of prophecy found in Daniel and in Revelation which he then recorded in his book.

Do you realize what this means to God’s church? It means that we can speak with authority and with one voice on all the major lines of prophecy. Let me illustrate what it means for God to have channeled light in order that our minds might be directed to the truth.

Imagine that Daniel 11:1-45 is a river that flows through the landscape of historical events that are to take place on planet earth. This river is going to end up at a specific event which is brought to view in Daniel 11:45. There is no way that Uriah Smith and his group of “able Bible students” could, on their own, direct this river to its intended destination. God had to step in and use Uriah Smith as a channel through which to communicate light which divinely directed this prophetic river to its true destination.

God did not write the commentary on this chapter. He channeled light on these prophecies to a human agent who would then write out this commentary so that His church could know for certain where this river of prophetic truth would end up. Because this channeled light passed through a faulty human agent, there may very well be some boulders in the river that will create some white water rapids, thus obscuring a minor prophetic point along this river. But a boulder here and there in the river bed does not change the course of that river. As more light flows from God through His servants as they apply prayerful study to this chapter, increased understanding will come and if any “Smith boulders” are found, they can be blasted out of the river so that it will flow more smoothly. But this new light will not change the course of this river. Removing a boulder from a river does not affect the river’s destination. God set the course of this river of prophetic truth through his servant, Uriah Smith. Because the prophetic truth in this chapter was channeled by God Himself, we can be 100% certain that the river is running in the right course to its appointed destination.

In the mid-20th century, Louis Were decided that it wasn’t God who channeled the prophetic views on Daniel 11 but that it was the Jesuits who influenced Uriah Smith to send this river to a Turkey destination. So Louis Were erected a Were Dam around verse 36 to stop the river’s flow. Then he cut through the bank of the river bed and redirected the river down a different channel that took it to a papal destination. Others have followed his example and have erected dams in a variety of places in this chapter to redirect this river to arrive at a half a dozen different places. In doing this, they have produced a swamp of confusion.

My mission is to dismantle the Were dam with the truth that was originally channeled by God and then watch this river once again flow in the direction that God originally channeled it to go through His servant, Uriah Smith. There might be some folk who won’t be happy with anyone messing with Were Dam, but it’s too late in the day to be building dams on the great prophetic waterways of Daniel and Revelation!

On the backside of this page are some questions that Seventh-day Adventist scholars need to address.

Questions on the following two Ellen White statements need to be answered:

“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**. 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.... Satan and all his hosts are on the battlefield. **The enemy of our souls has acted the part of a busy agent in presenting the thought that many of our books now in print are in need of general revision.** He would be glad to have our brethren receive the impression that **many changes** must be made. He would delight to insinuate questioning and doubt into the minds of many of our people.” Ellen G. White, Ms. 11, 1910, July 31.

1. Should we include the book, *Daniel and the Revelation* as one of the important books of which Ellen White is speaking?
2. If we are saying that from verse 36 to verse 45 in Daniel 11 that Uriah Smith is not presenting the correct interpretation of this prophecy, that would mean that 28 pages (8,748 words) of this important book would need to be torn out and a complete rewrite of these verses be undertaken. Would this constitute a **minor correction** or a **general revision** of these prophecies?

Here is the second statement:

“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.**” Ms, 174, 1899.

1. Is God telling us in this statement that He Himself is assuming the responsibility for ensuring that *Daniel and the Revelation* will direct the reader’s mind to a true understanding on the major lines of prophetic teaching?
2. If the majority of our scholars are in complete agreement that there is no linguistic or contextual basis for a prophetic interpretation that is taught in *Daniel and the Revelation*, should we go with our scholars or should we stay with Uriah Smith?

“Coming again to the Book of Daniel I determined to try once more to find a way to be absolutely faithful to both Daniel and the traditional Adventist interpretation of 8:14, but again found it impossible. I then formulated six questions regarding the Hebrew text of the passage and its context, which I submitted to every college teacher versed in Hebrew and every head of the religion department in all of our North American colleges—all personal friends of mine. Without exception they replied that there is no linguistic or contextual basis for the traditional Adventist interpretation of Daniel 8:14.” Raymond F. Cottrell https://www.academia.edu/41578528/The_Sanctuary_Doctrine_Asset_or_Liability_by_Raymond_F_Cottrell

Wouldn’t the above two statements tell us to stay with the prophetic view taught in a book for which God has assumed the responsibility for its truthfulness? If Raymond Cottrell and his fellow scholars had accepted the above two statements as being inspired by God, they would not have gone astray on Daniel 8:14 or on Daniel 11:36-45.

John Witcombe
pastorjcw@gmail.com

For more information on this topic, watch this presentation: tinyurl.com/yynah83q
This video can also be found on the Videos page at ThirdWoe.com