

135.) EGW spricht nicht für unsere Zeit / EGW speaks not for our time - Parminder Biant 18.05.2020

In our class yesterday we spoke about why the church has failed in its mission and why we have failed in our mission.

As teachers it's really important to be able to discern and understand the real issues.

3SM 76: *...Whether or not my life is spared, my works will speak until the end.*

How do SDA read a statement such as this?

That EGW's writings stay valid forever. It's even more pointed or simple than that, because you would argue that Moses' writings also will have value until the end.

But we approach EGW's writings in a different way: that they speak directly to us without any application or modification. We read them literally. And we don't approach the Bible that way.

The main problem is her closeness to us, as it's just over 100 years since her death in contrast to the Bible which is much older. That can cause us problems.

Another interesting phenomenon is that until recently, a large portion of her writings weren't even available to us as they were unpublished: the unpublished writings, letters and manuscripts. So we are still discovering new material.

The Bible doesn't operate that way. The KJV is almost 500 years old, when the Dead Sea scrolls were found, when they cross referenced all this newly discovered material against the KJV, there was basically no substantial change. Whatever new manuscripts and documents were discovered, the bible has remained intact for centuries.

EGW's writings don't have the same feel to it. We still have a very modern contemporary feel about them.

The other issue is the style of her writing. It's very plain and direct. There is very little symbolology in it. At least that is what we think. So when she says she saw something in vision, often we take those things very literal and we are not willing to see that her writings could be parabolic in nature.

In summary, the two issues are: She is very close to us and she speaks very literally.

Those two issues combined with the vast scope of her writings - most people haven't even read all of her works - all of these things create an atmosphere or a culture in Adventism that they think what you read should be literally understood today. If she were alive today, she would continue to write in the same vein. There would be no modification or modernization of her works.

That seems to me being the underlying problem that Adventism has faced and not dealt with. And what that creates in the mind of some people is a backlash or a hatred of her works. So that's why there are people who would burn their books but honor and love the bible. Their reaction or experience obviously is wrong. But it's a by-product of misusing and misreading, misapplying EGW's

works. This happens on a number of levels. But our concern is in her prophetic works. When you consider her prophetic model, we should be approaching her works in the same way that we would approach John's, Daniel's, Paul's works. But we don't do that. It won't take much effort to show people that they are inconsistent, when they start applying her writings in that way. That's the church's problem.

We say we haven't rejected the past. So we have looked at another quote:

LDE 72.1

*In reviewing our past history, having traveled over every step of advance to our present standing, I can say, Praise God! As I see what the Lord has wrought, I am filled with astonishment, and with confidence in Christ as leader. **We have nothing to fear for the future, except as we shall forget the way the Lord has led us, and His teaching in our past history.**—Life Sketches of Ellen G. White, 196 (1902). {LDE 72.1}*

This is the passage we use frequently in our movement. And again we use this to attack the church. Because we say **not only has the church forgotten, but they have rejected EGW's writings**, not only her writings but our own history. Many people don't accept that what happened in the past has been true. They point to the pioneers as having made gross and serious mistakes.

What some of us are realizing now in the movement is, that the fundamental problems that we have fallen into, that we are experiencing, is that we too have made mistakes in our past history. It's not that we have rejected the pioneers or EGW, we haven't forgotten our past. What have we done? **We have not understood the issue of dispensationalism.** (With dispensationalism we are not speaking about the doctrine that evangelicals are holding to.)

Because we haven't understood how this works properly, we haven't approached bible prophecy in a correct way. And we have very little excuse for this really. Perhaps for the last 5-6 years, what concept or idea have we brought forth when we consider the history of the Millerites and our own?

Gen 15:16

*But in the **fourth generation** they shall come hither again: for the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full.*

We spoke about that issue about 6 years ago in a very pointed fashion and we went to other Bible passages:

Exo 20:5

*Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the **iniquity of the fathers** upon the children unto the third and **fourth generation** of them that hate me.*

We took this idea of 4 generations and we split Adventism from 1798 to the 2nd Advent into 4 generations or dispensations. Everybody agreed on one point: The Millerites are the 1st and we are the 4th generation.

The idea of dispensations was based upon what Bible methodology to explain and develop that? Progression and repeat & enlarge?

The **progression** model is: The story of progression is a linear story and it's useful to conceptualize it with the story of Rev 14 and the 3 angels. It begins in 1798, the TOE with the first Angel. 46 years

later, the 2nd angel arrives and then months after its arrival the 3rd Angel arrives and the 3rd Angel goes from that point to the end of time. You see that those Angels run sequentially one after the other.

The events at the beginning bring you to the events at the end. Things get progressively worse.

If you go to Rev 18:2 with Millers rule No.1 and look at the **concept of progression** you go from one step to the next:

What word or phrase would you see is most important in Rev 18:2?

“Is fallen is fallen?” No, because this says **repeat** and not progression.

“Is become” = progression

That’s the important phrase, rule No. 1 in connection with our subject: Find the most important word in your study. That’s the practical use of rule No.1.

Which words are important or more important than others? That which is the most important word for our study.

What’s the problem with that? Every word is important and the most important word can change.

What we want to see depending upon the subject of the study, the most important word can change.

So because our subject is progression, what we don’t want to see or what is not the most important concept is that the angel says the same thing twice. Because the angel hasn’t changed, there is no progress. At the beginning he says: fallen; at the end he says: fallen. There is no progression.

The idea of progression is to build upon the past, to progress, to evolve. So if you look at the verse and you want to think about progression, what progression has been made?

At the beginning, what was there? There was a cage at the beginning and that cage remained all the way through but what happened with that cage? At the beginning it was empty and now it’s full. So we see progression, we see the cage has got progressively filled with birds. At the beginning there were no birds, then Rev 14:8, the angel comes and says: the first bird is there and then there will be more and more until the end.

Rev 18:2: The hold of every foul spirit. Hold = prison

We can see progression here. How many dispensations do we have then? How many people, children do we have then? One generation.

Luk 21:32: This generation shall not pass or die.

It’s the generation that sees the beginning to the end.

What happens in 1798? What do we suddenly get?

We are in Revelation 12:6, the woman has run into the wilderness until 1798 and then what happened?

Rev 12:17: The dragon was angry with the woman, but could not hurt her. So instead he went to make war with the remnant of her seed.

Luk 21:32

Mark 13:30

Math 24:34

Rev 12:17

This is Adventism, true and correct. One generation.

So we take EGW’s writings and she belongs to our generation. She is the same generation for us. Like we would say, Paul was the prophet for his generation and that generation lasts a great time:

Children, grandchildren, grand grandchildren were born. From the birth of John the Baptist to John the Revelator in Patmos we have minimum 4 generations. But we would say that those writings apply

to that singular generation and that is how we approach EGW's writings. She is the prophet to the remnant, Adventism, and her writings apply for that one generation - Laodicea or Adventism.

So Adventists are correct to view it that way, but what have we done in the development of our studies? We have divided that history into 4 generations. When you do 4 generations, you see that each generation basically repeats the crimes of the previous generation.

We took that principle and applied it to the history of the priests. The priests are 1 generation, or 1 dispensation. But we divided it into 4 parts: ploughing, former rain, latter rain, harvest. And when we did that we begin to see a repeating pattern. So we go from 1 dispensation to 4 and each one has this recurring theme. That's what we did with the history of Adventism.

What principle do we use when we start thinking about histories? If we had a history here, how do we normally conceptualize that when we want to understand about the end? We always look at the beginning and call it alpha and omega. We don't look at the middle first but always at the beginning and the end.

This line is Adventism divided into 4 generations: The people are: **Miller for the 1st generation**, EGW for the 2nd generation, after her death we don't have any direction, after that we have Jeff for the 4th generation. So **our primary prophet to understand our history should be Miller and not EGW**. We look at the alpha, the 1st generation to understand about the omega, the 4th generation.

But most SDA don't even consider Miller being a prophet. EGW had no participation in the beginning of Adventism - none. She had no prophetic role. She comes in after that history.

The point I want us to see is that the way we apply EGW and the importance that we give her writings at the very core foundation is not right.

When we think about prophecy our primary reference point should be Miller and he becomes a symbol of that whole movement: Miller and his associates - Pippenger and his associates. But we are so focused upon EGW's writings that we have turned her into the definitive answer for our own history.

EGW says the Millerite history was the foundation of Adventism, so she supports that fully. It would be also the foundation for future generations. Just this simple illustration shows us that the way we are approaching the SOP has problems. It isn't quite correct.

We need to consider progression, Luke 21, Rev 12. We need to consider repeat and enlarge, alpha omega, the 4 generations of Adventism, the first and last; and when we consider all these aspects, it gives us the license to begin to look at EGW's writings in a different way. In a more accurate and honest fashion.

We know that the church has got its problems. It is Laodicea. There is no point in criticizing them.

The criticism should be upon ourselves because we claim to be better – but we have done the same mistake. And the reason why we haven't noticed, why it's so deceptive, is that we haven't rejected the literal history. But we have rejected the methodology that the Millerites used. Prophecy was seen to be a figurative or symbolic representation of history that would bring you to the end of the world and once we claim to hold on to that idea and we use it perfectly happily when we go to the scriptures.

The KS goes from France to UDSSR to Russia. No one has a problem with that. But when it comes to EGW's writings we throw away all of those principles. We don't use those same rules to study EGW's writings than to study the bible. Why don't we do that? We have a different approach because she is so close. We take Luke 21 and think she is part of our generation but she is not. She is part of a

previous generation. And therefore **we should use her writings in the same way we approach Paul's writings. Same we approach the bible.**

Literal history has to be understood symbolically and that's what we have refused to do.

We do that for different reasons:

The **church** because they have **rejected all of the past.**

Us because we have **rejected the methodology.**