

134.) Wie ist EGW zu nutzen? / How to use EGW- - Parminder Biant 17.05.2020

In the last class we were seeing **how successful** we were as a movement but also **how much of a failure** we have been:

How have we been so successful and such a failure at the same time?

We have been observed and we were observing.

As observers we have been successful and we have accepted dates and events.

As people that were being observed we failed completely.

The question is, as people were being observed, how comes people have failed?

What has been the underlying issue why people have failed?

The reason we failed is because we **didn't understand the methodology of parable teaching** and we **took literal history and applied it literally.**

The way we have approached this issue is through the lens of Isa 46,10.

God wants to show us the end from the beginning. He shows it to us in the present.

Isa 46,10 works upon this premise: past, present, future.

God will show you the future by explaining the past and he does that in the present.

The future (end) is still ahead of you and the past (beginning) is behind you.

So it has these 3 components to it: past, present, future.

We **accuse the church of having rejected the past.** This issue is addressed in following EGW quote:

LDE 72:

*In review of our past history, having travelled over every step to advance of our present standing, all I can say is Praise the Lord. As I see what God has done for us I'm astonished and I have complete confidence in Jesus as our 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.***

We used 17MR 1 and 2SM 102 to demonstrate the principle in Isa 46,10. But the above passage (LDE 72) has even a stronger connection because it has all 3 tenses in this passage: future, past and she is talking about this in the present: our present standing.

It says here: "**Lest we forget...**" We use stronger language: What do we accuse Adventism of? We accuse them of **rejecting, not just forgetting.** We use those terms interchangeably. If you reject the past, what does the future hold for you? Fear! You will make mistakes and you will not understand your present standing in the eyes of God. So we can easily accuse the church of this crime. The chart is

evidence of this. Many SDA are not even familiar with this chart because it had been rejected. The chart is nothing more than a pictorial representation of our past history, or the faith of our forefathers. Just like the artworks that we do on the whiteboards is a pictorial representation of our present faith.

We accuse them of rejecting the past, failing in understanding the future and have no idea where they stand today, because the church is waiting for something to happen that will not happen and they are looking into the wrong direction. And we as a movement have smugly thinking that we are good and they are rubbish, because **we** didn't forget our past. We didn't reject our pioneers. We do line upon line.

But we rejected something as well and **our rejection is worse** than the church's. It is worse because it is more subtle. And it becomes self deceptive because it looks like we are believing in our past but we are not. We look at the past, literally, and that's correct. But we have taken that literal past and understood it literal today. So **we went from literal to literal**, thereby **destroying the methodology of parables**.

Why did we do that?

Because **we did not know how to deal with progression and repeat and enlarge at the same time**.

The more fundamental reason is:

When you take the Bible, OT or NT, when it speaks about Israel or the Jews, we project that to Adventism. When Paul says, "We upon whom the ends of the world have come", what do we do with that? We take his statement and immediately put it upon ourselves. We don't look at the context. When Paul says "the end of the world", we say, what he meant was, "the end of the Jewish world", the end of the Jewish dispensation. That's what we would do and then we take his statement and would apply this verse upon our own history. We would recycle it.

How do we know that?

1 Cor 10,11: *All these things happen unto them for examples and they are written for our admonition upon whom the end of the world should come.*

All the things that happened to the prophets are examples for our time.

Who is Paul writing to, when he says "for our admonition"? To the people living then and there? Just from Paul's perspective Jesus wasn't about to come back. In 1 Thes and 2 Thes, Paul tells them, "don't worry about all the people that are dying because Jesus can't come back at least for a longtime." When he says "the end of the world", Paul is internally consistent with himself. What end is he talking about? He speaks to the people of his own generation and he knows that Jesus isn't coming back soon.

So what end of the world is he speaking of?

If you look at the word "world" G165

In Strong's: properly an age, by extension perpetuity

Eternity: past, present and future = everything

By implication "the world"

Thayers gives us 3 definitions for "the world":

1. an unbroken age or eternity

2. the world
3. a dispensation or period of time

So the more literal translation would be something like this:

“All this was written in the scriptures to teach us, us who live in these last days.”

Or: “As a warning for us in whom the culmination of the ages has come.”

So basically it's the end of the ages or end of the periods of time. The KJV says “world” instead.

So we all agree that the end that Paul is speaking about is not the end of the world. But when we take this passage we do say it's the end of the world.

Why did we come to this passage?

When we read the Bible we read contextually carefully. When Paul says these things are happening today, we take those statements and bring them into the future.

How do we as SDA's approach the writings of EGW? In the same way or differently?

The way we treat Paul is by looking at his context.

In the example that we gave, we know it's not the end of the world. So we apply his writings to our history.

Do we approach the SOP that way? No, with respect to prophecy.

Even a conservative Adventist would contextualize some moral issues.

But prophetically how do we deal with her writings? Plain!

Why do we treat her writings different to the Bible?

We take her writings and say that EGW is a prophet for the last days. And these began in 1798. So her writings are going to be applicable from the TOE all the way to the 2nd Advent. As a prophet her ministry covers the whole of the end of the world, literally. And that's the mistake that we make. What we are not willing to see is that when she died and the church began to go in a wrong direction, then we wandered into the wilderness, we were scattered and therefore her writings are part of past history and not for a new history. And because we have this false or incorrect understanding, the church is unable to understand who the 144,000 are and how and when they exist.

When I say the church has this problem, what's more concerning for us is that we have the same mindset. And yet what distinguishes this movement from the rest of Adventism is one issue only: It's not 911. It's 1989! Dan 11:40 was “magic”: We created a new TOE from nothing!

When we do that, what we have in essence done, is reset the clock, the stop watch.

If you reset things in that direct fashion what's one of the primary consequences of doing that - which we have ignored or not seen?

You have to reset our approach to EGW as prophet for our time.

If you reset time, then you have to reset EGW's place in prophetic history. You can't have it both ways. You can't recreate time (what we have done), brand new TOE and bring EGW with you.

You have to do one or the other:

Either you do what the church does: No new TOE and you bring EGW with you all the way to the end because she is the prophet of the end.

Or:

If you create a new TOE, then you need a new prophet. And EGW gets relegated/placed to the past history.

People see this as some kind of attack upon her. **All I'm saying is that she now has the same role, the same standing as Paul did. No less and no more.**

How do you proof that there is a new TOE?

EGW will tell you: "If you trust my ministry and if you believe that I'm really the prophet of God, then I have one principle, which is **no time setting**." **So if you follow through with her, you cannot have a new TOE.** The problem is that **if you don't have a TOE, you have no way of working out what the 144.000 are, who they are and how they are created. You lose all ability to understand end time prophecy.** So the movement has correctly identified this issue.

We have a solution for it: 1989. However we got there. Having done that, **we now need new prophets to be raised up to proof this point.**

I would refer back to an old study of mine about the different qualities or standards of prophets. Is EGW of a higher quality than Elder Jeff? Was John the Revelator of a higher or lower quality than John the Baptist? This may seem easy to answer but it's not that straight forward. You can't base it upon quantity of work nor upon quality of work. So I think it becomes a very difficult proposition to put prophets on a scale.

How can this movement reject so many prophetic concepts of EGW?

The primary one being **time setting**. This movement has just ignored the issue.

When does EGW speak about **Islam** as a major player in end time prophecy? When did she speak about **Russia** as major player? She doesn't!

New people had to be raised up to address these two players (Islam and Russia).

What they do at the same time is either minimizing her or they change EGW's version of end time prophecy. And it all is triggered by 1989.

We are intellectually dishonest, to not to admit that we are putting EGW to one side prophetically. You can maintain her morality, that's fine. Health reform, country living,... that's all OK.

But her prophetic models have been substantially changed.

Just to list these 3 things: New TOE, Islam, Russia. She doesn't even mention any of those things.

Therefore for us to develop a theology that is even underpinned by those 3 issues - that means we have a new foundation - I think we can't just pretend as it was business as normal with EGW.

And we haven't even dealt with some other issues yet: Priest, Levites, Nethinims. The lines for those 3 groups and all the implications connected with those ideas. Telling people that the church has priests they would laugh about you because EGW doesn't talk about priests.

She just says, "there is only the church and the world". And she is even stronger: she says, if one SDA stands up and says 'I'm this super elite group that is going to fight against the conference, that is God's voice on earth', what should you do as an Adventist? You should run away from them and run into the arms of the corrupt conference!

Our very existence as a movement is completely against EGWs teachings!

1989, Islam, Russia, Priests, Levites, Nethinims, Line upon Line, all these lines, organization that opposes the conference, we take tithes and offerings, we baptize,... the list we oppose EGW grows and grows. These are all prophetic issues. **I don't know how we can honestly say how EGW is our prophet in a sense that what she says is still applicable today literally.**

I still say, we should read and understand EGW the same way as we should understand Paul.

There is no SDA that takes EGW and puts her on the same level as Paul or Isaiah.

When people throw her books away, what is the statement of them?

They don't say, we hate her, or she is a liar. They are trying to say: Her literal writings cannot control my literal life.

They don't throw the bible away when they do that.

If we took this properly, we would have said: "EGW is like Paul, Isaiah, Moses. We take her writings in the same way as we take all these other people's writings." If we said that, then all those people would take the EGW books out of the dust bin and accept them. They would embrace them as they would embrace the bible.

It's **we** who have destroyed her ministry because we haven't understood **how** to use her writings.

If you say her work is to be literally understood, then thinking people (SDAs) will reject that concept because it doesn't make any sense. That's why I'm saying, the reason why we made so many mistakes, the rejecting that we did is that we have taken the past, Millerite literal history and have not used it parabolically in our history. We did literal to literal and not literal to spiritual because we kept EGW and brought her with us, whilst actually we destroyed and fought against her ministry.

3SM 76.3-4

I'm alive and I can speak to you. But I want to write it down, so that if I die there will be a record of my thoughts. ...I don't know if I will die or not, but **my writings will constantly speak and the work will go forward as long as time shall last....** (paraphrased)

I completely agree with that statement. It's true however we could say the same thing about Paul's writings. But what we have done, when she says, "my writings will constantly speak and the work will go forward as long as time shall last", we read that and if EGW says "there is a SL soon" - we take that literally right to the very end of the world. And I'm saying we can't do that, as soon as we realize that we create a new TOE and all the implications of what that means.

This is the fundamental mistake of Adventism. We have kept EGW's writings and read them literally in our history when we are not allowed to. All the NT prophets never did that. They took OT stories and reapplied them to their history. And we should do the same with EGW's writings: we should reapply them to our history. If we did that properly our church would be successful. But as it is, they have failed in their duty, but what's really sad, is that this movement, the leader (Jeff) and those that have followed him have fallen into the same trap; in fact another way to express this, they never got out of that ditch that they were in. It's not they fell into it but they never came out of the ditch.

Discussion after class:

EGW forbids you to have 1989 because she forbids you to set time. So by what authority do we set 1989?

The Jews asked Jesus: "By what authority do you say everything of this? You are fake!"

Jesus answered: "You just misread the old prophets."

How could they prove that Jesus was the messiah? There was no evidence. You just can't prove it!

Same with 1989: we have no evidence; we just can't proof it from the Bible.

Same at Noah's time: even though it was raining they didn't believe it.

You have to trust a random person that says something. But we have evidence that it might be right.

Like 1798 was also only some mathematical calculation. You can't proof this either. But we could say that we can proof 1989 because we have Tess who confirms it - Tess as a prophet. Like EGW confirms 1798 as a prophet.

Dan 11:40 was completely fulfilled in 1798. We can't proof 1989 with EGW. All we can do now is like an auditor, trace the evidence and come up with a theory. If you take the verse and make it into our version, you have to proof text. Take the book of Revelation and make a resurrection of the beast. So we can make these assumptions.

Millerites had their faith on the foundation of a 16 year old farmer, which was crazy as well.

That's why Atheists have problems with us, because it's not provable what we believe.