

Daniel 11: “The Takedown of the USA and Adventism”

Part One: 'The Dilemma'

The purpose of this series of articles, is to identify the underlying reason, or operative principle, driving the ‘new issues’ that are currently confronting us as a nation and as a church. Covid 19, Social Justice, Critical Race Theory, Woke, LGBTQ, Women’s Ordination, Same Sex Marriage, Global Warming, Evolution, Liberals vs Conservatives, Democrats vs Republicans, and so on.

Daniel 11, along with Revelation 13 and 17, will help us to define the underlying cause that has produced these inevitable effects.

First, a word regarding the title of this series of articles. I do not believe in conspiracy theories, or the use of eye catching and sensational titles and headlines. I do believe however in calling something what it is. Especially when that something directly affects my country and my church.

In my personal quest to understand the meaning of words and the intent that they convey, I go to Webster’s 1828 dictionary to look them up. It is my understanding that Noah Webster produced that particular dictionary in order to guard the language of our US Constitution. It is interesting to see that he often uses Scripture to illustrate the meaning of a word. With such ‘services’ as Wikipedia and others, our language is ever changing where it no longer conveys the original intent of a word.

More and more, we are exposed to seemingly new issues that are happening in our society and church which require some kind of a name. Most, if not all of these issues are simply a new manifestation of an older original version. It seems that now we give them a more sophisticated name, as the old ones no longer work due to being ‘outdated’ or politically incorrect—even going so far sometimes as to label them as hate speech. Also, when we give them a new term or name, somehow it becomes worthy of our attention and study again. In other words, we change the name, hoping to change the perspective.

Setting the Stage

To begin with, though we’ll be looking at the last portion of Daniel 11, we are going to do so with a different set of glasses. I have noticed along with many others, that within Adventism there are different schools of thought, or camps, so to speak, when it comes to the study of Daniel 11, particularly from verse 36 on. The kings of the south and north are highly debated and usually boils down to two or three accepted interpretations.

Having said that, I would like to point out a principle that I believe is highly relevant to this study and to the debate as to who the KOS and KON represent. This principle is found in two other histories who also engaged in a study of their present truth as found in the book of Daniel.

Both of these groups ran into interpretive trouble when studying their unfulfilled portion of Daniel, just as we have.

The first history had to do with the Jews in the time of Christ, and the second was with the Millerites. In both cases their study of present truth came from the book of Daniel, and each detailed a series of events leading to a movement of Christ. The present truth of the Jews was the seventieth week of Daniel 9, and the present truth for the Millerites was the end of the 2300 years of Daniel 8. One involved a movement from the courtyard to the holy place, and the other a move from the holy place to the most holy place.

The same is true of our time, with our present truth found in the last unfulfilled portion of Daniel 11, which leads directly to the final movement of Christ in Chapter 12:1.

The principle is found in the book *The Great Controversy*, in the chapter called *Light Through Darkness*. On p. 352-353 Mrs. White lets us know that *“As the disciples were mistaken in regard to the kingdom to be set up at the end of the seventy weeks, (their present truth from Daniel 9) so Adventists were mistaken in regard to the event to take place at the expiration of the 2300 days”*. (Their present truth from Daniel 8).

She then gives us the reason for the mistakes: *“In both cases there was an acceptance of, or rather an adherence to, popular errors that blinded the mind to the truth.”* Backing up a page, she also tells us that *“Errors that had been long established in the church prevented them from arriving at a correct interpretation of an important point in the prophecy”*.

- Acceptance: A receiving with approbation or satisfaction; favorable reception; as work done to acceptance.
- Adherence: The quality or state of sticking or adhering.
- Prevent: To hinder; to obstruct; **to intercept the approach or access of.**

When I consider the meaning of these words, I find that the same thing also applies to me in how I understand our present truth in Daniel 11. Acceptance would imply that the disciples and Millerites were satisfied with the prevailing interpretation of the truth for their time. But she then uses the word adherence, implying instead that they were either uncomfortable or unable to see outside of the popular and long established errors held by the church. In other words, they were stuck in those established errors, and those errors intercepted the approach of the correct meaning, and denied its access.

The Interpretative Camps of Adventism

In the debate of Daniel 11:40, there are three main camps within Adventism when it comes to the identity of the king of the north and the king of the south: Turkey and Egypt, the Papacy and Atheism, and the Papacy and Islam. One prominent Adventist minister boils his version down to the KON and the KOS both being Satan, making each entity a direct representative of Satan.

Taking that thought in a different direction will help us to see an obvious but overlooked point—that is, without exception, each of the accepted views within Adventism have attributed satanic characteristics to the king of the north, and to the king of the south.

How one arrives at that conclusion depends greatly upon the identity of the ‘willful’ king of verse 36—the king that does according to his will. The key to correctly identify this king and other components of the prophecy, is to correctly identify the ‘Daily’ of Daniel 11:31.

As we will see, the nature of this king, whether it be good or evil, determines the nature of the KON and the KOS, whether they in turn be good or evil. This same principle is also seen in the two opposing views of the ‘Daily’ as one view ascribes satanic attributes to this entity, while the other ascribes godly attributes.

Here again, there seems to be three prevailing views concerning the king of verse 36, and the KON and KOS. One view says that the king of verse 36 is the same as the KON; another that the KON and KOS are in a direct battle against each other, and have no bearing to the king of verse 36; while yet another view says that the KON and KOS are united in battle against the king of verse 36. And then yet again, there are two accepted views of the identity of the king of verse 36 that come to us primarily from either James White, who saw that king as the Papacy, and Uriah Smith, who saw that king as France.

Currently:

- Three views of the identity of the king of the north, and the king of the south.
- Three views concerning the relationship of the three entities to each other.
- Two views of the identity of the king of verse 36.

These represent the prevailing camps in Adventism, and are derived from the use of different methods of interpretation. The method one uses will determine the conclusion that is reached. Each of these conclusions have the official sanction of the BRI and our scholars. In other words, at the highest level in Adventism, they do not know. In addition to these three ‘established’ views, there are multiple independent versions circulating around as well.

The Interpretative Process

In looking over the various presentations in the latest round of annual discussions concerning Daniel 11, I am reminded of a point EA Sutherland brings out in his book entitled *Living Fountains or Broken Cisterns*, p. 350.

“Said a mother, ‘Two and two are what?’

The boy hesitated.

'Surely you know that two and two make four.'

'Yes, mama; but I am trying to remember the process.'

'Process indeed!'..."

He then goes on to define the 'process' a little further,

One day Mary was bending over a tablet writing words on both sides of a straight line, like multiplied numerators and denominators.

"What are you at now?" Asked Grandma.

Mary answered with pride, 'I am diagraming.'

'In the name of sense, what's diagraming?'

'It's mental discipline. Miss Cram says I have a fine mind that needs developing. Look here, Grandma, now this is the correct placement of elements. 'Fourscore' and 'seven' are joined by the word 'and,' a subordinate connective copulative conjunction. It modifies 'years,' the attribute of time. 'Ago' is a modal verb of past time. The root of the first clause is —.'

'Why, that's Lincoln's speech at Gettysburg. I keep it in my work-basket and know it by heart.'

"Indeed! Well, 'ours' is a simple personal—."

"That's enough. If President Lincoln had been brought up on such stuff, that speech would never have been written. He called a noun a noun, and was done with it."

And that is the point.

Another well-known Adventist scholar in this debate defines his methodology as a "linguistic, syntactical, and grammatical analysis of the text." Other scholars use similar impressive words. There is an ever increasing use of intellectual sounding words in an attempt to pinpoint to precision how each scholar is reaching his or her conclusion. In effect they have created an elite and non-attainable world, complete with its own language, that requires a go-between to dumb it down for the average person.

It is this very process that not only renders the average layman unable to comprehend or to contribute, but has also become a snare for our theologians and scholars. They are stuck in an endless process, *"ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth"* when instead it is our privilege to come to the point where we should *"let us now hear the conclusion of the whole matter."* (2 Timothy 3:7; Ecclesiastes 12:13)

In this process, they find themselves in the dilemma of Isaiah 29:11-12. “And the vision of all is become unto you as the words of a book that is sealed, which men deliver to one that is learned; saying, ‘read this, I pray thee’ and he saith, ‘I cannot; for it is sealed.’”

When they say to us that the prophecy cannot be understood because it is not yet fulfilled, and their interpretation may turn out to be incorrect; they are in effect telling us that the prophecy is still sealed. And for them it most surely is, as they have placed themselves in a bewildering maze of interpretive methodologies that prevent them from arriving at a definitive and concise interpretation of the prophecies of Daniel 11, and Revelation 17.

If for instance, someone were to ask ten different geologists from the different secular universities how a particular rock got there, instead of getting a united response of which all ten were agreed, you would invariably get multiple and conflicting answers. This is due to the ‘process’ they each use to arrive at their studied conclusions, though they all come under the umbrella of the theory of evolution. In a sense, the same has become true within Adventism concerning in particular, the books of Daniel and Revelation, with each individual method, or process of interpretation, falling under the broad umbrella of Historical Grammatical, or Higher Critical methodologies.

In other words, these umbrellas allow for multiple ‘right answers’ when the reality is, in either case, that none of them are correct.

You Mean Us?

But is it fair to place all of the blame on our leaders, or to lay on their shoulders the burden of discovering all of the truth for us?

The next verse deals with us as members and laymen. “And the book is delivered to him that is not learned, saying, ‘read this, I pray thee’ and he saith, ‘I am not learned’”.

In the Dark Ages the Bible was chained to a desk, written in Latin—a language the common people could not understand, and it was claimed that only the priests and the pope were capable of interpretation. The only difference now is the language has changed to Greek and Hebrew—another language the common people cannot understand, and that same claim is put forth that it must be interpreted by our scholars and the BRI. In each case it is the ‘church’ who claims the right to interpret.

This can most certainly work both ways. Our scholars claim that they only can understand, but then we allow it to be so. Shame on us. Instead of becoming intelligent as to how to study for ourselves, we just sit in our easy chair and read someone else’s book on the subject, or opt to sit in that same easy chair and let 3ABN do the digesting for us. We rarely consider the fact that the Holy Spirit is promised to any and all who will diligently and earnestly “study to show themselves approved.” (2 Timothy 2:15)

We as Adventists are a movement based on prophecy. Not only is the existence of our church a fulfillment of prophecy, but like Daniel and his three friends, we are also to be the premier interpreter of prophecy. It was Daniel's correct interpretation of prophecy that won from king Nebuchadnezzar the statement—"Of a truth it is, that your God is a God of gods, and a Lord of kings, and a revealer of secrets, seeing thou couldst reveal this secret" (Daniel 2:47). The same should be true with Adventism, and we should ever remember that it was our distinct interpretation of prophecy that set us apart from all other churches on planet earth. We knew how to give the trumpet a certain sound.

Conclusion

In writing this article, I sincerely hope I am not seen as blasting away at our leadership, as I recognize that they are far more intelligent thinkers than I. They themselves have acknowledged the need to step back and carefully examine their hermeneutical procedures. It is only an attempt to set a framework that will allow us to see Daniel 11:31-45 through a different perspective. In doing so, we need to bear in mind that there is a reason, or cause, that produced those prevailing and long established errors in the church. It was no accident that each group was blinded to the correct understanding of their present truth, and the very same dilemma exists in our own Seventh Day Adventist church. "As the bird by wandering, as the swallow by flying, so the curse causeless shall not come." (Proverbs 26:2) The cause always produces the effect.

Daniel 11 correctly understood, gives us the reason for the chain of events detailed in Revelation 12 through 18. Put in a different way, these verses in Daniel 11 detail the operative principle that will cause America to speak as a dragon.

In this article we have seen that there are two issues that confront us in regard to the correct interpretation of Daniel 11:31-45. One is the effect of popular and long held errors in the church, and the other are the effects of our methods of interpretation. In the next part of this series we will take a closer look at the main error that prevents us from correctly understanding Daniel 11. Samson's riddle holds the key that will let us see this error for what it is, and is the subject for part two.