

August 19, 2014

An open letter to Don Frost concerning his incorrect prophetic applications and twisted historical premises:

Brother Don,

I understand that after you interacted with Brother Duane Dewey and his wife via telephone, that you *made* a commitment to contact me. Previously, you told Brother Michael Chapman that you were reviewing my public materials, and when finished, I should expect a call from you. When Michael had brought to my attention the conversations you and he have had, I expressed my doubt in ever hearing from you. There have been numerous times when men have stated that they intend to contact me and converse upon that which they perceive to be my erroneous ideas, but they never, ever do. I found it unfortunate that Duane had put you in a position where you felt compelled to finally contact me; for by the time that you had emailed me asking to set up some future interaction between us, things had changed. Some changes, I am sure, perhaps even Duane will not understand the significance of.

“The **publications** sent forth from our printing houses are to prepare a people to meet God. Throughout the world they are to do **the same work that was done by John the Baptist** for the Jewish nation. By startling messages of warning, God’s prophet awakened men from worldly dreaming. Through him God called backsliding Israel to repentance. By his presentation of truth **he exposed popular delusions**. In contrast with **the false theories** of his time, truth in his teaching stood forth as an eternal certainty. ‘Repent ye; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand,’ was John’s message. This same message, through the publications from our printing houses, is to be given to the world today. The prophecy that John’s mission fulfilled outlines our work,—‘Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make His paths straight.’ Matthew 3:2, 3. As John prepared the way for the first, so we are to prepare the way for the second, advent of the Savior.” *Counsels to Writers and Editors*, 178.

Public statements are identified with the exposing of “popular delusions” and “false theories” as seen in the work John the Baptist. This is the justification for much that has been written in the past year and a half in the *Future for America* newsletters, and now in this open letter. Prior to your recent email stating your desire to interact with me (shortly after your phone interaction with Duane), Bill Campbell had already begun his mass promotion of your false teachings. Now that your false teachings are public, they require a public (not private) rebuke. (I am aware that beforehand you had been teaching these foolish ideas, but Bill succeeded in flooding the market and thus, has forced a response.)

So shall they fear the name of the Lord from the west, and his glory from the rising of the sun. When the enemy shall come in like a flood, the Spirit of the Lord shall lift up a standard against him. Isaiah 59:19.

If my input was of any worth to your understanding, it should have been obtained prior to the mass dissemination of your faulty ideas. I am not saying this because I believe people need to speak to me before they preach and teach their convictions, but simply because you had raised the idea several times to others that you would indeed interact with me over these things.

Over a year ago, a meeting took place at Randy Moeller's where Emiliano Richards introduced a false historical premise that has been (at least partially) adopted by you, Leo Ortiz, and probably others. I have no way of knowing whether Emiliano's false historical premise was actually co-opted by you and Leo, or if you all arrived at this false premise independently of one another—but, it matters not. That false historical premise is that I have been typified by William Miller, and (according to Emiliano and Leo) that Miller rejected the Midnight Cry message that was presented by Samuel Snow. You may not have stood upon the idea that Miller rejected the Midnight Cry as Emiliano and Leo do, but instead have reasoned that Miller was the last to receive it, and therefore I would be the last to receive your new light. Accompanying this idea is the assertion—separately claimed by you and Emiliano (both inferring it about yourselves), and Leo (directly teaching it about himself)—that you (or they) are currently fulfilling the role of Samuel Snow in presenting the modern fulfillment of the Midnight Cry.

(Some time after Emiliano inserted this teaching into the public arena, I spoke with him face-to-face about it; initially, he denied teaching it. Thereafter, I informed him that the only reason I even knew this claim existed was because those who had watched it on the internet after Randy posted it had called and emailed me about it. I also notified Emiliano of the fact that after I asked Randy if he heard Emiliano teach these things, Randy admitted it was true—though he claimed he was uncertain of what exactly Emiliano was implying in the presentation. After those two points were shared with Emiliano, he then claimed that he had not meant it that way. So, perhaps Emiliano did nothing more than publically introduce, and then privately retract, a false idea. I do not know where he stands on this teaching today.)

Miller never rejected the Midnight Cry prior to October 22, 1844. On October 22, 1844, the door closed to the Holy Place, and the door in the parable of the ten virgins was closed for the Millerites. In December of 1844, Miller reverted to his original understanding of the Midnight Cry that predated Snow's presentation of the Midnight Cry by more than a decade. For anyone to claim or infer that I (typified by Miller) am destined to reject their so-called Midnight Cry message before our door of probation closes at the Sunday Law is evidence that they do not understand the history which they are trying to use to support their misguided premises. Miller may have been the last to accept Snow's presentation of the Midnight Cry, but he did accept it.

Though I believe that you understand the previous paragraph, it is apparent to me that your understanding of Millerite history includes other erroneous ideas. For example: Samuel Snow derived his understanding of the Midnight Cry from an article that William Miller penned in May of 1843. Can you show how your Midnight Cry message has been derived from anything I have ever taught? You certainly cannot, for your teaching is based upon a totally different prophetic model than I have employed—a model that I have opposed for years. There is no connection between your Midnight Cry message and the previous teachings of the one you are identifying as being typified by Miller. Couple that with the fact that when Miller finally accepted Snow's presentation of the Midnight Cry, he (Miller) wrote a letter to Joshua Himes and publically thanked Snow for his work.

“On the Seventh Month

“Behold the Bridegroom cometh.”

“Dear Brother Himes:—I see a glory in the seventh month which I never saw before. Although **the Lord had shown me the typical bearing of the seventh month, one year and a half ago, yet I did not realize the force of the types.** Now, blessed be the name of the Lord, I see a beauty, a harmony, and an agreement in the Scriptures, for which I have long prayed, but did not see until today.—Thank the Lord, O my soul. **Let Brother Snow, Brother Storrs and others, be blessed for their instrumentality in opening my eyes.**

“William Miller. Low Hampton, October 6, 1844.” Joshua Himes, *Advent Herald Reporter*, October 16, 1844.

It appears now that you have been pressured into speaking with me, but this does not negate the fact that prior to this recent decision you had informed more than a few people that you would not interact with me because you believed that since I have been typified by Miller I would be the very last to accept your misguided teachings. Yet, the history that you have employed to form your argument shows that Miller and Snow expressed mutual confidence in each other throughout the development of the message of the Midnight Cry. Let us not be likened to that religious sect on planet Earth that has obtained the reputation of misrepresenting history in order to uphold their false views.

In this discussion, it is not I—but you, Leo, and Emiliano who have either inferred or directly claimed that I have been typified by Miller. I do reject your message, Leo’s message, and Emiliano’s; not because I was typified by William Miller, but rather because all three of you employ faulty historical analyses and incorrect prophetic applications. I will address this further in this open letter, but want to finalize a point before then.

If I have been typified by William Miller, then according to the sacred history of the Millerite movement, my rejection of the true Midnight Cry of the modern Samuel Snow (whether it be you, Emiliano, or Leo) will take place after the door closes for Adventism at the Sunday law and not before. Also, if I have been typified by William Miller, then according to the sacred history of the Millerite movement, your Midnight Cry message would be based upon work that I have done in the past, plus we would have a mutual confidence in each other. We neither hold a mutual confidence, nor is your message built upon a foundational approach that I have employed or endorsed, but rather something completely different.

Your biblical application is not new. It is a repeat of an old controversy in Adventism. James White and Uriah Smith maintained a controversy over biblical application from the time when Uriah Smith first introduced his false idea until the death of James White. Recently, a modern author (Donald E. Mansell, *Adventist and Armageddon*) has written about the terrible aftermath of Smith’s approach to biblical application. His analysis is not only essentially correct, but also a validation of James White’s criticism of Uriah Smith’s faulty biblical analysis. In the past, Louis Were also wrote several books, tracts, and articles identifying the faulty prophetic application of Uriah Smith.

The two-fold problem of Uriah Smith (which James White repeatedly addressed) is the same two-fold problem found in your teachings. We have been forewarned that in the time of the latter rain, “old controversies” would be revived. Quite frankly, your message is the echo of Uriah Smith’s foolishness.

“We are standing upon the threshold of great and solemn events. **The whole earth is to be lightened with the glory of the Lord** as the waters cover the channels of the great deep. Prophecies are being fulfilled, and stormy times are before us. **Old controversies which have apparently been hushed for a long time will be revived, and new controversies will spring up; new and old will commingle, and this will take place right early. The angels are holding the four winds**, that they shall not blow, until the specified work of warning is given to the world; but the storm is gathering, the clouds are loading, ready to burst upon the world, and to many it will be as a thief in the night.”
An Appeal to our Ministers and Conference Committees, 1892, 38.

James White repeatedly identified that the erroneous application of Uriah Smith was accomplished when Smith used history to interpret prophecy, as opposed to allowing prophecy to interpret history. The prop that Smith employed to uphold this faulty application disregarded the fact that prophetic passages are to be understood and established figuratively—not literally. The problem between Smith and White began when Uriah Smith introduced that the king of the north was Turkey, not the papacy. The old controversy of Uriah Smith is the new controversy of you, Don Frost. Perhaps you can find some solace in the fact that the recent book by Mansell, details that Smith’s false concepts tragically found a large reception within Adventism. So you may very well expect to have a good reception of your teachings, but they are still as erroneous as Smith’s was.

You, Leo, Emiliano, and other current public figures in this message have wrested both Miller’s rules and the Spirit of Prophecy to uphold your various prophetic conclusions. I say “various” because I know of not one of you that fully agree with each other. However, where all of you do manifest agreement is in the fact that each of you pass over and set aside clear historical and prophetic principles with the purpose of promoting fallacious teachings.

It has been shared with me that you question why I follow Louis Were’s teaching on the biblical rule of “before and after the cross” regarding prophetic application. It is true that I refer to Were’s books on this rule, but not because he is the point of reference. I came to understand that prophecy was to be applied figuratively long before I knew of Louis Were. In the public ministry that I have been in for almost twenty years, there was a period of time (at least three years running) that I was continuously in controversy with the “futurists” of Adventism. I was regularly being confronted by those who attempt to reapply the time prophecies at the end of the world in a day-for-a-day fashion—the Larry Wilson followers, the Dr. Robert Hauser followers, the Robert Wheeling followers, the Marvin Moore followers, and on and on. Before that period of time, I had no idea what a “futurist” was, or that the application of futuristic prophecy had been purposely invented by the Jesuits of Rome. But since that time, I have figured the Lord had a reason for me to learn that history. Perhaps your current teachings are part of that reason?

Since I was providentially in an ongoing controversy with Adventism’s futurists, it became easy to refer people to the writings of Louis Were in hopes that they could become educated on this subject. It was far easier to refer someone to a book that was already available than to re-write one. So, due to my reference to the writings of Louis Were being a matter of public record, I can understand why you may think that I derived my understanding of figurative biblical application from Louis Were—but this is not a correct assumption.

I do not actually know when or how I recognized and accepted the principle that prophecies are to be applied figuratively, but I assumed that I learned it from the Holy Spirit. That being said, the first public presentation that I ever gave began with a passage from Ellen White, and I have since employed numerous times through the years. Anytime I present this, I have always informed my audience that this is my baseline. The reason being, that I determined for them to internalize the definition of prophecy. The passage reads as follows:

“Historical events, showing the direct fulfillment of prophecy, were set before the people, and the **prophecy was seen to be a figurative delineation of events** leading down to the close of this earth’s history.” *Selected Messages*, book 2, 101–102.

It was always vitally important for me to layout and assist in understanding the definition of prophecy before we began to study it. Next, I covered the definition of “figurative” from the *1828 Webster’s* dictionary.

FIGURATIVE: 1. Representing something else; representing by resemblance; **typical**. 2. Representing by resemblance; **not literal or direct**. *Webster's 1828 Dictionary*.

Ellen White, not only Louis Were, informs us that prophecy is “a figurative delineation of events.” Sometime after my confrontation with the time setters of Adventism, I began to realize that literal applications of prophecy were the work of the Jesuits. They purposely invented a prophetic application in an attempt to destroy the ability to identify the pope of Rome as the antichrist. When I began to digest that history, I came to understand that before William Miller was even born, Protestantism had so fully recognized the false Jesuit prophetic application that includes futurism’s literal application in place of the Protestant figurative application; that the Protestants had actually written books exposing and ridiculing this Jesuit application. I also found that the Protestant world never came close to fully accepting this foolish Jesuit application of prophecy until the introduction of the Scofield study Bible at the beginning of the twentieth century. That Bible incorporated a biblical commentary based upon the Jesuit ideas. From that point on, little by little, the Jesuit futuristic ideas swept over the Protestant world. When I came into public ministry, I found that those faulty ideas had also taken root within Adventism.

I find it ironic that with all the lamenting that Bill Campbell has exhibited concerning the tragic affairs of the Newport church, one of the antagonists he laments the most over is Steve Wohlberg. Isn’t it ironic that Bill can point to Wohlberg’s negative role in the Newport crisis and simultaneously disregard the fact that Wohlberg’s influence within Adventism has (at least in part) been accomplished because of his expertise on the subject of Jesuit futurism entering into the Protestant world through the Scofield study Bible? Why or how would Wohlberg or anyone that is sympathetic with his work on the Jesuit prophetic application give any credence to messengers of 9/11 that now employ those very techniques?

Sister White stated:

“Historical events, showing the direct fulfillment of prophecy, were set before the people, and the prophecy was seen to be a figurative delineation of events leading down to the close of this earth’s history.” *Selected Messages*, book 2, 101–102.

This is exactly what William Miller’s rules uphold. But you, Leo, Emiliano, and others misrepresent Miller’s rules to endorse your preconceptions and misconceptions. There is only one of Miller’s fourteen rules that identify how God reveals things to come—that rule is Rule VI.

It is unfortunate that Randy Moeller (who is also a sympathetic promoter of your teachings) would simply not ask his wife to grammatically analyze Miller’s rules. I say this because his wife is a professional expert in grammar. She is employed to write technical manuals for various business enterprises. On one hand, she must protect the companies that she is writing the manuals for from liability in case something claimed in the manual is incorrect, while on the other hand her writing must also be clear enough that the reader of the manual can understand the directions contained therein. She is a professional in English grammar, not to mention the fact that she is also a linguist, fluent in several languages. If Randy would have her carefully analyze Miller’s fourteen rules, she would indubitably find that there is only one of those fourteen rules that identify how God reveals thing to come—again, that rule is Rule VI.

RULE VI—God has revealed things to come, by **visions**, in **figures** and **parables**, and in this way the same things are often time revealed again and again, by different visions, or in different figures, and parables.

The only way God reveals things to come, according to Miller, is “by visions, in figures and parables.” In Rule VIII, Miller is in full agreement with Ellen White when he states:

RULE VIII—Figures always have a figurative meaning, and are used much in prophecy, to represent future things.

Rules VI-XIII address certain issues connected with figures, but none of the information from Rules VII-XIII contradicts that “visions, figures, and parables” is the only method “God” reveals “things to come.”

You, Leo, Emiliano, and others claim to uphold Miller’s rules, but you destroy them with your literal application of prophecy! You confuse your audience with references about prophecy being literally fulfilled, while making no distinction whatsoever to the fact that the fulfillment of prophecy is a totally different subject than the application of prophecy. It is true that every prophecy is literally fulfilled. The correct interpretation of this truth is so imperative, that it is emphasized in three (perhaps more than three) of the *Conflict of the Ages* series.

“After the Lord’s ascension, the disciples realized the fulfillment of His promise. The scenes of the crucifixion, resurrection, and ascension of Christ were a living reality to them. They saw that **the prophecies had been literally fulfilled.**” *The Desire of Ages*, 667.

“In his [Paul’s] presentation of the gospel he sought to make plain the prophecies relating to the first advent of Christ. He showed conclusively that these prophecies **had been literally fulfilled** in Jesus of Nazareth. The foundation of his faith was the sure word of prophecy.” *Acts the Apostles*, 124.

“With intense interest he [William Miller] studied the books of Daniel and the Revelation, employing the same principles of interpretation as in the other scriptures, and found, to his great joy, that **the prophetic symbols** could be understood. He saw that the prophecies, so far as they had been fulfilled, **had been fulfilled literally**; that all the various **figures, metaphors, parables, similitudes, etc.**, were either explained in their immediate connection, or the terms in which they were expressed were defined in other scriptures, and **when thus explained**, were to be literally understood. ‘I was thus satisfied,’ he says, ‘that the Bible is a system of revealed truths, so clearly and simply given that the wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err therein.’—Bliss, page 70. Link after link of the chain of truth rewarded his efforts, as step by step he traced down the great lines of prophecy. Angels of heaven were guiding his mind and opening the Scriptures to his understanding.” *The Great Controversy*, 320.

The fact that every prophecy is literally fulfilled is a completely different issue from how we establish and apply prophetic passages. Every prophecy will have a literal historical fulfillment, and you will only correctly recognize that prophecy if you seek to understand the prophetic illustrations contained in the “visions, figures, and parables” in a figurative sense.

Sister White often refers to passages in the Bible that will be literally fulfilled. This does not mean that those prophecies are unsealed to the student by relating to the passages in a literal fashion—for this would not only contradict her stated definition of prophecy and Miller’s rules, but it would be absolutely absurd. Are we to believe that when she informs us that Ezekiel 9 is to be literally fulfilled that it has to do with six angels going through the temple in Jerusalem? When are they going to rebuild that temple in order for that to be fulfilled literally? Every prophecy is literally fulfilled, but how a student of prophecy rightly divides a prophetic passage is a different consideration than how that prophecy will be fulfilled in history. If a prophetic passage is to be correctly established, a student of prophecy will analyze the prophetic passage in a figurative sense.

To build your false prophetic model while claiming to uphold Miller’s rule is quite a trick, since it requires that you cloud some issues, wrest some facts, and dazzle your audience with some titillating ideas designed to stimulate their emotional sensibilities. With all the clouds, wresting, and stimulation, you destroy Miller’s rules—while professing to uphold them! You are forced by the make-up of your audience to manifest this fancy footwork, for your audience is familiar with the following endorsement of Miller’s rules:

“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; 3. Nothing revealed in Scripture can or will be hid from those who ask in faith, not wavering; 4. To understand doctrine, bring all the scriptures together on the subject you wish to know, then let every word have its proper influence; and if you can form your theory without a contradiction, you cannot be in error; 5. Scripture must be its own expositor, since it is a rule of itself. If I depend on a teacher to expound to me, and he should guess at its meaning, or desire to have it so on account of his sectarian creed, or to be thought wise, then his guessing, desire, creed, or wisdom is my rule, and not the Bible.”

“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.

If you are going to speak to the audience that professes to be those that will actually participate in the proclamation of the third angel’s message, then you must claim to uphold Miller’s rules. But, Rule VIII claims that figures “always” have a figurative meaning. *Webster’s 1828* dictionary informs us of the meaning of “always.”

ALWAY, ALWAYS: 1. Perpetually; throughout all time; as, God is always the same. 2. Continually; without variation.

Figures “perpetually” and “without variation” have a figurative meaning. But you, as did Uriah Smith, insert a literal application to uphold your effort to allow historical events to define prophecy.

You teach that Sister White upholds a literal application of prophecy in direct contradiction to her stated words. You employ a passage from *The Great Controversy* which actually refutes your claim, but you insist otherwise. It is also of interest that the passage is primarily addressing false teachings and false teachers.

“The truths most plainly revealed in the Bible have been involved in doubt and darkness by learned men, who, with a pretense of great wisdom, teach that the Scriptures have a mystical, a secret, spiritual meaning not apparent in the language employed. These men are false teachers. It was to such a class that Jesus declared: ‘Ye know not the Scriptures, neither the power of God.’ Mark 12:24. The **language of the Bible should be explained according to its obvious meaning, unless a symbol or figure is employed.** Christ has given the promise: ‘If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine.’ John 7:17. **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*, 598.

You interpret this passage to say that prophecy can be literally applied, when she actually stated, “The language of the Bible should be explained according to its obvious meaning, unless a symbol or figure is employed.” She is stating here that a passage that possesses no symbolic or figurative meaning is to be treated as truth, not as a prophecy. You employ this identical misguided logic on Miller’s eleventh rule to attempt the same ends.

RULE XI—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.**

Miller has already established in Rule VI that God only reveals things to come by “visions, figures, and parables.” He is now helping the student to understand how to know when a passage is figurative in nature, or simply a literal passage of Scripture. In this rule and in the previous passage from the Spirit of Prophecy, you suggest that both Miller and Sister White are informing us of how to apply prophecy in a literal fashion, when in actuality they are informing us how to know when a passage is not prophetic. If it is a literal passage with no figurative meaning, then it is simply a literal passage in God’s word which possesses no revelation of things to come. This is where Randy’s wife would excel. Without any difficulty, she would easily recognize that there is no justification for suggesting that Miller’s eleventh rule somehow overturns his sixth rule.

Uriah Smith became so wrapped up in his attempt to foist his false prophetic application upon Adventism, that he placed in his evaluation of Daniel 11 a claim that the vision of Daniel 11 was a literal prophecy. His claim is a direct denial of Sister White’s claim that prophecy is a “figurative delineation of events,” and Miller’s sixth and eighth rules that state that God reveals things through “visions, figures, and parables” which “always” have a “figurative meaning.” Smith needed to place that false premise in his opening remarks of Daniel 11, since his primary point of contention was the identification of the king of the north as a literal not figurative power. The very first publication by the Millerites after October 22, 1844 was titled *The Word to the Little Flock*, which was co-authored by Joseph Bates, James & Ellen White. On page 9, James White wrote:

“Michael is to stand up at the time that the last power in chapter 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 Revelation 13:11–18. His number is 666.”

James White knew from the very foundation of Adventism that the king of the north was Rome (figurative), not Turkey (literal). So, when Uriah Smith began to teach otherwise, White believed that he himself was defending not only Truth in a general sense, but that he was defending against an attack upon the foundational truths of Adventism. The attack that White opposed was based upon the concept of using current history to define prophecy, in connection with employing a literal application of prophetic symbols instead of a figurative application as Protestantism had always done, and as Miller's rules identify, and as Sister White thereafter confirmed. The history of the time that Smith used was referred to by the historians as "the eastern question" and had to do with the aggression of Islam (the children of the east—9/11). Smith's old controversy [which is your (Don Frost's) new controversy] has several parallel characteristics for those who will see.

It is beyond the scope of this open letter, but it needs to be noted for the few that will hear, that the Protestant rule that identifies prophecy as a "figurative delineation of events" is the rule that allowed them to become Protestants. Without that rule, they would have been unable to identify the pope as the antichrist, and would have had no justification for separating from the papal beast. We may not understand this historical fact today, but the Jesuits understood it well enough to invent the literal application of prophetic symbols for the exclusive purpose of destroying the Protestant's ability to identify the pope as the antichrist. The false rule that Smith employed—which you have now taken up—is not simply false, but it is a direct attack against genuine Protestantism, the foundations of Adventism (Miller's rules), the Spirit of Prophecy, and the true message of the Midnight Cry.

As already noted, you publically use *The Great Controversy* statement that completely denies your premise to claim that prophecy can be literally applied. You place your emphasis on the portion of the sentence that reads, "The language of the Bible should be explained according to its obvious meaning," and then suggest that a tower is obviously a tower. You cut the sentence in half to uphold your faulty premise. The sentence reads, "The language of the Bible should be explained according to its obvious meaning, unless **a symbol or figure is employed.**"

The word "tower" in the both the Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy is directly defined as a symbol, but somehow you overlook this fact and move right ahead with your presentation. The Bible identifies a tower as symbolic when it states:

And thou, **O tower of the flock**, the strong hold of the daughter of Zion, unto thee shall it come, even the first dominion; the kingdom shall come to the daughter of Jerusalem. Micah 4:8.

Sister White identifies the Tower of the flock as the second Adam. Both the second Adam and the Tower of the flock are figures of Jesus Christ.

"All that was lost by the first Adam will be restored by **the second**. The prophet says, 'O **Tower of the flock**, the stronghold of the daughter of Zion, to thee shall it come, even the first dominion.'" *Review and Herald*, October 22, 1908.

The Bible therefore identifies that a tower is a symbol of Christ, who is also a temple according to Revelation 21:22.

And I saw no temple therein: for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it.

Sister White completes this figurative loop concerning the figurative nature of a biblical tower when she states:

“The **tower was a symbol of the temple**. The lord of the vineyard had done everything needful for its prosperity. ‘What could have been done more to my vineyard,’ he says, ‘that I have not done in it.’ Isaiah 5:4.” *The Desire of Ages*, 597.

Therefore, both the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy inform any who are willing to see that a “tower” at the end of the world is a figure for a church. A biblical “tower” either represents God’s church or a fallen church at the end of the world, but you teach that it represents the Twin Towers of New York City. You prepare your listeners to accept your false contention by turning Sister White’s words upside down, by ignoring the closing words of the sentence which states “unless a symbol or figure is employed.”

You disregard that the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy both specifically define a “tower” in a figurative sense, identifying it as a church, while turning Miller’s sixth rule upside down by claiming that there is one other way that “God” “reveals things to come” beyond “visions, figures, and parables.” Your ploy in disregarding Rule VI is in turning Rule XI upside down by claiming that Rule XI is teaching the student of prophecy when he should apply prophecy literally, when grammatically Miller is simply identifying how to make a distinction between a literal or figurative passage. In essence, you turn Rule VI and Rule XI upside down. When you turn a 6 upside down, you get a 9; when you turn an 11 upside down, you get an 11. So, Miller’s rules themselves provide a figurative symbol of your work, for your turning of his rules upside down changes Rules VI and XI into 9 and 11—**9/11**—which is of course, the very history that you employ to define prophecy, as opposed to allowing prophecy to define history.

Surely your turning of things upside down shall be esteemed as the potter’s clay: for shall the work say of him that made it, He made me not? or shall the thing framed say of him that framed it, He had no understanding? Isaiah 29:16.

You and those sympathetic to you may think that the fact that turning Miller’s rules upside down figuratively produces 9/11 is simply some misguided human argument that I am employing to attack your Midnight Cry message. But I would assume the majority of the audience that might consider your teachings and my response to your teachings have already recognized that William Miller’s dream, as recorded in the book *Early Writings*, possesses the same inspiration as the Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy—we have all accepted that his dream figuratively identifies the covering up and unsealing of the truths represented as Jeremiah’s old paths. With Sister White’s inspired endorsement of these rules, we should also understand that the Hand of inspiration was as much the author of the rules as it was Miller’s dream. Therefore, the recognition that 9/11 is figuratively identified when you and others employ Rule XI to turn Miller’s rules upside down should cause a student of prophecy to step back and remember that they are standing on holy ground when they study these things.

When Jesus had fed the five thousand, He sent the disciples to the sea and told them to get a boat and cross over to the other side. He tarried behind for so long that the disciples finally left without Him. That night, in the midst of a great storm, He came to them walking on the water. He then stilled the winds. The next day He was in the synagogue in Capernaum teaching that if anyone were to be His disciple they must eat His flesh and drink His blood. This is the story of 9/11.

The tarrying time in our history began at 9/11 when the winds of strife were restrained. Thereafter, we are called to eat His flesh and drink His blood. In His time, most of those that claimed to be His disciples turned from Him, for they refused His message of eating His flesh and drinking His blood due to the same faulty prophetic approach that you and Uriah Smith have employed. Sister White is specific when she says those disciples that left Him at the synagogue in Capernaum did so because they determined to understand His words in a literal sense, and not a figurative one.

At 9/11, you and others have turned Miller's rules upside down as you repeat the controversy of Uriah Smith by employing the Jesuit technique of applying the prophetic symbols in a literal fashion in order to erect a platform to define prophecy through the current history—rather than allowing prophecy to identify current history. You argue that “towers” are the literal Twin Towers, disregarding the definition that the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy provide for “towers” as none other than Christ—the Tower of the flock. Your insistence of applying the towers literally, repeats the disciple's choice in the synagogue in Capernaum who chose to refer to Christ's body (the Tower of the flock and the Bread of Heaven) as literal, rather than figurative.

I have no confidence that any of my logic can impact the direction that you and those employing these faulty concepts are heading towards; for the disciples that turned from Christ at the synagogue at Capernaum never reversed their decision once. Instead, they turned and walked no more with Him. I am certain that you are a nice guy—I have never spoken to anyone that has interacted with you that does not submit this fact about your personality. That reputation is a pleasant Christian attribute, but it is not what is at issue here. Your false teachings are what are at issue.

“False teachers may appear to be very zealous for the work of God, and may expend means to bring their theories before the world and the church; but as they mingle error with truth, their message is one of deception, and will lead souls into false paths. They are to be met, and opposed, **not because they are bad men, but because they are teachers of falsehood, and are endeavoring to put upon falsehood the stamp of truth. What a pity it is that men will go to such pains to discover some theory of error, when there is a whole storehouse of precious gems of truth by which the people might be enriched in the most holy faith. Instead of teaching truth, they let their imagination dwell upon that which is new and strange, and throw themselves out of harmony with those whom God is using to bring the people up upon the platform of truth.** They cast aside all that has been said in regard to unity of sentiment and feeling, and trample upon the prayer of Christ as though the unity for which he prayed was unessential, that there is no necessity for his followers to be one, even as he is one with the Father. They go off on a tangent, and Jehu-like, call to their brethren to follow their example of zeal for the Lord. If their zeal led them **to work in the same lines in which their brethren who have carried the heat and burden of the day, are working;** if they were as persevering to overcome discouragements and obstacles as their brethren have been, they might well be imitated, and God would accept them. But men are to be condemned who start out with a proclamation of wonderful light, and yet draw away from the agents whom God is leading. This was the way in which Korah, Dathan, and Abiram did, and their action is recorded as a warning to all others. We are not to do as they have done,—accuse and condemn those upon whom God has laid the burden of the work.” *Review and Herald*, September 12, 1893.

I have certain empathy for you, for I believe those that have encouraged you and promoted you have a greater condemnation before the Lord in at least one regard. The Bible is clear that we are not to lift up novices to a position of influence before they have had time to prove themselves. Bill Campbell, Randy Moeller, Glenn Woiler, and others who have followed this message for years now, should have unquestionably been much more guarded in their promotion of someone who has consistently demonstrated that he did not yet understand the breadth of this message. Yet they moved forward, perhaps based upon the sentiment that all of us in this movement are holy.

First Timothy 3:6 informs us that an elder should not be a “novice,” which means “newly planted.” You have received a genuine disservice by being lifted up, well before you were ready to publically present the message. I have heard your claims that the day of the Lord began on October 22, 1844. That is preposterous. It moves the sacred waymark of the closed door in the parable of the ten virgins.

I have heard your ideas that perhaps the two failed assignation attempts of Reagan and Pope John Paul II in 1982 were the fulfillment of Daniel 11:40. That is also preposterous. It destroys the time of the end in this reform movement, which is of course another sacred waymark. These and other of your ideas should have been recognized by your promoters as evidence that you were not yet prepared to be lifted up as the modern version of Samuel Snow—even if you do infer (or at least in the past have inferred) or emphasize the close connection between the meanings of the names “Snow” and “Frost.” Some have informed me that they have read on a website or perhaps Facebook that you do not identify yourself as Snow. It is good if you have moved away from that thought, but there are far too many that have heard your claims as such in the past. If you have publically distanced yourself from that claim, I hope that you have clearly admitted that you have made this claim or inference in the past.

I am certainly no one’s judge, but my understanding is that those that have broadcasted your faulty ideas far and wide have a much more serious standing in all this than you, for they should have recognized the warning flags that many of us could see even at a distance. But they failed to see. I sometimes think that the reason we fail to see (which is simply another explanation of failing to hear), is that we spend far too much time talking, and virtually no time listening. Paul states:

And that ye study to be quiet, and to do your own business, and to work with your own hands, as we commanded you. 1 Thessalonians 4:11.

I perceive your message as superficial and designed to connect with those that are not willing to genuinely take up the work of thorough biblical study. Your message connects with the superficial among us that Paul identifies as having “itching ears,” which I understand to be having a hunger for the emotional exciting emphasis that is located with your historical tidbits and fables that you employ to interpret prophecy. The style of presentation which those with itching ears love to hear is contrasted with a message that preaches the Word, which is to say, a message that employs the prophetic word to define history and not the reverse.

Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine. For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; And they shall turn away *their* ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables. 2 Timothy 4:2–4.

Now that the Lion of the tribe of Judah has opened up Ezra 7:9, it can be soundly and conclusively identified that the “time” which Paul just referred to—when there will be those that “will not endure sound doctrine”—arrived in history on 9/11. At that time there will be individuals who will “heap upon themselves” false “teachers,” because they have “itching ears,” and they will turn from the “truth” unto “fables.”

At the synagogue in Capernaum, most of Christ’s disciples turned away from Him based upon their unwillingness to apply His prophetic word figuratively. In the passage above Paul is informing us (concerning the very same period of time) that there is a group that turns away, but he adds to the understanding of the motivation of the disciples that turn away. Paul makes clear that they are also those who love to listen to the fables, and that they are personally responsible for bringing these teachings upon themselves. This is the reason why I have much concern for those that are promoting your message, as I do for the messenger they are promoting.

It is because of Paul’s reference to the itching ears that I am convinced that at least part of the reason that a message such as yours finds reception among those professing to uphold Miller’s rules and the truths connected with 9/11 has to do with their ears. In my experience, I have arrived at a conclusion about human nature that may or may not be accurate. Still, I have noted from interactions I have had with God’s people through the years that those who strive to be so talkative are almost always terrible listeners. With that observation I have made the assumption that those of us that are so talkative, might be able to pray very long prayers, but I am afraid that if this is who we are, we probably do not accomplish the more important part of prayer—stopping and listening for God’s voice as He answers our requests. I therefore understand Paul’s ‘itching ears’ to represent those among us that are more than happy to drink a message such as yours; whether they understand it or not, they are starving to hear God’s voice speaking to their souls, but do not understand that it is virtually impossible to hear His voice, or anyone else’s voice for that matter, when all we do is talk.

“Those who are most superficial generally have the most to say.” *Testimonies*, volume 4, 71.

I am sure that this open letter will backfire against me in regard to upholding the longstanding accusation of my critical spirit, divisive nature, and unloving attitude. The reality is that I never intended to be so direct and open about your erroneous teachings. In the recent newsletters from our ministry, I was sending out warnings that your promoters could have recognized if they had chosen to do so. Those newsletters were dealing primarily with the teachings of you and Emiliano Richards, yet the Path of the Just brethren (who also teach some of these faulty ideas) determined that those newsletters were specifying them, and to them this proved that I had broken some type of mutual agreement that I never made. (I have never agreed to be silent about false teachings.) So be it.

The point is that your teachings have already cost me and *Future for America* in a variety of ways, and I am certain there will be more fallout after this open letter goes forth. I would have been content to share these concerns in a more subtle way through newsletters in hopes that your promoters might begin to re-evaluate their responsibility towards God in terms of being watchmen upon the walls of Zion, but the distribution of your message into the public arena has changed the situation.

“If a brother is teaching error, those who are in responsible positions ought to know it; and if he is teaching truth, they ought to take their stand at his side. We should all know what is being taught among us; for if it is truth, we need to know it. The Sabbath-school teacher needs to know it, and every Sabbath-school scholar ought to understand it. We are all under obligation to God to understand what he sends us. He has given directions by which we may test every doctrine,—‘To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.’ [Isaiah 8:20.] But if it is according to this test, do not be so full of prejudice that you cannot acknowledge a point simply because it does not agree with your ideas.” *Testimonies to Ministers*, 111.

Your teachings are erroneous, and they are the fulfillment of Sister White’s warning that the “old controversies” would be revived during the time of the latter rain. The Jews that turned and walked no more with Christ in John 6 employed the literal application of His words, and His words were figurative words. In doing so, the disciples at the synagogue in Capernaum typified those from 9/11 onward that refuse to relate to the Tower of the flock as figurative. The prophetic application that the Jews employed was later introduced by the Jesuits in order to defeat Protestantism, and thereafter the same application was used by Smith to defeat Adventism. Your approach to prophetic application has been marked by God’s prophetic word in a variety of ways, and you need to publically retract your teachings; for Adventism, genuine Protestantism, and the Tower of the flock will not be defeated by this counterfeit.

Those that in my human judgment that have allowed you to become an influence in this movement—men who should have known better—need to do the very same thing in a more serious fashion. They had more light than you, and light is what we are to be judged by.

“There is less excuse in our day for stubbornness and unbelief than there was for the Jews in the days of Christ. They did not have before them the example of a nation that had suffered retribution of their unbelief and disobedience. But we have before us the history of the chosen people of God, who separated themselves from him, and rejected the Prince of life. Though they could not convict him of sin, though they could not fail to see their own hypocrisy, they hated the Prince of life because he laid bare their evil ways. In our day greater light and greater evidence is given. We have also their example, the warnings and reproofs that were presented to them, and our sin and its retribution will be the greater, **if we refuse to walk in the light**. Many say, ‘If I had only lived in the days of Christ, I would not have wrested his words, or falsely interpreted his instruction. I would not have rejected and crucified him as did the Jews;’ but that will be **proved** by the way in which you deal with his message and his messengers today. The Lord is **testing** the people of today as much as he **tested** the Jews in their day. When he sends his messages of mercy, the light of his truth, he is sending the spirit of truth to you, and if you accept the message, you accept of Jesus. Those who declare that if they had lived in the days of Christ, they would not do as did the rejectors of his mercy, will today be **tested**. Those who live in this day are not accountable for the deeds of those who crucified the Son of God; but if with all the light that shone upon his ancient people, delineated before us, we travel over the same ground, cherish the same spirit, refuse to receive reproof and warning, then our guilt will be greatly augmented, and the condemnation that fell upon them will fall upon us, **only it will be as much greater as our light is greater in this age than was their light in their age.**” *Review and Herald*, April 11, 1893.

Jeff Pippenger—August 19, 2014