

# MY TWO REPLIES TO THE RESPONSE OF HEIDI HEIKS

## 1. BRIEF REPLY TO THE RESPONSE OF HEIDI HEIKS

Dr. Alberto R. Treiyer

January 16, 2014

[www.adventistdistinctivemessages.com](http://www.adventistdistinctivemessages.com)

**WARNING:** This document requires a work of edition that I did not have time to do. Anyway, I tried to do my best to simplify it so the main issues could be easily understood. In time it will be edited and updated.

I am in Argentina right now. I don't have all the documentation that I have in my home in the USA, and I depend on others to enter for a little while the internet. But the vast historical documentation that I give in my book *The Seals and the Trumpets*, and confirmed shortly in the second book *The Mystery of the Apocalyptic Trumpets Unraveled*, is enough to prove the importance of the year 1840 for the fulfillment of the prophecy of the trumpets. You may find there, as in my criticism to Heidi Heiks (see my web page above), that my emphasis is on the importance of the year 1840 more than on the specific date of August 11 of that year. However, I believe today, more than never before, that the date of August 11 may also stand by biblical exegesis as well as by historical facts.

Concerning Heidi's accusations of lies, lack of honesty, deception, falsehoods, without proving it, I would say simply that this kind of reaction is typical of those who do not have answers, but want to remain anyway stubbornly in their position. I will leave these accusations of Heiks with God. He is the one who judges all hearts, and I will stand before His great tribunal in vindication of my intellectual honesty and moral integrity. My strong criticism to him was required before his boasted and bold attack (backed by Pfandl and Bohr), to the prophetic interpretation that our church always supported on the trumpets, even today. The spirit of the book of Heiks is a high hand sin, and I could not stand before that great court in heaven if I didn't face him as I did. Many confound a Christian spirit with being politically correct. But the cause of God requires integrity, a frank and honest spirit to face evil. And this is what I did.

Anyway, what we need here are facts. And Heiks is not offering facts to answer my criticism. He seems more concerned with saving the reputation of his book and therefore its sale, than with truth. What we find in his "response" to my criticism is not primary sources that he also constantly boasts to have in his book, to deny unsuccessfully the historicist interpretation of the Adventist movement. His problem has to do with the interpretation of some sources which others, before him, had already also considered. At the same time, his problem becomes more serious for his selective usage of those sources, putting away what does not fit his destructive attempt to discredit the official interpretation of our church (our church never relinquished the official interpretation on the trumpets that comes from the 19<sup>th</sup> Century and was confirmed by E. G. White). Heiks does the same in his analysis of the writings of E. G. White. He passes over her clearest testimony on the matter. Is this an "honest evaluation" on this issue, as he pretends to do?

Only two points are brought now by Heidi in his response to my criticism of 20 well documented pages. The first one has to do with the date when the ultimatum of the European high powers was in force, and the second one with what E. G. White confirmed.

**1. The date when the ultimatum was in force.** The selective usage of sources that I found in the book of Heidi Heiks which I exposed in my criticism to his book, may be clearly seen now again, when he tries to avoid to meet what Ron du Preez said in his interview of 3 ABN. Ron dealt there with primary sources and historian commentaries on what happened in 1840. Ron brings out there the testimony of objective

and non-denominational historians who affirm that the ultimatum of the European high powers, to the Syrian and Egyptian government, was in force simultaneously in Constantinople, Beirut, and Alexandria, at the moment when the convoy arrived to Beirut and Alexandria. The ultimatum reached those two key cities at the same time, on August 11, 1840, according to primary sources. Heiks accuses me of “an outright lie” for saying this, denying that Ron du Preez said this in the 3 ABN interview after quoting independent historians. I invite you to watch his testimony again, and judge for yourself who is lying (in the terminology of Heiks). You may find the link in my web page.

At the beginning of my first reply to Heiks, I warned in red letters that I didn't have time to edit the English version of my criticism of Heidi's book. At the same time, I was editing my fourth seminar on the sanctuary which deals with all the apocalyptic dates of the Bible, and I didn't want to spend time in details. I regret now that I was not enough clear on this point in my criticism to Heiks on this specific point, as I was in my books, because I relied in the testimony of Ron du Preez by giving the webpage where the interview of 3 ABN could be watched.

Concerning the date when the naval army arrived to Beirut, now under the dominion of the Pasha of Egypt, see the confirmation in Wikipedia: “On August 11, 1840, Napier's ships appeared off Beirut and he called upon Suleiman Pasha, Mehmet's governor, to abandon the town and leave Syria, whose population shortly revolted against Mehmet's occupying army.”

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Egyptian%E2%80%93Ottoman\\_War\\_\(1839%E2%80%931841\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Egyptian%E2%80%93Ottoman_War_(1839%E2%80%931841))

Let us quote another historian reference. “In 1839 the Sultan decided to strike back at Egypt but his army was routed at Nezib on 29 June and the Turkish main fleet deserted at Alexandria. In July 1840 Britain, Austria, Russia and Prussia agreed to back Turkey and Admiral Sir Robert Stopford ordered Captain Charles Napier to proceed to *Beirut which was captured on 11 August*” (*The Eastern Question. A Study in European Diplomacy*, by J.A.R. Marriot, 243).

Concerning the date when the convoy arrived to Alexandria, see the testimony of the newspapers of that time, brought out by Ron in his interview. It is found in the *London Morning Chronicle*, September 5, 1840: “Alexandria. August 16. The arrival of Rifat Bey and Mr. Alison... from Constantinople, on the 11<sup>th</sup> instant, with the ultimatum of the four powers [the treaty of London], produced a great sensation here.”

The Sultan in Constantinople knew when the convoy would arrive to Alexandria with the ultimatum. This is the reason why that very day, August 11, he called the four European ambassadors for a meeting to ask them what kind of measures would be taken in the case Mehemet rejected the ultimatum. In the same day, August 11, 1840, he received the answer that “provision had been made,” but he could not know what it was. He could reject the agreement unless they explained him how would they proceed. But he didn't do it. He submitted there to the high powers of Europe. From that moment onward, the Sultan and his government were clearly put under the control of the European powers. The masters of the game were now the Europeans, not him (see below).

**2. The confirmation of E. G. White.** Heidi Heiks insists that E. G. White was not dealing with the fulfillment of the prophecy of the fifth and sixth trumpets. He brings again the views of other brothers who believe that she was referring only to what many believed at that time. But no one will be able to convince believers or unbelievers that E. G. White did not believe that the prophecy of the Bible was fulfilled in 1840. The attempts of Heiks and Pfandl of making us believe the contrary fail. She said, literally: “In the year 1840 another remarkable fulfillment of prophecy excited widespread interest” (*GC* 334). Period. (For a careful analysis of her complete statement, see my web page:

[www.adventistdistinctivemessages.com](http://www.adventistdistinctivemessages.com))

Heiks tries to prove that E. G. White was wrong when she said that the prediction of Josiah Litch was exactly fulfilled. But he fails to prove it again. I do not care at the different calculations and speculations of Josiah Litch at different moments. I do not care at the fact that, after the disappointment of October 22, 1844, he abandoned that view. After 1844 Litch also rejected the date 1844 as being valid. Does it prove that we are wrong concerning the date 1844? Of course, not! Some of his expectations were also wrong concerning August 11. But what count for me is the statement of E. G. White, which confirms what the Bible and history say.

“At the very time specified, Turkey, through her ambassadors, accepted the protection of the allied powers of Europe, and thus placed herself under the control of Christian nations. The event exactly fulfilled the prediction”.

Let us ask some questions. Was this statement of E. G. White a general reference to all the issues involved in this submission to the Christian nations at that time, or was it just an overall consideration of key issues in the matter, that was materialized when the ultimatum of the European nations reached the two cities in revolt? In Ezra 6:14, we are told that the Jewish elders built the house of the Lord by the decrees of Cyrus, Darius, and Artaxerxes. Why is Ezra including Artaxerxes, if that king had nothing to do with the construction of the temple? Because the text summarizes, at that precise moment of inauguration of the temple, a more complete picture (it is interesting that the Bible of Jerusalem does not include the name of Artaxerxes in this text). Is E. G. White doing the same with her testimony of what Turkey did in the year 1840, under the specific date of August 11, given the importance of that date? It could be, but I don't think so. Her testimony was based on historical facts, corroborated by primary sources, as we proved it above. She lived at the time when that happened.

***Historical confirmation by primary sources.*** As already seen, the Turkish ambassador Rifat Bey came to Alexandria from Constantinople with the ultimatum of the high powers of Europe. According to local testimonies (primary sources), this ultimatum caused a tremendous sensation in Alexandria, and was in force from the moment when the convoys arrived from Constantinople to Beirut and Alexandria simultaneously. The Pasha of Egypt, in Alexandria, was notified on the purpose of the convoy that very day, and left the city, trying to avoid the reception of the ambassadors. For him, they were unwelcomed in his domains. But the meeting took finally place some days later at his return, and he received in person the ultimatum. He rejected it afterward, expecting the support of France to face the European threat.

E. G. White did not say that the Pasha of Egypt received officially or accepted the terms and conditions of that ultimatum on the day of arrival. She even does not mention Mehemet, the Pasha of Egypt. The ultimatum was in force, as it is interpreted even today by some historians, in Constantinople as well as in Beirut and Egypt, when it reached the two cities that were under the domain of the Pasha. And this happened in August 11, 1840, when the two convoys which went to Beirut and Alexandria arrived with the ultimatum of Constantinople which accepted the protection of the European armies. We have already seen that the Sultan asked the European powers about what kind of measures would be taken in the case that Mehemet rejected the ultimatum. They replied the same day, August 11, 1840, that “provision had been made,” but that he could not know what it was. The masters of the game in the Middle East were now the high powers of Europe.

When a person does not want to receive an ultimatum and tries to avoid it, this does not invalidate the ultimatum. The Pasha of Egypt could finally decide not to receive the Turkey emissary and the consuls of Europe. But such a decision would not free him from a document that was already in force, backed by ships of war in the case the Pasha did not want to submit to the ultimatum. The Pasha could also reject the ultimatum, as he finally did, but for his own damage, because he lost the war. He lost territories that he had conquered, and could do no other thing than finally to submit to the terms and conditions of the ultimatum before the end of 1840, which was in force from August 11.

The pivotal date was August 11, which meant a turning point in the international relations. Since that time, the Western Powers would intervene with new threats and impositions in the Muslim territories. Whereas formerly, the threat of “killing” came from the Turkey government, now we find a new trend. The Western Powers started to impose their will on the Ottoman Empire and in the Middle East in general. This is absolutely well documented and confirmed by secular historians even today (read my books).

I expect to receive from the press, in March (the book is already there), my fourth seminar on the sanctuary, where I deal more carefully with the dates of the fifth and the sixth trumpets, as well as with all the apocalyptic dates of the Bible. The title of the book is *The Apocalyptic Times of the Sanctuary. Biblical, historical, and astronomical confirmation* (370 pages). Let me share beforehand with you my conclusion on this issue, which you will find in p. 282:

**“Conclusion.** We may hold to the prediction of August 11, 1840 as it stands. We may even emphasize that it is confirmed by the Spirit of Prophecy. But we do not need to be too dogmatic with the exact date when we face people whose logic is stuck too closely to an Aristotelian syllogistic pattern. We may insist in these key dates without imposing them as absolute or exclusive, and bring to prominence the things that took place in their respective years of fulfillment. After all, this is what we do with other prophetic dates to understand better the context and importance of what happened in the foretold year.”

### **The Book of James White (1859)**

Let me share with you what James White, the husband of E. G. White, wrote in 1859, just 19 years after the event. James and Ellen lived at that time, and witnessed the effervescence of the news that came from the East. We may discuss when exactly the ultimatum was put into the hands of the Pasha of Egypt. But the fact is that the Pasha understood clearly that with the arrival of the convoy from Constantinople, the threat from Europe was there, and this was the reason why he immediately left Alexandria for some few days. Even if he received in person the ultimatum some days later, it is evident that he was notified about the purpose of these unwelcome guests on the day of their arrival (August 11).

The book of James White on the trumpets is online:

<http://centrowhite.org.br/files/ebooks/apl/all/JamesWhite/The%20Sounding%20of%20the%20Seven%20Trumpets%20of%20Revelation%208%20and%209.pdf>

5. The Sultan did dispatch Rifat Bey in a government steamer (which left Constantinople Aug. 5) to Alexandria, to communicate to Mehemet the ultimatum. This was a voluntary governmental act of the Sultan. The question now comes up, when was that document put officially under the control of Mehemet Ali? The following extract from a letter of a correspondent of the London Morning Chronicle, of Sep. 18, 1840, dated, Constantinople, Aug. 27th, 1840, will answer the question: “By the French steamer of the 24th, we have advice from Egypt to the 16th. They show no alteration in the resolution of the Pacha. Confiding in the valor of his Arab army, and in the strength of the fortifications which defend his capital, he seems determined to abide by the last alternative; and as recourse to this, therefore, is not inevitable, all hope may be considered as at an end of a termination of the affair without bloodshed. Immediately on the arrival of the Cyclops steamer with the news of the convention of the four powers, Mehemet Ali, it is stated, had quitted Alexandria, to make a short tour through Lower Egypt.

The object of his absenting himself at such a moment being partly to avoid conferences with the European consuls, but principally to endeavor, by his own presence, to arouse the fanaticism of the Bedouin tribes, and facilitate the raising of his new levies. During the interval of his absence, the Turkish government

steamer, which had reached Alexandria on the 11th, with the envoy Rifat Bey on board, had been by his orders placed in quarantine, and she was not released from it till the 16th. Previous, however, to the Porte's leaving, and on the very day on which he had been admitted to pratique, the above named functionary had had an audience of the Pacha, and had communicated to him the command of the Sultan, with respect to the evacuation of the Syrian provinces, appointing another audience for the next day, when, in the presence of the consuls of the European powers, he would receive from him his definite answer, and inform him of the alternative of his refusing to obey; giving him the ten days which have been allotted him by the convention to decide on the course he should think fit to adopt."

According to the foregoing statement, the ultimatum was officially put into the power of Mehemet Ali, and was disposed of by his orders, viz., sent to quarantine, on the ELEVENTH DAY OF AUGUST, 1840. But have we any evidence, besides the fact of the arrival of Rifat Bey at Alexandria with the ultimatum on the 11th of August, that Ottoman supremacy died, or was dead, that day? Read the following, from the same writer quoted above, dated, "Constantinople, August 12th, 1840:"

"I can add but little to my last letter, on the subject of the plans of the four powers; and I believe the details I then gave you comprise everything that is yet decided on. The portion of the Pacha, as I then stated, is not to extend beyond the line of Acre, and does not include either Arabia or Candia. Egypt alone is to be hereditary in his family, and the province of Acre to be considered as a pachalic, to be governed by his son during his lifetime, but afterward to depend on the will of the Porte; and even this latter is only to be granted him on the condition of his accepting these terms, and delivering up the Ottoman fleet within ten days. In the event of his not doing so, this pachalic is to be cut off. Egypt is then to be offered him, with another ten days to delivered on it, before actual force is employed against him.

"The manner, however, of applying the force, should he refuse to comply with these terms--whether a simple blockade is to be established on the coast, or whether his capital is to be bombarded, and his armies attacked in the Syrian provinces--is the point which still remains to be learned; nor does a note delivered yesterday by the four ambassadors, in answer to a question put to them by the Porte, as to the plan to be adopted in such an event, throw the least light on this subject. It simply states that provision has been made, and there is no necessity for the Divan alarming itself about any contingency that might afterwards arise."

Let us now analyze this testimony.

1. The letter is dated "Constantinople, August 12."
2. "Yesterday," the 11th of August, the Sultan applied in his own capital, to the ambassadors of four Christian nations, to know the measures which were to be taken in reference to a circumstance vitally affecting his empire, and was only told that "provision had been made," but he could not know what it was; and that he need give himself no alarm about any contingency that might afterwards arise!" From that time, then, they, not he, would manage that.

Where was the Sultan's independence that day? GONE! Who had the supremacy of the Ottoman empire in their hands? The great powers. According to previous calculation, therefore, Ottoman Supremacy did depart on the eleventh of August, into the hands of the great Christian powers of Europe

## 2. MY REPLY TO THE SECOND RESPONSE OF HEIDI HEIKS

Dr. Alberto R. Treiyer

[www.adventistdistinctivemessages.com](http://www.adventistdistinctivemessages.com)

January 21, 2013

I am in Brazil right now, enjoying the beautiful beaches that my body needed after the hard work of writing my fourth seminar on the sanctuary, *The Apocalyptic Times of the Sanctuary. Biblical, Historical, and Astronomical Confirmation*. A friend of mine has an apartment at two blocks of the sea, and kindly allowed us to stay here with my wife for two weeks. Fortunately for me in this time of vacation, the second response of Heiks is not requiring too much time to answer. Again, he seems more concerned with the promotion of his book than with the truth, because he tries once more to discredit me with liberal scholars who departed from the prophetic legacy that we received from the Protestant Reformation on the trumpets. (I will not quote here other many scholars that are faithful to the testimony of the Spirit of Prophecy in the interpretation of the trumpets of Revelation, and support with historical facts their fulfillment).

What we need are facts, and it is amazing to see again, a response of Heiks that is not supported by facts. He does not include my reply to his first response because I support there unquestionable historical facts from primary sources to prove that August 11, 1840, was crucial in the relations of the high European powers and the Muslim world, more notably the Ottoman Empire. He does not quote many historians that I quote in my two books on the trumpets (see my web page above), which unconsciously support what E. G. White said about what happened in the year 1840. Besides this, Heiks quotes the Biblical Conference of 1919 where Prescott and some others insisted in his views but which were never adopted by our church, to pretend that I neglect what our church did along the years. In this way, Heiks places himself, as well as Pfandl, Paulien and Stefanovic, with the liberal trend that appeared after the death of E. G. White.

Please, go to my webpage, and you will see in the section articles, my analysis of what that Bible Conference did, as well as answers to their questions. I prepared that document one year ago. Our church never endorsed the views of some in that Biblical Conference. Heiks also mentions the BRI as working besides E. G. White on this matter. I do not have an official document of the BRI doing this, except what Pfandl was writing on his own in recent times. What I find in the BRI of the 90s is the concern for not having a current document to settle the matter. And this was one of the reasons for which I decided to study the matter more in depth.

In addition, Heiks now quotes from the *Great Controversy* version of 1888 where E. G. White makes a general commentary of Litch's interpretation, to prove that she made a mistake. Why does Heiks not mention the more precise statement she later wrote, in the 1911 edition, where she is more precise in the description of the events, and also neglects the request of Prescott to forget August 11, 1840, as fulfilling the prediction of the prophecy?

Heiks again misinterprets some of my views, apparently in an additional desperate effort to discredit me. For instance, given the fact I believe in two waves of Muslim expansion that lasted 150 years according to the fifth trumpet (where that span of time is projected twice), the first one by the Saracens, and the second one by the Otomans (proved by history), he pretends that I disagree with the pioneers who said not too much about the first wave. This has nothing to do with a disagreement, but rather is complementary to what they believed.

Heiks also pretends that I reject E. G. White and our pioneers (as he openly does), because I leave open the possibility of giving “the hour” of Rev 9:15 a span of time embracing the whole sixth judgment, that is, 391 years. For Heiks, any complementation means rejection, opposition, contradiction... Read what I wrote in my webpage one year ago on the matter. The emphasis of E. G. White is on the year, but she also confirmed what history proved and Heiks tries to neglect. The prediction was exactly fulfilled in August 11, 1840. This is what I do. First I emphasize the year and, then, I prove that August 11, 1840, fulfilled the prophecy. Why is Heidi not bringing out the primary and secondary sources that I gave to prove it? If he misinterprets others in such an ominous way, could we be sure of trusting him when he discusses what other historians wrote? I insist again, the problem of Heiks is not with primary sources, but with the interpretation of those sources and the neglect of other primary sources...

Let me tell you that I was reluctant in my first book on the trumpets, *The Seals and the Trumpets*, to deal with the date August 11, 1840. I expressed this in that book, but at the same time I testify of my change of mind when I found the historical confirmation of that date, and the testimony of impartial historians. Since I migrated from skepticism on the exact date to faith on it before biblical and historical facts that cannot be denied, I believe that the best way to re-convert skeptic people is to start emphasizing the the prophetic fulfillment that occurred in that exact year, and then emphasize the amazing fulfillment that occurred on that exact day. I believe that the biblical text allows us to read it in both directions. This is why I wrote that the matter will always remain open to those who prefer focusing on the year, while others will focus and emphasize the day of the year. As such this statement is not evidence of a failure to answer Heiks' incorrect assumptions, as he claims I am doing.

“The enemies of truth cannot make truth error. They may trample upon the truth, and think that because they have cast it down, and covered it with rubbish, it is overcome; but God will move upon some of his faithful ones to do as Christ did when he was upon earth, -- brush away the rubbish, and restore the truth to its appropriate setting in the framework of truth” (*HM*, September 1, 1894 par. 2).

“‘The wrath of man shall praise Thee,’ says the psalmist; ‘the remainder of wrath shalt Thou restrain.’ God means that testing truth shall be brought to the front, and become a subject of examination and discussion, even if it is through the contempt placed upon it. The minds of the people must be agitated. Every controversy, every reproach, every slander, will be God's means of provoking inquiry, and awakening minds that otherwise would slumber” (*RH*, December 11, 1888 par. 9).