

JOURNAL OF ADVENTIST ARCHIVES

Volume 3
2023



Journal of Adventist Archives

Volume 3, 2023

Editor: Roy K. Kline

Managing Editor: Michael F. Younker

Editorial Board

Merlin Burt, Kevin Burton, Frank Hasel, Doug Morgan, Tim Poirier, Dragoslava Santrac, Galina Stele, and David Trim.

The *Journal of Adventist Archives* is a refereed journal published annually by the General Conference Corporation of Seventh-day Adventists, under the Office of Archives, Statistics, and Research. Direct all editorial correspondence to archives@gc.adventist.org.

Office of Archives, Statistics, and Research
Seventh-day Adventist Church World Headquarters
12501 Old Columbia Pike,
Silver Spring, Maryland 20904
United States of America

www.adventistarchives.org
archives@gc.adventist.org

All articles not copyrighted by their authors are copyright © 2023 by the General Conference Corporation of Seventh-day Adventists.

The opinions expressed in *JAA* reflect those of the authors. The validity and accuracy of quoted material included in articles is the responsibility of the authors of the articles.

JAA articles from past issues may be found online at
<https://documents.adventistarchives.org/ArchivesPublications>

Journal of Adventist Archives

Vol. 3 (2023)

Foreword	iii
<i>Roy K. Kline with Michael F. Younker</i>	
“The Everlasting Gospel of the Kingdom at Hand”: Joshua V. Himes and the Resilience of Second Advent Hope	1–21
<i>Douglas Morgan</i>	
Officers’ Consultations in the Seventh-day Adventist Church: A History	22–32
<i>D. J. B. Trim</i>	
John Nevins Andrews (1829-1883): A Visionary Missionary Pioneer	33–65
<i>Gilbert M. Valentine</i>	
The Office of Archives, Statistics, and Research: Bringing Together the Past and Present in Order to Inspire for the Future . .	66–79
<i>Ashlee L. Chism and D. J. B. Trim</i>	
Book Review:	
“ <i>Ostriches and Canaries: Coping with Change in Adventism,</i> <i>1966-1979</i> , by Gilbert M. Valentine	81–84
<i>Ashlee L. Chism</i>	

Foreword

Roy K. Kline, Editor
Michael F. Younker, Managing Editor

It is with pleasure that we welcome readers to the third volume of the *Journal of Adventist Archives*.

In this 2023 issue, our readers will find an article by Douglas Morgan about Joshua Himes and his resilient hope in the Second Advent despite the Great Disappointment; additionally, David Trim shares fresh research on the history of the officers' consultations process in the history of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. Then, we have two articles that are drawn from our *Encyclopedia of Seventh-day Adventists* that we would like to highlight here: First, a biographical article on our visionary missionary pioneer, John Nevins Andrews, by Gilbert Valentine; second, a history of the purpose and mission of the Office of Archives, Statistics, and Research, by Ashlee Chism and David Trim. Finally, we are pleased to publish a book review of Gilbert Valentine's *Ostriches and Canaries: Coping with Change in Adventism, 1966-1979*, by Ashlee Chism.

We in the Office of Archives, Statistics, and Research at the General Conference wish you good reading this autumn! Also, as a friendly reminder, we invite our readers and their fellow Adventist historians and other scholars doing relevant research to submit articles for publication in *JAA* to our managing editor of *JAA*, Michael Younker, at younkerm@gc.adventist.org. We welcome your submissions for potential future publication!

Articles

“The Everlasting Gospel of the Kingdom at Hand”: Joshua V. Himes and the Resilience of Second Advent Hope¹

by
Douglas Morgan

Introduction

Joshua V. Himes (1805-1895) had good reason to quit Adventism by the time he reached his 70s. In the 1840s he had been William Miller’s closest associate, “the principal promoter, manager, and financier” of the Second Advent movement.² But after at least three disappointments over the expected time of Christ’s return, ridicule and slander in the press, 30 years of infighting between Adventist factions, and two scandals largely manufactured by fellow Adventists, Himes, in 1876, was through with denominational Adventism. Three years later he was ordained to Episcopalian ministry. Nevertheless, in a deeper sense, he insisted: “I am an *Adventist*. I have ever been true and faithful to the cause.”³ And he would reaffirm his conviction that Christ’s second coming was *near*, right up to the time of his death in 1895, a little over half a century after the crisis of 1844.

¹ This article was originally delivered on October 22, 2022, at the 4th Annual Adventist Archives Lectureship series, which is sponsored by Washington Adventist University and the Office of Archives, Statistics, and Research at the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists.

² David T. Arthur, “Joshua V. Himes and the Cause of Adventism,” in *The Disappointed: Millerism and Millenarianism in the Nineteenth Century*, eds. Ronald L. Numbers and Jonathan M. Butler (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1987), 42.

³ Quoted in George R. Knight, *Millennial Fever and the End of the World: A Study of Millerite Adventism* (Boise, ID: Pacific Press, 1993), 282.

So, what kept Joshua V. Himes still an Adventist after all those years? That is a question that, to my knowledge, Seventh-day Adventists have rarely if ever asked. Our “seventh-day” branch of Second Adventism grew and flourished in a way that dwarfed the Advent Christian branch that Himes represented. Does not this success put Seventh-day Adventists in the position of showing other heirs of the Millerite movement, such as Himes, how to sustain an Adventist identity and mission over an unexpectedly long haul, not the other way around? Likely so, in important ways. Yet today, exactly 178 years after that day of shattering disappointment in 1844, my proposal is that Seventh-day Adventists also have insights to gain from considering what made Joshua V. Himes’ conviction about the imminence of the second advent resilient for more than half a century.

Himes’ legacy demands our attention if for no other reason than that he was one of five co-founders of Seventh-day Adventism. That is my contention, anyway.⁴ Joseph Bates, Ellen White, and James White are generally regarded as the three co-founders, but if we include in the picture the broader Second Advent movement from which the Seventh-day Adventist church sprang, then Himes, as well as William Miller should be added, making a total of five who alone qualify for co-founder status. It was Himes’ skill and resourcefulness as a promoter, communicator, and organizer, along with an unflagging fervor for the message that would transform William Miller’s preaching from a regional curiosity to a national movement.⁵

Selected aspects of Himes’ career will now be considered, following a chronological path, with two or three side trips to explore the question I have raised about the resilience of his faith. These peregrinations may be relatively lengthy but will eventually converge with the main path.

⁴ Douglas Morgan, “Himes, Joshua Vaughan (1805–1895),” *Encyclopedia of Seventh-day Adventists*, September 13, 2020, accessed November 4, 2022. <https://encyclopedia.adventist.org/article?id=49HD>.

⁵ Richard W. Schwarz and Floyd Greenleaf, *Light Bearers: A History of the Seventh-day Adventist Church*. Silver Spring, MD: General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists Department of Education, 2000), 34.

Radical of Radicals

Joshua Vaughan Himes was born in 1805 in the village of Wickford, Rhode Island, to Stukely and Elizabeth Himes.⁶ The collapse of his father’s prosperous business in the West Indies trade put an end to plans eventually to send Joshua to Brown University for an education that would lead to a prestigious career in the Episcopalian clergy. No longer headed for the Ivy League, Joshua, at age 13, was apprenticed to a cabinet-maker in New Bedford, Massachusetts.

His call to ministry, though, must have come from a higher source than his parents. After fulfilling his apprenticeship and marrying Mary Thompson Hardy in 1826, Himes was, at the age of 22, ordained to ministry in a network of congregations that called themselves simply the Christian church, or, the Christian Connection. It was one of several restorationist movements in nineteenth-century America dedicated to restoring the New Testament church, sweeping away all claims to authority other than the Bible. “Here,” he later wrote, “I found the open Bible and liberty of thought, and made good use of them.”⁷

Himes’ early success as an evangelist and church planter in small-town Massachusetts led to a call, in 1830, to the pulpit of the First Christian church in the city of Boston, a dwindling congregation badly in need of revival. Himes had been denied the Ivy League, but now he was in the nation’s leading urban center of cultural influence, and he would make the most of the opportunity. In Boston, a hub for the multitude of social movements that thrived in antebellum America, Himes became an advocate and organizer for a wide range of reform causes including temperance, women’s rights, peace, and, at the forefront, abolition of slavery. He was described as a “radical and an enthusiast by temperament” and regarded as “among the most radical of radicals.”⁸

He became one of the early supporters of William Lloyd Garrison’s advocacy for immediate abolition of slavery and full

⁶ General biographical information in this essay is drawn from two works by historian David T. Arthur, the foremost expert on Himes’ career: his University of Chicago M.A. thesis, “Joshua V. Himes and the Cause of Adventism, 1839-1845” (1961) and his chapter by the same title in *The Disappointed*.

⁷ Arthur, “Joshua V. Himes and the Cause of Adventism,” in *The Disappointed*, 37.

⁸ *Ibid*, 38, 42.

equality for people of African descent, set forth in the *Liberator*, published from Boston beginning in 1831. Such demands were overwhelmingly denounced in respectable public opinion as impractical and dangerous, and abolitionists were subjected to mob violence. Yet Garrison attested that Himes, at “a very early period avowed himself an abolitionist, and has been a faithful supporter of the anti-slavery movement, never ashamed to show his colors, never faltering in the darkest hour of its history.”⁹

Many of Himes’ church members objected to his extensive involvement in reform movements, charging that he was neglecting traditional pastoral duties and that the quality of his sermons was suffering. He was dismissed as pastor of First Christian Church in 1836, but many of the younger and more progressive members joined him in forming the Second Christian church. They built a new house of worship the following year called Chardon Street Chapel, and the congregation quickly grew to fill its 500-seat capacity. It became a meeting place, or conference site, for many radical reform causes.¹⁰

The Second Advent Cause

In July 1840, Himes, as a member of the New England Non-Resistance Society’s executive committee, was signatory to an open letter defending Garrison and the American Anti-Slavery Society for the controversial decision to link the cause of women’s rights with abolition of slavery.¹¹ Two columns to the right on the same page of the *Liberator* (July 31, 1840) was an advertisement for a new paper entitled *Signs of the Times* that would “expound the writings of the Prophets and Apostles relating to the Second coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, the first resurrection and the end of the world.” The publication, it stated, “is conducted by Joshua V. Himes: assisted by Wm. Miller, and Josiah Litch, writers on the prophecies.”

Himes’ new cause, the Second Advent movement, was the most sweeping of all. It promised, as historian David Arthur put it, “not merely a better world, but a world made new.”¹² And, it

⁹ Wm. Lloyd Garrison, “The Second Advent, No. 1,” *Liberator*, February 10, 1843, 3.

¹⁰ Arthur, “Joshua V. Himes” (M.A. thesis), 14-16.

¹¹ “Important Letter,” *Liberator*, July 31, 1840, 124.

¹² Arthur, “Joshua V. Himes” (M.A. thesis), 20.

5 – Morgan: “The Everlasting Gospel”: Joshua V. Himes

promised full success soon. Christ would return to earth “about the year 1843,” according to the movement’s evangelist, William Miller.

After Miller delivered a series of lectures at Chardon Street Chapel in December 1839, Himes famously confronted the preacher with the question, “Do you really believe this doctrine?” Assured by Miller’s response not only of his sincerity but his readiness for a drastic expansion of his work, Himes told him to “prepare for the campaign; for doors should be opened in every city in the Union, and the warning should go to the ends of the earth!”¹³

Himes became Miller’s publicist and booking agent, arranging for him to lecture in the large cities of the East. As the movement’s chief promoter, Himes utilized the latest developments in communications technology and marketing to orchestrate “an unprecedented media blitz,” in the words of Nathan O. Hatch a leading scholar of American religious history.¹⁴ He published papers, tracts, and books; organized conferences that gave the movement coherence and momentum, and camp meetings that galvanized mass audiences. With “Father Miller” as the spiritual and theological head of the Second Advent movement, Himes became its organizational leader.¹⁵

The Kingdom of the Messiah At Hand

It is not surprising and perhaps inevitable that from then until now, it is the fevered yet fluid prognostications about times and dates, the lurid tales of behavioral extremes, the sensation and scandal of it all, that attracts most of the attention given to the Millerite movement. But we need to look more carefully at the content of the message to begin to understand why it had such staying power for Himes.

Although I have only just begun looking closely at Millerite primary sources in connection with a projected biography of Himes, I have been struck by how unclear I have been about the heart of the message. Take, for instance, the call issued for the first

¹³ Quoted in Knight, *Millennial Fever*, 72-73.

¹⁴ Hatch’s observation in *The Democratization of American Christianity* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1989) is quoted in Knight, *Millennial Fever*, 77.

¹⁵ Arthur, “Joshua V. Himes and the Cause of Adventism,” in *The Disappointed*, 36-37; Knight, *Millennial Fever*, 74-77.

“General Conference on the Second Coming of our Lord Jesus Christ,” to be held October 14, 1840, at Chardon Street Chapel. It begins: “The undersigned, believers in the Second Coming and Kingdom of the Messiah ‘*at Hand*’ cordially unite in the call of a general Conference”¹⁶

Though William Miller was the first-listed signatory, commitment to his timetable was not required or expected. Himes had been converted to Miller’s teaching about the character of the second advent and its nearness but at this point was not convicted about Miller’s specific chronology, and other prominent leaders, most notably Henry Dana Ward and Henry Jones, never embraced it.

Yes, as Himes later pointed out, exposition of biblical, time prophecies, sparked the conviction that Christ’s second coming was near “at hand” in a way that it had not always been “at hand.”¹⁷ Yet, at the same time, the message of the “advent near” in the 1840s was about renewal of the faith that had animated the apostolic church and had been perpetuated by faithful witnesses through the eighteen centuries of Christian history. Many of these—early church “fathers” and leading Protestant Reformers—were listed on the cover of the published report of the first General Conference.¹⁸

Second, the predominance of the language of Messiah, king, and kingdom is striking. The call evoked Jesus’ own original gospel announcement: “The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe the gospel” (Mark 1:15). And the conveners of the conference were further described as those who “believe that the kingdom, which was foretold by the ancient prophets . . . the kingdom of which Jesus in this world was the prophet, Jesus in heaven is the high priest and Mediator, and Jesus in the world to come, will be the everlasting king, *is near*, answering to the prayer he taught us to say: ‘Thy kingdom come, thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth’”¹⁹ The Second

¹⁶ “A General Conference on the Second Coming of the Lord Jesus Christ,” *Signs of the Times*, September 1, 1840, 84.

¹⁷ Joshua V. Himes, ed., *Views of the Prophecies and Prophetic Chronology, Selected From the Manuscripts of William Miller, with a Memoir of His Life* (Boston: Joshua V. Himes, 1842), iv.

¹⁸ “Report of the General Conference of Christians Expecting the Advent of Our Lord Jesus Christ,” *Second Advent Reports* 1, No. 1 (1840).

¹⁹ “The Conference,” *Signs of the Times*, September 1, 1840, 84.

7 – Morgan: “The Everlasting Gospel”: Joshua V. Himes

Advent message was grounded in the full story of the saving career of Jesus the Messiah—past, present, and future; not in a prediction but in a robust biblical theology of the kingdom.

Third, though the Second Advent message was about the “end of the world,” it most definitely was not about destruction of this planet and the evacuation of believers to a locale in outer space called heaven. The issuers of the call to a second general conference, this one at Lowell, Mass., in June 1841, identified themselves as those looking for “the everlasting reign of righteousness in the new creation which he will make”²⁰ To be sure, this entailed “the end of the world,” even the destruction of the world, in the sense of the present evil age, of certain judgment against the powers of the present order of things arrayed in opposition to the personal reign of Christ on earth.

The first of five “Fundamental Principles, On Which The Second Advent Cause is Based,” published in 1843, put it this way: “The word of God teaches that this earth is to be regenerated, in the restitution of all things, and restored to its Eden state as it came from the hand of its maker before the fall, and is to be the eternal abode of the righteous in their resurrection state.”²¹

To a large extent that language is familiar, compatible with Seventh-day Adventism, but there are contrasts as well. I grew up being taught in Sabbath School to sing “ma saya del sol”—“up there is my home . . . far beyond the sun,” and hearing at camporees and camp meetings about a seven-day journey though outer space on a cloud up to heaven. And still today it seems to me that our prayers, songs, and discourse about the “blessed hope” center on what Seventh-day Adventists understand will happen at the beginning of and during the millennium rather than the new earth—this world made new—unquestionably the climax of the biblical story of redemption. The Seventh-day Adventist teaching on the millennium provides invaluable insights that enrich our understanding of that great story, but, perhaps through misplaced emphases and priorities something has been lost that a fresh look at Miller, Himes, and the origins of the Second Advent awakening might help us recover—a more robust, biblical eschatology of God’s kingdom in its past, present, and future dimensions.

²⁰ “General Conference of Christians Expecting the Second Advent of Our Lord Jesus Christ,” *Signs of the Times*, April 15, 1841, 12.

²¹ *Signs of the Times*, May 3, 1843, 68.

A fourth point, now, about the content of the message before returning to the narrative of Himes' career. The Second Advent movement that Joshua V. Himes championed had cutting edge appeal in the 1840s because it challenged the postmillennial eschatology then dominant in American Christendom, according to which a temporal (or earthly) millennium would *precede* the return of Christ and the resurrection of the dead.

The problem with the incorrect sequencing of the last things was that it opened the way to a fusion of biblical eschatology with chauvinistic nationalism in which the United States of America became God's chosen nation and vehicle to the millennium. Lyman Beecher, who, with the possible exception of Charles G. Finney, was the most influential clergyman in antebellum America, gave classic expression to this nationalistic millennialism in his *Plea for the West* (1835). Beecher affirmed the proposal of his famous eighteenth-century forbearer, Jonathan Edwards, that "the millennium would commence in America" and thus that the nation was "in the providence of God, destined to lead the way in the moral and political emancipation of the world."²²

Such sentiments energized benevolent social activism, but for Second Advent advocates, the belief that the millennium would come about on earth through reform of the American nation-state involved too many compromises: it left on the throne a political and economic system that for all of its enlightened achievements was based on human pride and glory and all too often used the notion of millennial destiny to legitimate exploitation, slavery, and violent aggression.

Rather than the triumph of an American empire of liberty, the Second Advent message that Himes did more than anyone else to amplify, affirmed "the ancient and glorious doctrine of the personal reign and immortal triumph of Christ in his glorified kingdom of the earth—and that, that kingdom is 'at hand.'"²³ The historic Christian message of the second advent of Christ to reign over a regenerated earth, over against visions of American millennial glory, and with that a call for the church to break free from its complicity and lift the prophetic voice—these were more

²² Lyman Beecher, *A Plea For the West*, 3rd ed. (Cincinnati: Truman & Smith, 1835), 9-10.

²³ "Progress of the Cause," *Signs of the Times*, April 15, 1841, 12.

foundational to the Second Advent message than chronological calculations.

The Crisis of 1844-1845

When he fully dedicated himself to the Second Advent cause in January 1840, Himes remained noncommittal about specific time designations. He pointed out in 1842 that some prophecy expositors had “fixed upon” 1866 and others 1847, while Miller had designated 1843 as “the time of the end.” Thus, Himes acknowledged: “It is possible that we may be mistaken in the chronology. It may vary a few years, but we are persuaded that the end cannot be far distant.”²⁴

A critical shift came that same year after the general conference held in Boston in May 1842. The conference set forth resolutions affirming that the time had come to “distinctly avow” that God has revealed “the time of Christ’s Second Advent,” and Himes joined in that avowal.²⁵ Even so, for him this did not mean absolute certitude. In view of human fallibility, Himes could still contemplate the possibility of error in the timetable, but for him, the practical impact of Second Advent teaching took the sting out of that consideration: “Can we ever regret that souls were converted . . . and prepared to meet the Lord? If then we are mistaken about the time, what harm can result to the church or world?”²⁶

Himes may well have underestimated the harm that could result, especially when he finally endorsed the “seventh-month” message promoted by Samuel S. Snow, that fixed expectation on a specific day, October 22, 1844. Yet here again, practical results, even empirical observation, rather than scripture-based certitude was the decisive factor.

“This thing has gone over the country like lightning,” he reported to Miller in a letter of September 30, 1844. “Nearly every lecturer has come into it and are preaching it with zeal, and with great success.” The fact that he “did not yet get the light as to the month & day” would not be determinative for Himes. The

²⁴ Himes, *Views of the Prophecies and Prophetic Chronology*, iv.

²⁵ Arthur, “Joshua V. Himes and the Cause of Adventism,” in *The Disappointed*, 43, 46.

²⁶ Joshua V. Himes, “The Crisis Has Come!,” *Signs of the Times*, August 3, 1842, 141.

movement's fruit took precedence, but the results or impact that impressed him most ran deeper than numbers or dollar amounts. He witnessed transformed lives: "The worldly minded have been quickened and made alive—and all classes have been blessed beyond anything we have seen in time past," he told Miller. It was an influence that he "dare not oppose." He had planned to go to England to set up a publishing office that would also be a base for spreading the message on the continent of Europe. But he canceled the trip 10 days before the scheduled departure, explaining that it was now his "hope to go to the *New world*, instead of the *Old*."²⁷ On October 6, Himes announced his belief that the Lord would return on the "tenth day of the seventh-month"—Yom Kippur or the Day of Atonement (October 22).²⁸

The failed prediction created a gamut of serious problems for Himes—one wonders if he even had time to feel personally disappointed. Charges of venality reemerged with wild rumors about the enormous fortune he raked in and where he had fled with his stash—Texas, or Canada, or England, while others said he was already in jail, facing criminal charges. Himes and Sylvester Bliss, with thoroughness and transparency, succeeded in convincing the mainstream press of the integrity of the movement's leadership.²⁹

But the greater challenge was ministering to the needs—both temporal and spiritual—of the Advent people, making sense of what had happened, and determining where the movement should go from here. This is where Himes and the future leaders of Seventh-day Adventism would part company. For Himes, writing in the November 5, 1844, issue of the *Midnight Cry*, the lesson to be learned from the disappointment was that "the authorities on which we based our calculations cannot be depended upon for definite time." He reaffirmed the movement's core convictions regarding the near advent and declared: "With our present light, we have no knowledge of a *fixed day* or *definite time*, but do most fully believe that we should watch and wait for the coming of Christ, as an event that may take place at any time."³⁰

²⁷ J.V. Himes to W. Miller, September 30, 1844, quoted in Knight, *Millennial Fever*, 202.

²⁸ Knight, *Millennial Fever*, 203.

²⁹ Arthur, "Joshua V. Himes and the Cause of Adventism," in *The Disappointed*, 54-55.

³⁰ Joshua V. Himes, "Prophetic Times," *Midnight Cry*, November 7, 1844, 150.

11 – Morgan: “The Everlasting Gospel”: Joshua V. Himes

Most twenty-first-century Seventh-day Adventists could say “Amen!” to that statement. Yet the reality is that the founders of Seventh-day Adventism did not. The ideas that received the most attention in Adventist papers in the early months of 1845 centered on the conviction that the midnight cry had been sounded in fulfillment of prophecy in 1844 and that Christ the bridegroom had come as prophesied on October 22, 1844—not to this earth—but to a heavenly marriage ceremony to receive his bride (the true church). Those appropriately prepared to meet Him accompanied the bridegroom, spiritually, into the marriage while “the door was shut” (Matt. 25:10) excluding those unprepared to receive Him.³¹

Joseph Bates and Ellen and James White were firmly in this “shut-door” or “bridegroom” camp of post-1844 Adventists. The specifics were complex and fluid, but the determinative convictions that eventually came together were that the “seventh-month” message was a movement of God, and that the 2300-day prophecy of Daniel 8:14 was fulfilled on October 22, 1844, marking the beginning final phase of Christ’s ministry as High Priest in heaven.³²

Himes aggressively opposed “shut door” teaching because it stood in the way of the renewed heralding of the second advent message that he envisioned. And because of the suspect behaviors associated with it—ecstatic worship, visions, “promiscuous” foot-washing, the holy kiss, and so forth. Yet it seems significant that although Himes now rejected the time calculations set by the seventh-month message, he did not repudiate the movement’s spiritual power or deny God’s leading in it.³³

Nonetheless, advocates of new teachings such as the “shut door” were excluded from a conference Himes organized in Albany, New York, April 29, 1845, to chart a way forward. A follow-up conference in May held in New York City declared “no confidence in any new messages, visions, dreams, tongues, miracles, extraordinary gifts, revelations, impressions, discerning

³¹ Knight, *Millennial Fever*, 266. Merlin D. Burt, “Shut Door,” in *The Ellen G. White Encyclopedia*, ed. Denis Fortin and Jerry Moon. Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 2013), 1158-1162, proposes “bridegroom” Adventists as a more satisfactory general label than “shut door” Adventists.

³² George R. Knight, *A Search for Identity: The Development of Seventh-day Adventist Beliefs* (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 2000), 55-58, 61-66, 79-81.

³³ “The Advent Herald,” *Advent Herald*, October 30, 1844, 93.

of spirits, or teachings, &c. &c., not in accordance with the unadulterated word of God.”³⁴ Clearly, Himes and the “mainstream” leadership of what remained as the Second Advent movement were on a collision course with the emerging Sabbatarian Adventists for whom the “extraordinary gift” of the visionary Ellen White would be crucial.

Divergent Adventisms

Doctrinal particulars such as Sabbath, investigative judgment, and the gift of prophecy soon marked the difference between Himes and the Sabbath-keeping Adventists. But at the heart of the matter was a theology of history: in what way was biblical prophecy casting light on present reality? Now that the prophecy pointing to 1843 then 1844 had not been fulfilled as Miller anticipated, what could give ongoing conviction that the everlasting kingdom was “at hand,” impelling an urgent mission? What could give resilience to second advent proclamation as *present truth*?

The conviction that powered the seventh-day sector of the Second Advent movement derived from the three angels messages of Revelation 14. Familiar enough, in a sense, yet I am not sure how in touch Adventists today are with how this prophecy functioned in launching our movement. The formulators of Sabbatarian Adventism understood the three messages in this passage as a scriptural foretelling of a *sequence* of events unfolding in the 1840s. An almost palpable excitement about the identity, purpose and hope that James White found in the third angel’s message pulsates through his exposition published in the April 1850 edition of *Present Truth*:

“Never did I have such feelings while holding my pen as now. . . .

“The second angel’s message reached to the fall of 1844, where the cry—“Come out of her my people” closed: then the time for the third came. . . .

“We know then that the time for this third message is now. . . .”³⁵

³⁴ Knight, *Millennial Fever*, 274-277.

³⁵ James White, “The Third Angel Message,” *Present Truth*, April 1850, 68-69.

13 – Morgan: “*The Everlasting Gospel*”: Joshua V. Himes

This understanding both brought certitude that the everlasting kingdom was indeed very near at hand, and supercharged the present, the time span between 1844 and Christ’s return, with a sacred urgency about participating in the fulfillment of divine prophecy by making this third message known—a warning against receiving the “mark of the beast” and a call to instead “keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus.”

Over the next two decades adjustments came that broadened the scope of the mission and the content of the message. For instance, the emphasis on health reform in the mid-1860s brought development of a holistic conception of salvation—the work of restoring the whole person to the image of God. This expanded the scope of what needed to be done in the present, but such reform was still fused with vivid conviction that the second coming was near at hand. It entailed preparing bodies for translation to immortality and thus a continuity between the work of redemption undertaken in the present and its final realization soon to come.³⁶

All of this gave the Seventh-day Adventists a powerful advantage over non-Sabbatarian Adventists. The Second Advent doctrine was thereby renewed as *present truth*—gripping and soul-stirring, here and now. Himes lacked that re-infusion of the present with prophetic meaning. He would be drawn to prophecy expositions that rekindled hope for fulfillment in the mid-1860s, but thereafter jettisoned any form of date or time setting.³⁷

That said, I suggest that with the passage of another century and a half, bringing us up to the present, it may now be more apparent than it seemed in the late nineteenth century that Himes also has some things to say to Seventh-day Adventists. Believe what we may about 1844 as marking a final phase in Christ’s ministry in heaven that calls for a corresponding response of proclaiming the three angels messages on earth, the power of the *time element* in generating profound intensity of conviction about its nearness, such as James White felt 1850, has dissipated. Perhaps we can learn something from Himes about the resilience of hope in the near return of Christ, when the time element, by definition, has ceased to be *present truth*.

³⁶ Ellen G. White, *Testimonies for the Church*, Vol. 1, 486-489.

³⁷ Knight, *Millennial Fever*, 290-291.

Adventist and Activist

Back to Himes' story: In the summer of 1846, eager to get on with the mission of proclaiming the Second Advent as near without specifying a time, he embarked on his deferred trip to England to advance international spread of the message. He set up a publishing office from which the *European Advent Herald* was launched, and he preached throughout England, Scotland, and Ireland.³⁸

While in London in 1846, Himes was a delegate at a meeting of the Evangelical Alliance, an organization dedicated to advancing interdenominational cooperation among Protestants. With slavery already outlawed in England, the British participants had no difficulty with the Alliance's policy against admitting slaveholders into membership. American delegates, however, sought to soften the policy and thereby open the door to wider participation in the Alliance by churchmen from their nation. Himes and John Howard Hinton, a Baptist who had opened his pulpit to Millerite preachers, stood alone among the American delegation in opposition. Himes called the proposal "a miserable compromise of principle, which, if carried out, would be the strongest bulwark of the slave system."³⁹ Himes' stand drew cheers from abolitionist leaders, including Frederick Douglass and William Lloyd Garrison, the latter saluting Himes as the "one man who nobly did his duty."⁴⁰

A few days later, Himes spoke at an Anti-Slavery League meeting in Liverpool. Douglass, Garrison, and George Thompson, legendary opponent of slavery in the British Parliament, all spoke before Himes, who, just minutes before 10:00 p.m., finally had his turn at the podium. He rose to the challenge with a speech that was "brief but highly impressive" according to a report in the *Liverpool Times*.⁴¹

³⁸ Ibid, 279.

³⁹ "Mr. Himes and the Alliance," *Liberator*, November 20, 1846, 185-186.

⁴⁰ "Anti-Slavery League," *Liberator*, October 16, 1846, 165; Ronald D. Graybill, "The Abolitionist-Millerite Connection" and Louis Billington, "The Millerite Adventists in Great Britain, 1840-1850," in *The Disappointed*, 141 and 69.

⁴¹ "Anti-Slavery League. Meeting of the Delegates at the Concert Hall," *Liberator*, December 11, 1846, 198; from the *Liverpool Times*, October 20, 1846.

15 – Morgan: “The Everlasting Gospel”: Joshua V. Himes

About Thompson, whom he characterized as a “particular friend,” Himes wrote the following in a report for the *Advent Herald*:

We became acquainted a number of years since, when he visited the United States, to aid the friends of humanity in pleading the cause of the slave. I have always loved and esteemed him from my first acquaintance with him, but never more so than now. He stands here the fearless advocate of liberty for the negro in America, the native of India; and, indeed, the oppressed of every nation. He is a man of God. And while he is fearlessly pleading the rights of enslaved man, with new and unequalled success, he, with his faithful coadjutors, shall have my prayers and warmest sympathies.⁴²

It is a remarkable statement of solidarity from the foremost leader of the Second Advent cause, whose zeal for proclaiming the near return of Christ continued unabated.

Then, Himes gave perhaps his clearest explanation of how he saw the connection between activism in the public arena and Adventist faith:

“In reference to the slave question, as an Adventist, believing that the great systems of iniquity now existing will continue, in some form, to the end of the world, yet with this faith, I am bound to protest against and expose sin in all its manifestations, just as much as though I believed in the world’s continuance. Therefore I dare not meet my Judge without having washed my hands thoroughly, by bearing a faithful testimony against slavery, and by using my influence for its extinction.”⁴³ We should not leave unnoticed the fact that Adventism made a difference in how Himes viewed the matter. That faith, not the conventional progressivism of the day, generated and shaped his conviction. Indeed, he placed no confidence in the lasting efficacy of any political ideology or system of power, other than that of Christ’s Kingdom.

If the weight of Himes’ reform activism shifted to the Advent cause, especially from 1842 to 1844, his actions in Britain along

⁴² “Correspondence of the English Mission,” *Advent Herald*, December 9, 1846, 141. I am indebted to Kevin Burton for bringing this source to my attention.

⁴³ *Ibid.*

with the just quoted commentary suggest that all along he held to conviction that preparation for the soon-coming Kingdom requires a thoroughgoing fidelity to God's government in the present that reaches all aspects of life. Mission required both preaching and action to liberate the enslaved and oppressed from the powers holding them in oppression.

As historian Timothy George has observed: "One of the ironies of church history is that frequently those who have the most acute sense of the future reign of God—of living in the 'last days'—are precisely those who invest themselves with purpose and energy in changing things here and now."⁴⁴ In this regard, Himes likely offers a greater contrast with, and arguably a corresponding corrective, to the Adventism of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries than that of the nineteenth.

Fightings Within

In the fragmentation that followed 1844, an aversion to formalism that ran through all sectors of Adventism delayed establishment of denominations for approximately 15 years until three organizations formed in fairly rapid succession. Controversy over immortality of the soul vs. conditional immortality divided the non-seventh-day sector. The American Evangelical Adventist Conference organized in 1858 in opposition to conditionalism, while those who affirmed it formed the Advent Christian Association (ACA) in 1860, the same year that the Seventh-day Adventists took the first major step by agreeing on an official name. Himes ended up with the ACA, and in the early 1860s he was designated to evangelize "the west." In 1863, he established headquarters in Buchanan, Michigan, about 90 miles southwest of Battle Creek, where the Seventh-day Adventists were finalizing their organization as a denomination. He began publishing the *Voice of the West and Second Advent Pioneer* in 1864, renamed the *Advent Christian Times* in 1870.⁴⁵

On January 1, 1865, Himes once again had the privilege of sharing a podium with Garrison and other prominent abolitionists

⁴⁴ Timothy George, "The Reformation Connection," Christian History Institute, accessed November 6, 2022, <https://christianhistoryinstitute.org/magazine/article/hus-reformation-connection/>.

⁴⁵ Arthur, "Joshua V. Himes" (M.A. thesis), 164.

17 – Morgan: “The Everlasting Gospel”: Joshua V. Himes

during services held in Boston to celebrate the second anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation.⁴⁶ Beyond celebration of past achievements, Himes had a leading part in organizing the American Advent Mission Society in 1865 and was elected its first president. He took particular interest in the society’s project of establishing schools for those newly emancipated from slavery in cities such as St. Louis, Missouri, and Memphis, Tennessee.⁴⁷

Another priority for Himes was higher education for the training of young Adventist ministers. That project was stymied by opposition from another influential Advent Christian leader, Miles Grant, editor of the *World’s Crisis*. The two had a history of conflict and in the early 1870s, among other issues, Grant opposed Himes’ activism in establishing schools and building churches as contrary to belief in the near Second Advent.⁴⁸

After hearing a rumor alleging inappropriate behavior with women on Himes’ part, Grant secured letters from two women accusing him of immorality. Himes would eventually acknowledged “improprieties” while insisting that he was innocent of adultery. But Grant used the threat of making the letters public to blackmail Himes, forcing him out of the ACA leadership.⁴⁹ Disassociated with denominational Adventism but still vigorous in his 70s, Himes ended up entering the Episcopal ministry. He was ordained in 1879 and served as rector of St. Andrews Episcopal Church in Elk Point, South Dakota, until his death in 1895.

His social radicalism proved resilient as well. Himes served as vice-president for the Union County, South Dakota, woman suffrage association in 1890 and participated in the August 1890 suffrage convention in Mitchell. He was commended for “helping in the present struggle to give the ballot to the women of this State.”⁵⁰

⁴⁶ “Celebration of the Emancipation Proclamation,” *Liberator*, January 6, 1865, 2.

⁴⁷ Arthur, “Joshua V. Himes” (M.A. thesis), 165.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 165-166.

⁵⁰ “Rev. Joshua V. Himes,” Biographies of Women’s Suffrage—H, History in South Dakota, accessed November 6, 2022, <https://historysouthdakota.wordpress.com/womens-suffrage-in-sodak/biographies-of-womens-suffrage-h/>.

Himes and the Third Message

Paradoxically, the institutional expression of Adventism with which Himes eventually became the most friendly was Seventh-day Adventism (SDA), which had emerged from the disreputable “shut door” radicals on the wrong side of the Adventist tracks in 1845. Soon after setting up his publishing office in Buchanan, Himes stopped in Battle Creek on a return trip to the East in November 1863 to visit with the SDAs. It was a friendly visit and, initially, so was the tone of an exchange of views between the *Review and Herald* and the *Voice of the West*. But before long the exchange escalated into heated argument with increasingly harsh language from Himes about the “delusion” of Ellen White’s visions and influence.

Buchanan-Battle Creek relations remained frosty for about five years until attacks (“raids”) by Miles Grant on both began to foster sympathies between Himes and the Whites. Himes again stopped by Battle Creek in November 1873 while the General Conference was in session and gave “a few remarks” during a Friday evening service.⁵¹

Himes’ lifelong inclination to assess an idea or movement by its fruit—its practical impact—rather than by doctrinaire absolutes may in part account for his ability to establish good rapport with the SDAs and develop a genuine admiration for their achievements without accepting their distinctive teachings. In a letter of July 12, 1878, Himes notified James White about the closing up of the Buchanan office, and commented on the positive features he saw in the SDA work:

First, the full proclamation of the future coming and reign of Christ on the earth; second, the establishment of a school and the promotion of education; and, thirdly, the establishment of a health institution, in which the laws of life and health are taught and enforced. These are facts. This is work, for the good of all, and must tend to the better preparation of all who come under these influences to meet Christ.⁵²

⁵¹ “Seventh-Day Adventists,” republished from *Himes’ Journal* in *Review and Herald*, February 3, 1874, 61.

⁵² J[ames] W[hite], “Union is Strength,” *ARH*, August 8, 1878, 52.

19 – Morgan: “*The Everlasting Gospel*”: Joshua V. Himes

Another recurring theme is also implicit here: activism enlivens preparation, increasing rather than decreasing vivid consciousness of “the everlasting kingdom near at hand.”

In the summer of 1894, Himes returned to Battle Creek, this time seeking treatment from Dr. John Harvey Kellogg of Battle Creek Sanitarium for cancer on the left side of his face. The doctor declared Himes, at 89, to be “astonishingly well preserved for one of his age.” Himes resolved not to discuss any points of controversy while at the Sanitarium but seemed to enjoy talking with people about his memories of “Father Miller” and the events of the 1840s.⁵³

Himes wrote Ellen White on September 12, 1894, after attending a meeting in the Battle Creek Tabernacle at which a letter she wrote from Australia was read. In the letter she appealed for funds to support mission work in that land. In his letter, Himes briefly filled her in on his work with his Episcopal parish in South Dakota while affirming, almost exactly 50 years after 1844: “I preach the Advent as being near, without a definite time, and I believe it.”⁵⁴

Though he wrote of his own work in a positive tone, he concluded the letter in a wistful, self-deprecating mode. “You and your associates have done a great work since 1844—and still go on,” he told Ellen White. Then, a little later, apparently by way of contrast, he wrote: “Well, I finished my work really, in 1844, with Father Miller. After that, what I have done at most was to give comfort to the scattered flock.”⁵⁵ He enclosed \$5 as a gift, followed by donation of another \$40 for SDA mission work.

Ellen White seemed profoundly moved by Himes’ letter and donation and attached great significance to his gesture. Along with expressing warm gratitude, she told Himes that she saw his donation as signifying “that you have not lost the missionary spirit which prompted you first to give yourself to the work, and then to give your means to the Lord to proclaim the first and second angels’ messages in their time and order to the world.”⁵⁶ Drawing out her meaning in a letter to Sister Austin, the nurse who

⁵³ J.H. Kellogg to E.G. White, August 19, 1894, Ellen G. White Estate Incoming Correspondence, ellenwhite.org (hereafter EGWE).

⁵⁴ J.V. Himes to E.G. White, September 12, 1894, EGWE

⁵⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁶ E.G. White to J.V. Himes, Letter 31a, January 17, 1895, Ellen G. White Writings, <https://m.egwwritings.org/en3>.

attended to Himes at the Sanitarium, Ellen White glossed over Himes' rejection of the Sabbath reform entailed in the third angel's message, instead celebrating his support as "evidence that one of the pioneers in the work of giving the message of warning to the world in 1840-1844 is acting a part now in giving the third angel's message."⁵⁷

In his reply dated March 13, 1895, Himes reiterated that he did not see "the events or the work relating to the close of the present dispensation" as Ellen White did. But, speaking her language, he acknowledged: "There is a great and earnest work being done to send the message of the 3rd angel everywhere."⁵⁸

It seems that both Ellen White and Joshua Himes valued benevolent labor for Christ and humanity above theological correctness. The point should not be twisted: they both had firm convictions and they both thought truth mattered, mightily. But when the fruit of the Spirit was in evidence, both were willing to join heart and hand and seek to cultivate commonalities rather than aggravate differences. Ellen White would never give up the seventh-day Sabbath as a decisive test of loyalty to Christ yet she was willing to declare Himes an honorary participant in giving the third angel's message even though after 50 years, he still couldn't see the light. And, despite that inability to be persuaded by distinguishing points of SDA teaching, Himes could celebrate and support the "great and earnest work" to advance the message of the third angel.

But Himes also had a warning. Despite his repeatedly stated admiration for the SDA advances along medical and educational lines, he pointed out that prosperity "in worldly things, and heaping up of riches" threatened to give their "talk of the coming of Christ as an event very near at hand" an inconsistent ring.⁵⁹ While diligent work to "make men whole" could both be fueled by and refuel fervor for the soon return of Christ, the resultant institutional success could be a temptation to triumphalism, hubris, and complacency, any or all of which could hollow out claims to Adventist faith. Lively faith in the imminent, personal reign of Christ in a world made new could be a powerful generator

⁵⁷ E.G. White to Sister Austin, Letter 1a, January 17, 1895, Ellen G. White Writings, <https://m.egwwritings.org/en3>.

⁵⁸ J.V. Himes to E.G. White, March 13, 1895, EGWE

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*

for good in the world; but it was also needed to check the human tendency to turn the good accomplished into an idol.

Resilient Hope

Though Himes never embraced the theology of history that helped power Seventh-day Adventism’s unlikely success and durability, his hope in the near Second Advent of Christ remained resilient because it was grounded in apostolic, historic faith in the reign of Messiah Jesus that would become personal, real, and victorious in a recreated earth. Though invigorated by time prophecies, it was not at its core dependent on interpretations of them, even for its sense of imminence.

Himes’s faith in the everlasting kingdom near at hand both gained resilience from and demonstrated its authenticity by its embodiment in radical activism in the present showing tangibly that the coming kingdom was not wishful thinking but was in fact on its way.

His Second Advent faith also both demonstrated and derived resilience from its refusal to be co-opted by any of the present world’s ideologies and agendas, and thereby served to call into question recurring tendencies in the church to do just that.

Joshua V. Himes died on July 27, 1895, at Elk Point, South Dakota.⁶⁰ Just three months earlier, on March 14, he sent a note to Ellen White informing her that Dr. Kellogg had pronounced his cancer incurable. He had to face the inevitable: “And so, my last years will be very bad.” But, he concluded, “the morning will soon break and sickness, disease and death will pass away forever.”⁶¹

⁶⁰ “Preaches Seventy-one Years, Funeral of the Rev. Joshua V. Himes at Elk Point, S. D. – Noted Abolitionist,” *Chicago Record*, July 30, 1895, 3.

⁶¹ J.V. Himes to E.G. White, March 14, 1895, EGWE.

Officers’ Consultations in the Seventh-day Adventist Church: A History¹

by
D. J. B. Trim

Abstract

For decades the officers of the General Conference [GC] have held regular collective discussions with the officers of other major denominational entities: what are known today as meetings of the “General Conference and Division Officers” [GCDO], although its title and composition have varied over the years. These are high-level consultations and have played an important part in many key episodes in Adventist history, yet their role has invariably been advisory, and their membership always nominated by GC administration rather than elected or determined *ex officio*. Rather than making decisions, the meetings have given counsel and made recommendations, referring matters either back or on to other bodies.

Introduction

Meetings of groups of officers are a well-established practice in Seventh-day Adventist denominational administration. Officers’ meetings have taken place and continue to take place at all levels of Adventist organizational structure. At the world-Church level, a distinction must be drawn between:

(1) The regular meetings of the “General Conference officers,” *i.e.*, the officers of the General Conference headquarters, which were a predecessor of the General Conference Administrative Committee [ADCOM]; and

¹ This article is based on a research paper commissioned by the General Conference executive officers in 2019. It is used here by permission.

23 – Trim: Officers’ Consultations in the SDA Church

(2) Meetings of those officers with officers from other levels of church structure, which evolved into today’s GCDO, though its membership originally included union as well as division officers.

Although the former, strictly speaking, served in an advisory capacity rather than an executive role, in practice they often filled a decision-making function. The latter, in contrast, invariably provided a venue for consultation, rather than action.

The difference partly reflects the fact there were no permanent GC decision-making committees until the advent of ADCOM and the President’s Executive Advisory [PREXAD] (both founded in 1973, the former re-founded in 1991). The difference also, however, partly reflects the different roles of the different types of meeting. The internal, informal “officers’ councils” lacked formal executive authority, but their recommendations were regarded, at many levels of denominational structure, as actual decisions, because their pronouncements reflected the collective wisdom of the members of GC administration. In contrast, when the GC officers consulted with officers from the wider Church, it was an opportunity to hear and take account of other perspectives while developing administration’s position. Thus, while the first type of meeting expressed the collective voice of GC administration *to* the wider Church, the second provided for input *from* the wider Church into the views of GC administration before they were finalized and articulated.

It is the latter with which this short article is concerned: the longstanding consultations between the GC officers and officers of other major denominational entities.

Origins

It is difficult to answer the question “When was GCDO founded?”. Starting in 1982, there have been regular meetings of the officers of the General Conference and the Seventh-day Adventist Church’s world divisions, yet 1982 did not witness the start of a new consultation—rather it saw the renaming of a meeting that had existed for many years. The GCDO group is merely the latest manifestation of a working committee with a long history at world-Church level, with “GCDO” just the latest in a series of titles. The designation of the group and those typically invited to attend have alike evolved in step with the development of denominational structure and the increase in number and geographical extent of denominational organizations. At each

stage of development, however, the intention was to provide GC administration with counsel from the officers of key organizational units at the next highest level of structure.

It is difficult to say with certainty when consultations between the GC headquarters-based officers and officers of divisions and unions first took place—it seems likely that they began early after the election of the first officers of divisions in 1909. It is even possible that they began after the creation of union conferences in 1901. However, they first became formalized as a regular occurrence role in Adventist ecclesiastical polity in the 1930s, which was also when C. H. Watson, the GC president elected in 1930, instituted formal and regular meetings of the GC officer group at headquarters, with minutes kept. The first known council of “Home and Foreign Officers” occurred before the 1932 Autumn Council, appropriately enough in Battle Creek, Michigan.² None seem to have been held in 1933 but from 1934 onwards they were regularly held prior to councils of the General Conference Committee [GCC] (as the Executive Committee was usually known at least up to the 1970s).³ These of course were the occasions when the foreign officers would be in the United States. These were meetings of the GC officers, presidents of GC institutions, and officers of divisions outside North America: close to GCDO today.

Development

The standard nomenclature remained “Home and Foreign Officers” until 1950, but then alternative terminology began to creep in. In 1951 a report refers to the “Headquarters and Overseas Officers Meeting”, though this may have been an error for “Home and Overseas Officers” which began to be used in 1952. The latter became more prevalent from around 1954, but was used interchangeably with “Home and Foreign Officers”. It may be notable that references in General Conference Executive Committee minutes, which were more widely distributed, are almost always to “Home and Overseas Officers”, with “Home and Foreign” surviving in Officers’ Minutes, which had limited

² Officers’ Council, afternoon Oct. 13, 1932: those “Present” are simply summarized as “Home and foreign officers.” GC Archives (GC Ar.), Record Group 2, GC Officers [hereafter GCO] Minutes, series 2, p. 54.

³ See, e.g., Officers Meetings, Sept. 17, 1933, Sept. 20 and Oct. 13, 1935, GCO Minutes, series 2, pp. 372, 1430, 1474.

25 – *Trim: Officers’ Consultations in the SDA Church*

circulation. It seems likely that, because NAD union presidents were sometimes invited, a church leader from abroad complained that the president of the Canadian Union was not seen as “foreign”, leading to its replacement with “overseas.”⁴ This is unclear, because there is no evidence in officers’ or GCC minutes of why the title changed. By 1958, however, “Home and Overseas” had definitely replaced “Home and Foreign.” Around this time, too, the GC institution presidents stopped attending regularly. The Home and Overseas Officers meeting was effectively equivalent to GCDO today.

Meanwhile, also roughly in the mid-1950s, a new regular officers’ consultation had been introduced: the “Officers and Union Presidents” meeting [OUP]. This vague title masked an important defining characteristic: in OUP, GC Officers met with union presidents from the North American Division [NAD] and only from NAD. There were occasional variations, such as in 1958 when there was a meeting of “GC Home and Overseas Officers and North American Union Conference Presidents.”⁵ Typically of Adventist leaders, their use of terminology also varied, and thus one finds references in GC Executive Committee minutes and Officers’ minutes to the “General Conference Officers and Union Presidents” or to “Officers and North American Union Presidents”, at various points in the 1960s and early 1970s, but always to what was more formally titled the “Officers and Union Presidents” meeting, which began to be abbreviated OUP in the 1970s. Meanwhile, other variants occasionally made an appearance: in 1971 there were meetings both of “GC Officers and Division Presidents”, and of “GC Officers, Division Presidents, and North American Union Presidents.”⁶

In 1976, a third regular consultation was added: Home and Overseas Offices and Union Presidents, the acronym for which was, memorably, HOOUP (with HOO adopted for the smaller group). Initially, the membership of HOOUP, despite its name, was actually the GC and division officers plus only North American union presidents, but in 1981, the “union presidents”

⁴ *Review and Herald*, vol. 128, no. 43 (Oct. 25, 1951), 1—caption on cover photograph. Spring Council, Apr. 10, 1952, General Conference Committee [hereafter GCC] minutes (in GC Ar., RG 1), vol. 18, p. 764.

⁵ GCO Minutes, June 13, 1958, pp. 58-185-195.

⁶ GCC Spring Meeting, 1971, March 30, GCC Minutes vol. 23, bk. 2, p. 71-435.

attending HOOUP included some union presidents from outside NAD. This was by invitation from GC administration and must have reflected the views of the new GC president, Neal C. Wilson (see below) and a desire to represent different regions of the world.⁷

From 1976, meanwhile, the format of the consultations was settled: the GC officers' meetings with various officer groups from around the world lasted several days, before both the Spring and Autumn Councils (which were in the process of being renamed Spring Meeting and Annual Council). The HOO meeting would last for two days, OUP two or three days, and HOOUP one day, probably reflecting that its attendees would mostly have already heard items in HOO or OUP.

In 1981, there were some significant changes, presumably at the initiative of then GC President Neal C. Wilson. Both HOO and HOOUP were renamed, their terms of reference revised, and their membership adjusted. The out-of-date terminology of "home" versus "overseas" was abandoned (it was at this time, too, that NAD stopped being published first in the *Yearbook*, with divisions thenceforth purely alphabetized). In place of HOOUP was the "General Conference and Division Officers and Union Presidents" or GCDOUP, but with a much increased representation of union presidents (thus extending the precedent of the last HOOUP in 1981); at the first meeting, in 1982, almost half of the world Church's 82 unions were represented.⁸ Replacing HOO was the meeting of General Conference and Division Officers, or GCDO. In the 1980s, GCDO would meet for three days and GCDOUP for two days, again before both Spring Meeting and Annual Council.

Initially, OUP continued, but in 1983 it was re-named "Officers and NAD Union Presidents" or ONUP, its title and acronym adjusted in 1986 to "GC Officers and NAD Union Presidents" or GCONUP.⁹ By the late 1980s, GCONUP's meeting lasted just one day and it met only before Spring Meeting; the pre-Annual Council meeting was dropped. This partly reflected that a new division structure was being created in North America, but also perhaps partly that NAD's relative importance was

⁷ HOOUP, Oct. 10, 1977, and Oct. 4, 1981, GCO Minutes, p. 77-8, p. 81-137.

⁸ GCDOUP, Oct. 4, 1982, in GCO Minutes, p. 83-241.

⁹ Oct. 2, 1983, in GCO minutes, pp. 83-1009-1017; GCC, Oct. 10, 1986, p. 86-380; GCO, Apr. 4, 1988, GCO Minutes, p. 88-1001.

27 – Trim: Officers’ Consultations in the SDA Church

diminishing. After 1989, GCONUP ceased making recommendations to Spring Meeting and Annual Council; its business went straight to NADCOM councils. In its place, however, in 1990, came another new officer meeting, with a tongue-twisting acronym: “GC Officers, Division Presidents, and NAD Union Presidents”, or GCODPNUP!¹⁰ This only existed for two years before being replaced with the “General Conference Officers, North American Division Officers, and Union Presidents” meeting, and by the end of the 1990s the North American union presidents no longer enjoyed the unusual privilege of a separate meeting with the GC officers; instead, as in every other division, they met with their own division officers.

By this time, too, the experiment of having an extra meeting of GCDO that included union presidents, or representatives of them, had itself been discontinued, probably because the number of unions continued to grow. Prior to the 1995 Spring Meeting, GCDOUP met for two days, as was its long-standing custom, but 1995 was the last time it convened. In 2000, a new forum had its first meeting, GC Officers and Division Presidents; that group has met episodically since then. But today the only regular consultations of the headquarters officer group with officers from around the world is GCDO, which now is usually scheduled for less than a day—rather different to the three days of the 1980s (and the 1970s, when the meeting was HOO).

Overview

The chief principle for the last 90 years has been that division officers should consult with GC officers, though the idea that this group should include presidents of GC institutions long ago fell by the wayside. For some sixty years, there was a second consultative principle, too, namely that the union presidents in North America would have their own meeting with the GC officers. This reflected the disproportionate importance of the Church in NAD for the world Church: in membership in the 1930s but still in terms of tithes and offerings up to the early 1990s. Periodically, in the late 1960s–early 1970s and again in the early 1990s, the NAD union presidents met with the officers of the world divisions as well as GC officers, but this never became a constant.

¹⁰ GCO, Apr. 2, 1990, pp. 90-1001–1020.

There was one significant development, which was that for around twenty years, from the mid 1970s to the mid 1990s, there was some representation of union presidents in the meetings of GC officers with division officers. But 25 years ago, that approach too was dropped, which with hindsight seems perhaps unfortunate. In a sense, the poll of union presidents conducted by the Office of Archives, Statistics, and Research in 2018 represented a return of the idea of consulting with union presidents in advance of Annual Council.

The terminology evolved, reflecting different ideas of the relationship of the Adventist Church in North America to the rest of the world: from Home and Foreign Officers, to Home and Overseas Officers, with the addition of HOOUP. Then HOO was replaced by GCDO and HOOUP by GCDOUP; and the simple terminology of OUP (which implied a global scope!) was replaced with acronyms that reflected the North American character of this consultation, which eventually was downgraded.

Purpose and Operations

The purpose or role of officers' meetings was to discuss major questions of wide relevance; to consider appointments of important personnel; and to review proposed policies, statements, or other voted actions. In these meetings, further study was given to substantial matters: either because of uncertainty on the part of decision-making committees about measures proposed by standing or ad hoc committees and working groups; and/or to ensure wider input into the decision-making process than of the General Conference headquarters "brethren" alone. The function of officer consultations has been to ensure that actions voted by executive bodies are the product of mature reflection.

It is important to note that the membership of every iteration and variation of the meetings, from Home and Foreign Officers, to Home and Overseas, to OUP to GCDOUP to GCDO, was never fixed by GC Working Policy nor even by votes of the Executive Committee. This reflects the essentially advisory nature of all these consultations. Thus, the "Home and Foreign Officers" meeting in their second ever council in 1932 were joined by "the E. G. White Estate trustees", while the following day the GC officers were joined by union presidents, both "home" and "foreign", and by

29 – Trim: Officers’ Consultations in the SDA Church

leaders of the church’s sanitariums in North America.¹¹ Forty years later it was not unusual for HOO (roughly equivalent to GCDO, as we have seen) to be attended by the leadership of the Ministerial Association, or by the White Estate secretary and experts in Ellen White or Adventist studies; in the 1980s, similarly, representatives from Ministerial often attended one of the several meetings held over several days of GCDO and GCDOUP.¹²

The descriptive titles of the various iterations and incarnations of officer consultations have been the best guide to their membership, yet ultimately there was never a “membership”, as such, of any of these meetings. Rather there was attendance; and, despite the names given to the meetings, which imply that membership was fixed by holding certain offices, the fact is that who attended was not determined purely *ex officio*. Rather, attendance at such meetings was decided by the executive officers of the GC, based on what input into deliberations they judged to be most needed. For obvious reasons, it was always wise to avail oneself of the insights of officers of divisions and often of union presidents, but others would attend meetings at the discretion of the GC executive officers.

In terms of the tasks assigned to these officers’ meetings, the Home and Foreign Officers, which later became HOO, had the most substantive role. Proposed revisions of Working Policy were often given to that group to review and recommend to the Executive Committee. Recommendations from OUP/ GCONUP also went to Spring and Autumn Councils over the decades, but the difference is that in any given council, the Executive Committee would typically receive and review multiple recommendations from HOO, whereas recommendations from the largely North American group came less frequently and often only one at a time. This of course reflects the fact the officers meeting in OUP/GCONUP naturally had a more limited scope than HOO and had less expertise on global matters.

What kinds of business did HOO, GCDO, and GCDOUP process? A few illustrations must suffice. Examples of the

¹¹ Officers’ Councils, evening Oct. 13, and Oct. 14, 1932, GCO Minutes, series 2, pp. 55, 57–58.

¹² E.g., Home and Overseas Officers Meetings, Sept. 25 and 27, 1973, in GC Ar., RG 2, minutes of Home and Overseas Officers, Officers and Union Presidents, and Home and Overseas Officers and Union Presidents, pp. 73-1ff., 73-15ff. GC Officers, Oct. 6, 1983, GCO Minutes, p. 83-261.

Executive Committee taking actions to implement counsel from officers' meetings include Autumn Council 1956, which, acting on "recommendations from the meeting of the home and overseas officers," amended several policies in Working Policy, drew the attention of divisions to an existing provision in GC Working Policy, and established a new program of "mission orientation" for all new NAD missionaries, effectively the antecedent of the Institute of World Mission.¹³ At Autumn Council in 1959, a series of actions to amend the provisions of Working Policy relating to missionaries were taken on recommendations from the Home and Overseas Officers, rather than from the standing "Committee on Revision of Working Policy".¹⁴ In 1960, a new global initiative of mission to Muslims was established and Working Policy on missionaries further amended.¹⁵ A survey of minutes shows that officers' councils were especially influential in shaping Working Policy, particularly as it related to missionaries. But their counsel could be more wide-ranging: for example, so many actions were taken by the 1968 Autumn Council, in implementing recommendations of the Home and Overseas Officers that the records are found on twenty-one pages of the minutes.¹⁶

Similar examples could be multiplied, especially since HOOUP took on the function particularly exercised by HOO of reviewing proposed changes to Working Policy as it concerned interdivision employees. These instances all, however, hopefully give a sense of how consequential could be officers' counsel, formally expressed. And yet none of the important actions described above were their *decisions*: rather the minutes consistently and explicitly refer to "*recommendations* from the Home and Overseas Officers".

This is harder to detect after the introduction in 1978 of reference lines in General Conference Committee minutes, showing the committees in which items originated and by which they had been reviewed before they came to Executive Committee. While very helpful, these lines do not explicate, as past minutes

¹³ GCC, Oct. 24, 1956, Minutes vol. 19, bk. 3, pp. 680–683.

¹⁴ GCC, Oct. 26, 1960, Minutes vol. 20, bk. 3, pp. 702–705.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 706, and 709–711.

¹⁶ Further examples just from the 1960s: GCC, Oct. 22, 1964, Oct. 20 and 24, 1966, Oct. 20, 1967, Oct. 13-15, 1968, Oct. 12, 1969, Minutes vol. 21, bk. 3, p. 794; vol. 22, bk. 1, pp. 152, 223, bk. 3, pp. 67-669–671, bk. 5, pp. 68-1166, 1170–1172, 1175–1177, 1178–1182, 1194, 1218–1225, bk. 7, pp. 69-1702–1707.

31 – Trim: Officers’ Consultations in the SDA Church

had done, exactly what vote(s) had been taken by a review group or committee. However, the minutes of the officers’ consultations are plain.

At times the officers’ groups simply reviewed documents or presentations. They did sometimes take decisive action, but only in a limited sphere: in referring back, or in delaying, though this authority could sometimes be important. In 1973, for instance, the Home and Overseas Officers studied a recommendation that a “French-speaking division (to be known as the West Equatorial-Central Africa Division) be established”, but “decided that no action be taken at that time due to unsettled political and economic conditions in Africa.”¹⁷

Generally, however, committee actions are “Recommended”, rather than “Voted”, except when a “request” is made of the GC Officers, or when the vote is to ask another committee to look (or look further) at an issue. This remains true down to recent meetings of GCDO; this is revealed by a thorough survey of minutes (including of such uncommon meetings as “GC Officers and Division Presidents and Treasurers”), from the year 2000 through 2018.¹⁸ Even when an officers’ meeting proposes that more study be undertaken, the vote is frequently couched as a recommendation that this take place. At times no recommendations are made, and items are clearly on the agenda as a way of sharing information.

Officers’ recommendations have generally been to the Executive Committee, but by no means always. They have also recommended to boards of GC institutions (e.g., the Review and Herald Publishing Association and the Southern Publishing Association) and directly to GC Sessions.

Yet it should be noted that while recommendations were *usually* approved by the Executive Committee, they were not approved *automatically*. In 1968 for example, Autumn Council referred one such recommendation “to the General Conference Officers for further consideration”, an interesting action since the GC officers would have been part of the wider group that had discussed and recommended action; the choice to refer to the GC

¹⁷ See report to 1979 Annual Council, in GCC Minutes of Oct. 16, p. 79-390.

¹⁸ E.g., GC Officers and Division Presidents and Treasurers, Apr. 19, 2000, in ADCOM Minutes, pp. 00-1027, 1028; GCDO, 29 Sept. 2016, in ADCOM Minutes, pp. 16-1034, 1035.

officers is a pointed one.¹⁹ In 1971, a proposed statement, approved in draft by the “General Conference Officers and [NAD] Union Presidents” was referred to an *ad hoc* committee for further study, while another recommendation from OUP was referred to the GC officers “to continue research”.²⁰ In 1977, Annual Council referred a policy amendment recommended by HOOUP “back to the Home and Overseas Officers and Union Presidents for study.”²¹ At the 1986 Annual Council, a proposal for a new Church emphasis on the family, which came from GC Presidential, and had been “widely discussed” in advance of Annual Council, including review by GCDOUP, was, despite the endorsements it had received, referred “to the General Conference Officers for further study . . . with input from other parts of the world”.²² As numerous examples show, the recommendations of the various officers’ meetings really were suggestions, rather than a shorthand for actual decisions. This underscores where executive authority lay and affords a crucial insight into the role of officers’ meetings.

Conclusion

The purpose of the officer consultations was and is to facilitate high-level discussion and to give counsel to GC administration. While the advice of GCDO’s predecessors has rarely been disregarded, votes taken by it are not binding on any other body; they are recommendations, rather than actions. The membership, moreover, is not fixed, but can be flexible, reflecting GC administration’s need for counsel.

These are not recent developments; they have been true throughout the history of the officer consultations. This reality underscores the essentially consultative, as opposed to executive, nature of GCDO and its antecedents.

¹⁹ Oct. 14, 1968, GCC Minutes vol. 22, bk. 5, p. 68-1175.

²⁰ GCC Spring Meeting, 1971, March 30 and Apr. 1, 1971, Minutes vol. 23, bk. 2, pp. 71-438, 443.

²¹ Oct. 16, 1977, Minutes vol. 21, p. 77-378.

²² Oct. 13, 1986, Minutes pp. 86-431, 432.

John Nevins Andrews (1829-1883): A Visionary Missionary Pioneer

by
Gilbert M. Valentine

Introduction

A pioneer writer and scholar-evangelist, John Nevins Andrews exercised wide influence in the early Seventh-day Adventist church serving alongside James and Ellen White and Joseph Bates as one of the inner circle of leaders involved in founding the movement. He held a variety of important leadership positions including General Conference president, editor of the *Review and Herald*, and local conference president. He also served as a long-term member of the General Conference Executive Committee. John Andrews is remembered most for his scholarly defense of Adventist doctrines, especially the seventh-day Sabbath in his celebrated *History of the Sabbath*, and for his pioneering role as the first official overseas missionary for the church.

Early Life (1829-1849)

John Andrews was born on July 29, 1829 in a sparsely settled farming community of southeastern Maine known as East Poland about 35 miles northwest of the coastal city of Portland. On his father's side he could trace his forebears back through seven generations to a Henry Andrews who migrated to the American colonies in 1630 and settled in Boston, Massachusetts. His great-great grandfather David Andrews served for a time in the War of Independence and then in 1784 moved his family to the hamlet of North Paris where he established a new farm. John Andrews' father, Edward (1797-1865), was born in North Paris but at seven years of age was sent to live with his maternal grandparents, John and Elizabeth Nevins to help work their farm in Mechanic Falls.

He stayed with his Nevins grandparents for twenty-five years as a farm laborer and in 1827 married Sarah Pottle, the daughter of a well-to-do family in Minot, a neighboring town. After the birth of their first child, named John Nevins after his maternal grandfather, Edward and Sarah returned to the North Paris district to live among Edward's siblings again.¹ John Nevins Andrews grew up as an eldest son in a farming community surrounded by a close network of nine uncles and aunts that included four farmers, a lawyer, three successful merchants and a land developer. In childhood he enjoyed the company of a large number of cousins. His only sibling, a crippled younger brother, William, was born in 1834. A number of Andrews' uncles and aunts established themselves in the town of Paris Hill, the Oxford County seat, which became the social hub for the family.

John's mother, Sarah, traced her father's heritage back through five generations of loyal British "Tory" forebears who had migrated to America in 1693. She traced her mother's lineage back through the German Ricker family who had arrived in New England in 1750 and established themselves as a prominent hotelier family in the East Poland district at Poland Springs.² On his mother's side of his family John Andrews also inherited a wide circle of seven uncles and aunts. They were more broadly scattered around New England than his Andrews relatives but the Ricker-Potter connection also included merchants, teachers and an attorney. John Andrews thus inherited both European and British traditions shaped by a rich New England culture that valued individual liberty, family, religious faith, loyalty and above all, duty.

¹ A helpful annotated genealogical summary of the Andrews family that includes the Edward Andrews branch has been assembled by Miriam Andrews of Gorham, Maine, a descendant of John Andrews' uncle Alfred, under the title "Genealogy of My Branch of the Andrews Family in New England." See also Miriam Andrews to Dr. J. N. Andrews," November 7 and December 14, 1964. The documents are held in the Center for Adventist Research (CAR) Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

² *Poland Spring Centennial Souvenir 1795-1895*, 14. Ricker Memorial Library, Poland Corner, Maine. Sarah Pottle's maternal grandparents, the Ricker family, established a famous hotel on the site of Poland Springs and developed a huge bottled water industry at the site, see <http://archive.org/stream/polandspringcentoosouth#page/n5/mode/2> up accessed June 8, 2018.

There is no record of John Andrews attending any of the local schools although there was a one-room elementary school located on his grandfather's farm and there were other schools nearby. In 1843, at the age of fourteen, he attended a secondary school in Dixfield for six months while staying in the home of his Aunt Persis, a secondary school teacher, and Uncle Charles, an attorney who had served as a representative in the Maine legislature. After returning to practice law in Paris Hill, Charles Andrews had ambitions of sponsoring John through law school but John, along with his family, had become a Millerite and, believing that the world would soon end, declined the offer. According to his Aunt Persis, John was a "fine, promising boy – a very fine scholar and strictly moral." He was well versed in Latin, Algebra and English grammar, but "better than all" he had "first rate common sense."³ By his late teens Andrews had a well- trained intellect, a reading knowledge of several languages and a broad general knowledge. It seems that he acquired this extensive learning as an autodidact.

John Andrews relates that his "earliest religious conviction" occurred at church at the age of five when he heard a sermon by Methodist circuit preacher Daniel B. Randall on the "Great White Throne" of judgment portrayed in Rev. 20.11. The scene awed him with a deep sense of guilt and duty. At this time his mother entered his name upon the roll of his local Methodist Episcopal Church. An acute sense of duty and accountability shaped his Christian experience thereafter.⁴ When he was twelve years of age (1842) John Andrews first heard Joshua Himes and other Millerite preachers. Some months later, in January 1843, under the conviction of the Millerite message about the soon coming of Christ and the end of the world, he reported that he "found the savior."⁵ The local circuit preacher serving the North Paris Methodist congregation at the time, "Elder Brown," was an enthusiastic Millerite.⁶ Local newspapers report that the Millerite movement "spread like wildfire" and won large numbers of

³ Persis Sibley Andrews Black Diary (PSABD), October 8, November 9, 1843, Maine Historical Society, Portland Maine.

⁴ James White, "John Nevins Andrews," *The Health Reformer*, April 1877, 98.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Stephen Allen and W. H. Pilbury, *History of Methodism in Maine, 1793-1886*, (Augusta, ME: Charles E. Nash, 1887) 122. His pastor, Elder Brown later served the Millerite congregation at Beethoven Hall in Portland, Maine.

adherents “in every part of town” in the hamlets around John Andrews’ home.⁷ Andrews and his family committed to the movement and together with a group of like-minded families formed a small Millerite congregation of their own in North Paris.

The Great Disappointment of October 22, 1844 proved to be a severe upheaval for John Andrews’ family and their fellow believers. It took some time of struggle to understand their experience before they were able to reconstruct their theology and their lives. In Andrews’ immediate community it was thought that being faithful to the hope of the imminent Advent meant not returning to work and not returning children to school. They relied on the sale of property by the wealthier among them to sustain them. Unusual practices like “crawling” and exchanging “the holy kiss” were also adopted as they worked through their crisis of faith. At various times they hosted young women who claimed to have the prophetic charisma.⁸ During this period of disorientation, confusion and community anxiety, some of Andrews’ closest friends were removed from their parents’ custody because they were considered unstable and placed under state guardianship. For a brief time John Andrews was himself sought by the local constable.⁹ The suicide of the lay pastor of John’s church, Jesse Stevens, a year or so after the Great Disappointment caused their community much additional trauma. Perceptions of how their non-Millerite relatives perceived the group and their strange practices during this time are provided in the pages of his Aunt Persis Sibley Andrews’ diary.¹⁰

In mid-1845 John Andrews encountered Seventh Day Baptist teaching concerning the continuing sacredness of the seventh-day Sabbath and with young family friends he made the decision to become a Sabbath keeper.¹¹ The decision shaped the rest of his life

⁷ William Berry Lapham, *History of Woodstock, Maine with Family Sketches* (Portland: Stephen Berry, 1882), 82-85.

⁸ Marian Crawford, “Letter from a Veteran Worker,” *Southern Watchman*, April 25, 1905, 278; Marian Crawford to Ellen G. White, October 9, 1908, Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD (EGWE).

⁹ M. S. Crawford, “Extracts from Letter of M S Crawford to W. C. White” attached at the end of her letter to Ellen G. White, dated October 9, 1908, DF 439, EGWE; “A. C. Bourdeau Memoir,” CAR. Bourdeau worked with Andrews in Europe and the memoir which recalls conversations with Andrews is undated but seems to have been written towards the end of his life.

¹⁰ *PSABD*, February 28, March 11, April. 22, 1846.

¹¹ Crawford, “Letter from a Veteran Worker.”

and he eventually became one of the future Seventh-day Adventist church's most scholarly apologists for seventh-day Sabbath observance.

During his seventeenth and eighteenth years, tensions within the small Sabbatarian community where he worshiped became severely strained by doctrinal conflict and the group ceased meeting together. Andrews apparently used this period for further home-based study. In September 1849, Ellen and James White together with Joseph Bates visited North Paris and succeeded in reviving the Sabbatarian Adventist group. The Whites and Bates had been conducting a series of Bible study conferences around New England, sharing their convictions about an emerging doctrinal consensus that tied together a new understanding of the Great Disappointment explained by the insight that while the date was correct, believers had expected the wrong event. Christ had moved from one apartment in heaven to the other as part of a great eschatological cleansing of the sanctuary in heaven. This insight linked together with the seventh-day Sabbath teaching gave new meaning to the prophecies of Daniel 8 and Revelation 14 and to their 1844 experience.

John Andrews, after some struggle, enthusiastically accepted the new understanding and joined forces with Bates and the Whites in taking the new synthesis to share with other former Millerites. The September 1849 conference proved to be a major turning point in Andrews' life.¹² During the meeting an outbreak of charismatic glossolalia was interpreted as a message directed to Andrews, telling him "that the Lord had called him to the work of the gospel ministry and he must prepare himself for it."¹³ In retrospect, Ellen White confirmed that she viewed this conference as a time of healing and as the occasion of Andrews' call to ministry.¹⁴

¹² "Letter from J. N. Andrews," *Present Truth*, October 16, 1849, 29.

¹³ The testimony report is cited by Arthur L. White in "Tongues in Early SDA History," *ARH*, March 15, 1973, 5. See also Hiram Edson's account in *Present Truth*, December 1849, 36.

¹⁴ Ellen G. White, *Spiritual Gifts* II (Battle Creek MI: James White, 1860), 117.

Early Ministry, Ordination and Health Problems (1850-1855)

Shortly after the 1849 conference, John Andrews moved with his parents from North Paris into a small rented house in Paris Hill. Twelve months later in October 1850, James and Ellen White moved from upstate New York to board with the poverty-stricken Andrews family in a larger rented home just off the town square at Paris Hill.¹⁵ At this place, writing copy on the kitchen table, John joined James and Ellen in preparing the first issues of the *Review and Herald*, a magazine destined to become the flagship publication of the Seventh-day Adventist church. He was a member of the initial “publishing committee,” and would be associated with the magazine either as a consulting editor or editor for the next thirty-two years until his death in 1883. His first serious contribution to the magazine was an article entitled “Thoughts on the Sabbath,” a compact 1,000-word piece that would presage in condensed form the many issues Andrews would address later in his life-long defense of the seventh-day Sabbath.¹⁶

In December 1850, in an initial mentoring partnership with an older former Millerite preacher, Samuel Rhodes, Andrews began his itinerant ministry traveling through Vermont, New Hampshire and Maine, with a focus on persuading former Millerites of the credibility of the new synthesis of the Sabbath and sanctuary truth. Along the way he was able to write up a 10,000-word article defending the perpetuity of the ten-commandment law. Later Andrews would partner with Joseph Bates and Hiram Edson in his itinerant ministry. This formed the pattern for the first years of Andrews’ ministry which eventually took him through New England several times, then down into Indiana and Ohio and up into Michigan. He eventually settled for a time with the Whites after they had moved the new magazine to Rochester, New York in 1852. Andrews would not return again to Paris Hill until 1855 by which time ill-health obliged him to withdraw from ministry.

During their earlier nine-month stay with the Andrews family in Paris Hill in 1850, relationships between Andrews’ parents and

¹⁵ Ellen G. White to Reuben and Belinda Loveland, November. 1, 1850; Ellen G. White to “The Church in Brother Leonard Hastings House,” November 7, 1850. EGWE. James White, “The Paper,” *ARH*, March 1851, 53.

¹⁶ J. N. Andrews, “Thoughts on the Sabbath,” *ARH*, December 1850, 10.

the Whites had broken down over misunderstandings about rent and the terms of agreement for sharing a house. Tense personal relationships had also developed between the Whites and other Paris Hill Sabbatarian Adventists, particularly the Stevens family who were close friends of the Andrews. The Whites complained that they were not being adequately supported. Close living arrangements, overwork, ill health and “plain speaking” marred the connection and led the Whites to withdraw from the Andrews’ home in Paris Hill in June 1851. These difficult family relationships from Paris Hill days shadowed John Andrews’ personal affiliation with James and Ellen White for the rest of his life.

After leaving the Andrews family, James White took the magazine first to Saratoga Springs in upstate New York where supporters enabled him to acquire his own printing press. He then moved it further west to Rochester on the Erie Canal where the publishing enterprise began to flourish as the growing movement, with the help of John Andrews’ pen, began to extend its range of magazines and pamphlets. Andrews transferred his residence to Rochester and lived with the Whites again in their large home, which served as a boarding house for publishing employees and volunteers. For Andrews it also served as new base for his itinerant evangelism. This was a productive period for him as a maturing writer and speaker and he soon became Adventism’s leading scholarly, systematic exponent of doctrine and a highly effective apologist. He published extended series of polemical articles defending the Sabbatarian interpretation of Revelation 14, the 2,300-day prophecy of Daniel 8, and the cleansing of the sanctuary doctrine. These articles were soon turned into widely circulated booklets.¹⁷ He also engaged vigorously with numerous writers in other Millerite publications such as the *Advent Harbinger* and *The World’s Crisis* that were hostile to the doctrinal positions of Sabbatarian Adventists. James White regarded Andrews, who was 10 years his junior, as a Melanchthon-type colleague and he supported his fearless approach to defending their doctrine. “We approve of the mild, yet plain manner in which Bro. Andrews has defended his position; and fully believe that his letters are accomplishing, and will accomplish

¹⁷ J. N. Andrews, *The 2300 Days and the Sanctuary* (Rochester, N.Y.: Advent Review Office, [1854]).

much good.” Andrews challenged, in straightforward debate, “opponents” who “impiously trample on the commandments of God.” Such sharp disputation, while pointed, was “a necessity and unavoidable.”¹⁸

Andrews based his systematic expositions of the movement’s doctrinal positions on the conviction that “truth” was based on facts and that when facts were uncovered and clearly established, truth could be seen by all as just plain “common sense.” In this Scottish Enlightenment worldview, Andrews was shaped by the “common sense” philosophy which underlay the thought patterns of nineteenth century New England society. It derived from the Baconian scientific view that stressed the assembling of facts on any given topic and that when this was done the truth of the matter was “self-evident.”¹⁹ Whether or not Andrews actually read the works of Scottish philosophers such as Francis Hutcheson (1694-1790), Thomas Reid (1710-1796) or Dugald Stewart (1753-1828), their worldview formed the ground for his own underlying, sub-conscious philosophy. It framed all his writing, whether on health, ethics or religious doctrine. Andrews saw his role as setting out “the facts” on the Sabbath truth and on the prophetic fulfillments and the assemblage of facts would form an argument that would “speak for itself.”²⁰

In late October 1853 Andrews attended a conference meeting of his colleagues at Newhaven, Vermont, in which study was given to the matter of “Gospel Order.” As a result of the meeting, John Andrews, at age twenty-four, was among the first small group of Sabbatarian Adventist ministers to be ordained to the gospel ministry.²¹ He was aware of the importance of the step. Authorizing the ordination of its own ministry was a significant stride forward for the movement, helping to build its self-identity and draw its boundaries. The step also expressed the emerging movement’s need to act for itself as a community of faith.

By 1854, the pressure of writing and editing while engaged in an itinerant evangelistic ministry and lodging in parishioners’ homes with no regular income began to wear away at Andrews’

¹⁸ “Letters to O. R. L. Crozier,” *ARH*, July 8, 1852, 37.

¹⁹ A good discussion of the philosophical undergirding of John Andrews’ era is found in Mark Noll, *America’s God* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 2002), 113.

²⁰ See for example J. N. Andrews, “The Sabbath,” *ARH*, June 10, 1852.

²¹ James White, “The Eastern Tour” *ARH*, November 15, 1853, 148.

health. The unhealthy, cramped, and impoverished living arrangements with the Whites when he was back in Rochester aggravated a chronic, severe catarrh and dyspepsia. Exposure to the contagion of tuberculosis in the White household did not help. Four members of the household died from the disease during 1854-1855. In spite of appeals from James White to leading men among the *Review and Herald* readership for more financial support for Andrews, little was forthcoming. He returned penniless and with broken down health to his parents' home in Paris Hill in late April 1855 in order to recover.²² In the meantime, James White negotiated with supporters to move the *Review and Herald* publishing company further west to Battle Creek, Michigan, an initiative that apparently offended not only John Andrews but numerous other influential families in the Northeast.

Migration to Waukon, Iowa and Marriage (1856-1858)

At age twenty-six, in November 1855, John Andrews with his parents and brother migrated 1,400 miles west to the prairies of Waukon, in northeast Iowa. The location had a reputation as a much more healthful climate for those suffering from respiratory diseases. Andrews' plan was to help his parents make a new start in life, establishing a farm with the help of finance from sympathetic relatives. The Stevens family from Paris Hill and other Sabbatarian Adventists from New York state and Vermont, some of whom had disagreed with James White's decision over the relocation of the press, soon joined them. John Loughborough from Rochester was among the most influential.

Eleven months later, on October 29, 1856, Andrews married thirty-two-year-old Angeline Stevens (1824-1872), a childhood friend from Paris Hill. It was a marriage Ellen White felt quite ambivalent about, advising against it at first and then conceding reluctantly. She did not believe the relationship between the Andrews and Stevens families was a helpful one.²³ As the membership of the Waukon group expanded to about thirty, Ellen and James White feared that with some disenchanted families

²² James White to "Dear Brother," February. 9, 1855. EGWE. James White, "The Office," *ARH*, February. 20, 1855, 182. J. N. Andrews, "My Experience in Health Reform. – No 2," *The Health Reformer*, January 1872, 169-170.

²³ Ellen G. White to J. N. Andrews August 26, 1855, EGWE.

among them Waukon could become an Adventist center competing for influence with Battle Creek, perhaps even becoming schismatic. Thus at the end of 1856 the couple made a winter-time visit to the group to bring about reconciliation. Misunderstandings were clarified and fears allayed and Ellen White succeeded in enticing John Loughborough back into fulltime ministry, doing more to assist him financially.

Six months later, in mid-1857, Uriah Smith, the office editor for the *Review and Herald*, now located in Battle Creek, married John Andrews' sister-in-law, Harriet Stevens. The new family ties added layers of complexity and sensitivity to the delicate balance of influence and work relationships among the young church's leadership families. While the Whites deeply respected the literary gifts of both Andrews and Smith and valued their contribution to the Advent cause, at times the Smith-Andrews axis, later allied through marriage to the influential Butler family, also from Waukon, was perceived as a threat to James White's leadership. This gave rise to significant misunderstanding and conflict between the families.

Through this early period Andrews found difficulty relating to the prophetic charisma manifested in Ellen White, though not because he doubted that it was genuine. His problem related to why the charisma appeared to be manifested only in Ellen White when, according to his understanding of New Testament passages like 1 Corinthians 14:29, others in a congregation or a community might also experience the gift. In his Sabbatarian Adventist community in North Paris and among his relatives there were others who had claimed to experience similar charismatic phenomenon. Eventually he accepted his community's conviction of the manifestation of the gift exclusively in Ellen White for the guidance of the Sabbatarian Adventist movement and became a strong apologist for her ministry.²⁴

During 1857-1858, a period of national economic recession, the road back to health for Andrews was slow and arduous as the movement's leading theological exponent gave himself to establishing his farm, starting a family and undertaking such part-time ministerial work as his health would allow. He continued as a corresponding editor for the *Review* but wrote little. At the time of

²⁴ Edward Andrews to "My Dear Children" March 1, 1863; G. I Butler to J. N. Andrews, 1863, CAR.

his migration west he had published a study seeking to establish the biblical teaching on the beginning and ending time for Sabbath observance. His study demonstrated that in Scripture, Sabbath was observed from sunset on Friday to sunset on Saturday.²⁵ This proved exceptionally helpful in preserving unity in the young church. But for two years afterwards his pen was still until his illness was cured and he was once again strong enough to begin researching and writing on the doctrine of the Sabbath.²⁶

Return to Fulltime Ministry in New York (1859-1865)

As health returned Andrews slowly ventured beyond Waukon and again widened his sphere of influence. In early 1859, en route to some East Coast libraries to pursue further Sabbath research, he visited Battle Creek and led out in a study of biblical principles of financial support for ministry. This led to the adoption of a new approach to ministerial support called “Systematic Benevolence” based primarily on New Testament texts. At this time he understood tithing to be a requirement of the Old Testament ceremonial law and not binding on Christians. The new systematic approach, adopted widely by the church, eased the uncertain financial plight of traveling ministers and slowly strengthened church finances.²⁷ By the middle of 1859 Andrews had completed his initial survey of the history of the Sabbath and published a four-part article series on the subject in the *Review*. Later in the year the material was published as a well-received ninety-five page booklet.²⁸ The text would be expanded and refined over the next fifteen years to become Andrews’ *magnum opus*.

Returning health also brought to Andrews a deepening sense of duty to return to full-time ministry. In mid-1859 he became involved in evangelistic programs in Michigan and Massachusetts, which kept him from his Waukon home for more than seven months. The following year he engaged in itinerant evangelism in

²⁵ J. N. Andrews, “Time of the Sabbath,” *ARH*, December 4, 1855, 78. See also James White, “Time to Commence the Sabbath,” *ARH*, February 25, 1868, 168.

²⁶ J. N. Andrews, “Institution of the Sabbath,” *ARH*, January 6, 1859, 52.

²⁷ “Systematic Benevolence,” *ARH*, February 3, 1859, 84; “The Conference,” *ARH*, June 5, 1859, 20-23.

²⁸ J. N. Andrews, “History of the Sabbath and First Day of the Week,” *ARH*, July 14, 21, 28; August 4, 1859. The pamphlet carried the lengthy title, *History of the Sabbath and First Day of the Week; showing the manner in which the Sabbath has been supplanted by the heathen festival of the sun* (1859).

the east for a further ten months, again leaving his family in the care of his parents and in-laws. The outbreak of the Civil War in April 1861, soon complicated developments for the growing church located as it was in the Northern and Midwestern states. War fever disrupted evangelism and exerted pressure on the movement's finances and personnel and heightened Adventists' sense of the imminence of the Advent. Throughout 1862 Andrews experienced growing tension between the claims of farm and family and the call to full-time ministry, aggravated by further misunderstanding with the Whites who became more critical of Andrews' relatives among the Waukon group.²⁹ Finally in February 1863 Andrews determined to let his Waukon farm go and moved Angeline and his two children, Charles and Mary, to the east to join him in upstate New York where a fully paid regional ministerial role was assured. The family, after some uncertainty and further conflict with James White over location, finally settled in Rochester. White wanted Andrews in Battle Creek. Andrews argued that Rochester would give him much better access to university libraries for his Sabbath research.³⁰

As Andrews moved back into full-time ministry, the expanding movement felt more acutely the stresses caused by lack of any formal organizational structure. Economic disruptions and the growth of the business had increased the financial stress on James White, who held in his own name ownership of and therefore responsibility for the Review and Herald publishing company and its complex financial affairs. White began to agitate for personal relief from the pressure and issued an ultimatum that he would withdraw from responsibility if nothing was done.³¹ The ultimatum highlighted the need for a formal organizational structure both for the publishing endeavor and for the purpose of integrating and coordinating the rapidly proliferating congregations.

Andrews found himself caught up in a major conflict that soon broke out between leaders both over whether such a

²⁹ The stresses and joys of these years are narrated in a diary kept by Angeline Andrews (AAD) between October, 1859 and January, 1865. The diary is held at Loma Linda University Heritage Research Center (LLUHRC).

³⁰ John Byington, George Amadon and James White to J. N. Andrews November 15, 1864; J. N. Andrews to "Dear Brethren White, Byington & Amadon," November. 16, 1864, EGWE; AAD, November 19, 29, 1864.

³¹ James White, "Borrowed Money," *ARH*, February 23, 1860, 108.

structure was really needed and, if so, what form it should take. White declined to put up a formal proposal but simply argued that organization was needed. In an endeavor to find common ground Andrews proposed the convening of a conference.³² The influential R. F. Cottrell, one of the official “corresponding” editors of the *Review*, did not favor a strongly centralized structure but argued for a loose congregational model like the Baptists. John Andrews favored a legal association for the holding of the publishing company but was apprehensive about a central organizational structure for the congregations if, as a spiritual entity, it became “a church incorporated by law” and therefore tied to the state. He argued that some sort of umbrella association would be better but he did not think that the structure should take a form like the “iron wheel of Methodism” which he saw as rigid, dominating and restrictive of conscience. White took offense that Andrews was not more actively supportive of the urgency of the need for organization and as the conflict worsened, White accused Andrews publicly of “cowardly silence.”³³ Relationships between White and Andrews became tense as the conflict over organization broadened. It took some time for ideas in the church to clarify and for the Michigan state legislature to enact the kind of legislation that would eventually accommodate the church-state sensitivities of groups like the Adventists.

At the General Conference session of 1860, John Andrews, as the second most influential voice in the denomination supported James White when a name for the denomination was chosen and the *Review and Herald Publishing Association* was established.³⁴ For family reasons he was not able to participate in the follow-up 1861 meetings when the first local conference was organized for Michigan, an absence that led to serious further misunderstanding with the Whites. However, he was actively involved in implementation of the new conference arrangements in other states such as Minnesota and New York and at the local

³² J. N. Andrews, “The Review Office,” *ARH*, August 21, 1860, 108.

³³ James White, “Organization,” *ARH*, August 27, 1861, p. 100; Ellen G. White, “Slavery and the War,” *Ibid*, 100, 101. Twelve months later, despite Andrews’ submissive apology, White repeated the allegation in James White, “Organization,” *ARH*, September 30, 1862, 140.

³⁴ His hesitation before the final vote was over process not the name nor its necessity. “Business Proceedings,” *ARH*, October 9, 1860, 162; “Business Proceedings,” *ARH*, October, 23, 1860, 178.

church level.³⁵ Andrews was also closely involved in 1863 when the General Conference was organized. In this development he took a leading role not only in arguing the case for such an organization, but in researching possible constitutions and in leading committees that worked their way through the details of the articles of association.³⁶

As the need for more conscripts for Union forces in the Civil War became more acute during 1864, changes in the conscription law caused immense problems for the newly organized Church. The new acts sharpened the double moral dilemma of bearing arms and preventing Sabbath observance. The cost of paying bounties to secure non-combatant privileges became unsustainable, threatening to bankrupt the Church and force the abandonment of its mission.³⁷ In August 1864, J. N. Andrews was appointed by the General Conference to present the documents making the Church's case for non-combatant status to the Provost Marshal in Washington, D.C. Church leaders were not only unsure about whether such a petition would be successful but were deeply ambivalent as to whether formalizing a relationship with the government was even the right thing to do. Andrews' successful securing of recognition by the government of the needs of the Church marked the first formal interaction between the Seventh-day Adventist Church and the United States government and burnished Andrews' image as a leader who would represent the Church well.³⁸

Two months after Andrews returned from Washington, tragedy struck. On a visit to her husband as he conducted tent evangelistic meetings at Port Byron in upstate New York, Angeline, in an advanced state of pregnancy, suffered from an attack of malaria. A few days later Angeline almost died as she gave birth to a premature baby daughter who did not

³⁵ "Doings of the N. Y. Conference," *ARH*, November 4, 1862, 182.

³⁶ "The Conference," *ARH*, May 26, 1863, 204-206.

³⁷ Kevin Burton, "Situating Views on Military Service: Seventh-day Adventist Soldiers and the Church's Political Rhetoric during the Civil War," paper presented to Association of Seventh-day Adventist Historians Conference, Takoma Park, Maryland, January 8, 2018, 12.

³⁸ Ellen G. White to G. I. Butler and S. N. Haskell, August 12, 1886. EGWE; see also Douglas Morgan, "Civil War," *Ellen G. White Encyclopedia*, eds Denis Fortin and Jerry Moon (Hagerstown, MD: ARH, 2013), 721.

survive.³⁹ The trauma and loss sobered both husband and wife but could not keep Andrews from his summer evangelism.

Post-Civil War Leadership (1865-1870)

At the first General Conference session following the conclusion of the Civil War, James White was appointed president and John Andrews was appointed as a member of the powerful three-member executive committee. His pastoral assignment, however, was as a “missionary” to the Northeast and for the larger part of the next two years he gave his energies to evangelism in Maine, Vermont, Massachusetts and other locations in the “Eastern Mission.”⁴⁰ He found that changed social circumstances following the war brought a new class of audience to his meetings and required the implementation of new evangelistic strategies. No longer did short two or three week campaigns seem to be effective. The new audiences required a much longer program of meetings and more basic Christian teaching before the distinctive Adventist doctrines could be introduced. Andrews and his various assistants, including Dudley M. Canright and Merritt E. Cornell, found themselves pioneering the new evangelistic methods and needing to stay longer in a location, laboring to establish a church. This was particularly true at Norridgewock in Maine.⁴¹ It was the beginning of the need in Adventism for a settled pastorate that gradually replaced the itinerant circuit evangelist.

During the post-Civil War period Andrews felt the need to write much more extensively on the doctrine of the non-immortality of the soul. The horrendous loss of life during the war impacted families in every community and questions on life after death and the state of the dead were not just idly theoretical but deeply personal to traumatized families everywhere. Andrews wrote several extended pamphlets such as *Thoughts for the Candid* (1865), *Samuel and the Witch of Endor* (1866), *Departing and Being With Christ* (nd), and *The Wicked Dead: Are They Now Being Punished?* (1865), as well as many magazine articles.⁴² While didactic in nature his writing on

³⁹ AAD, September 3, October 28, 1863, LLUHRC.

⁴⁰ “Missionary Labors,” *ARH*, May 30, 1865, 204.

⁴¹ J. N. Andrews, “Labors in Maine,” *ARH*, October 31, 1865, 173.

⁴² G. W. Amadon, “Devil’s Rampant,” *ARH*, October 17, 1865, 160. See also for example, “The Wicked Dead,” which was a 7 ½ column piece. *ARH*, March. 28, 1865, 129-131; 136.

this topic also reflected a deep pastoral concern. Like his fellow Advent believers, John Andrews understood the nature of humanity to be such that the human soul was not naturally immortal and this meant that a state of uncomprehending unconsciousness prevailed during the time between bodily death and resurrection. Andrews believed that the doctrine integrated much more logically and consistently with the doctrines of the Advent, resurrection, millennium and final judgment. The central idea in the doctrine is today sometimes called Christian mortalism, or more pejoratively “soul-sleep” or “annihilationism.” These terms would figure more prominently in the more technical debates Andrews would occasionally have on the subject with other ministers such as Seventh Day Baptist scholar Jonathan Allen from Alfred University at Alfred Center in 1863 and again in 1869 with N. V. Hull, the editor of the *Sabbath Recorder*.⁴³

The demands of evangelism in the northeast were so pressing on Andrews in September 1866 that he was unable even to return home for the funeral when his fifteen-month-old daughter Carrie died of dysentery. The family had to rely on brother-in-law Uriah Smith to conduct the sad funeral.⁴⁴

In August 1865, James White suffered a stroke brought on by the accumulated stresses of chronic overwork, interpersonal conflict generated by his autocratic leadership style, a weak digestive system and poor dietary habits. White, elected president of the General Conference just three months before, had just returned to Battle Creek after a series of highly stressful meetings in Iowa at which he had tried to avert schism that threatened over the issue of non-combatancy versus pacifism and felt badly betrayed by former colleagues.⁴⁵ The stroke left White partly paralyzed, but it also greatly complicated Andrews’ life.

While White’s speech and movement gradually returned after the stroke, it was clear that the damage to his nervous system had

⁴³ J. N. Andrews, “Tent Meeting in Alfred Centre, N. Y.,” *ARH*, August 18, 1863, 92; see also *Sabbath Recorder*, August 20, 1863, 31.

⁴⁴ “Obituary,” *ARH*, October 3, 1865, 143.

⁴⁵ Three months after his stroke, White placed much of the blame for his illness on the “terrible conflict” with W. H. Brinkerhoff of Iowa. “My Condition,” *ARH*, November 7, 1865, 180. Also see Kevin Burton, “Apocalypticism, Patriotism, and a Fighting ‘Peace’ Church: Seventh-Day Adventist Combatant Soldiers and the Church’s Political Rhetoric During The Civil War.” A paper presented at the American Society for Church History, Berkeley, California, April 7, 2017: 27-29.

been severe. Excessive agitation, erratic emotional behavior, and general distress made him dysfunctional in any executive capacity. When further recovery did not occur, James and Ellen visited Dr. Caleb Jackson's "Our Home on the Hillside," a water cure retreat at Dansville not far from Rochester. The treatment was unsuccessful and a worried Ellen took James back to Battle Creek and then, in some distress, to a farm they had purchased earlier at Greenville, Michigan about 40 miles to the north. She would try her own remedies. In the meantime John Andrews and John Loughborough, president of the Michigan Conference at the time, had to begin to discreetly fill the gap and take care of decision-making for the church.⁴⁶

Despite White's debilitating illness, delegates at the May 1866 General Conference session, out of a sense of loyalty and as a statement of faith, re-elected him as president although replacement personnel were brought in to take over the management of the publishing house for him. Increasingly as 1866 progressed, White's erratic behavior and lack of social appropriateness grew worse and John Andrews was called several times to Battle Creek to moderate disputes and to begin acting unofficially as *de facto* president.⁴⁷ Even as he endeavored to keep his northeast mission going, Andrews' voice increasingly became the leadership voice in the *Review* and he became the unofficial public advocate for the new programs that had been launched. It was a difficult, sensitive role for Andrews because White was still aware of his official role and over time through 1867 he very slowly moved back into preaching. Andrews and others of White's colleagues were in a quandary at the time for they feared he might never fully recover.

Health problems also caught up with numerous other denominational leaders at this time which prompted the church to begin a health institute of its own in Battle Creek modeled on Dr. Jackson's Dansville program but without the social entertainments. A new "health reform" program promoting

⁴⁶ Ellen G. White to J. N. Andrews [undated but internal evidence clearly suggests 1866] (Ltr, 12, 1866) reflects on the sensitivity of whether to continue paying James a salary, EGWE-GC.

⁴⁷ Harriet Smith's diary (HNSD) for this period gives some idea of the distress the White and related families endured at this time. See entries for November 16, 22, 26 and December 3, 11, 1866, CAR.

vegetarianism and natural remedies was also launched in the church with enthusiastic endorsement from Ellen White's visions.

John Andrews played a significant formative role in helping introduce the new health reform ideas to the Adventist community during the early 1860s. His family in Waukon had been successfully experimenting with hydrotherapy treatments during 1862 and 1863 and from his work in New York Andrews had become familiar with the Dansville water cure program and Caleb Jackson's literature.⁴⁸ In early 1864 he had sent his six-year-old son Charles to Dansville with a severely lame leg. Over three months Charles had responded well to the treatments and returned home cured. During 1863 Andrews also became active in encouraging Adventists in his circle to subscribe to Dr. Jackson's health reform journal, *Laws of Life*. Andrews had earned a promotional edition of Dr. Russell Trall's *Hydropathic Encyclopedia* for his efforts.⁴⁹ His own example of recovered health and his enthusiastic endorsement of "hygienic" living contributed to a framework of acceptance within the movement, which Ellen White would do much to encourage. She would provide a theological and spiritual rationale so that healthful living became integrated into official Adventist doctrine.⁵⁰

At the General Conference session of 1867 it was clear to delegates that James White was not well enough to carry out executive responsibilities and John Andrews was elected president.⁵¹ If Andrews had been *de facto* president previously, now he became president formally although in reality he was still only a caretaker president. James might not have been able to take executive leadership but with his autocratic personality and determined entrepreneurial spirit he still had very firm views on

⁴⁸ Ronald Numbers suggests that the article on the hydropathic treatment of diphtheria published as a front page article in the *Review* of February 17, 1863 was brought to the attention of the Whites by John Andrews who went down with the disease himself in the diphtheria epidemic of early 1863 when he was preaching in western New York. *Prophetess of Health: Ellen G. White and the Origins of Seventh-day Adventist Health Reform* (Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press, 1992), 288.

⁴⁹ AAD, July 12, 1864, LLUHRC.

⁵⁰ *The Health Reformer*, June 1877, 161; D. E. Robinson, *The Story of Our Health Message: The Origin, Character, and Development of Health Education in the Seventh-day Adventist Church*, 3rd ed (Nashville: Southern Publishing, 1965); Ronald L. Numbers, 88.

⁵¹ "Business Proceedings," *ARH*, May 27, 1867, 284.

where the church ought to be putting its energies and on how things ought to be done. He was unable to let go of the reins of leadership. Andrews spent much of his year living with the Whites at their Greenville farm and travelling with them around the churches and to camp meetings in a team ministry. It was difficult for him to work so closely with James during this period of slow health recovery when the normal emotional swings of James' manic-depressive temperament were exacerbated, but Andrews had learned to adapt with a submissive spirit and this enabled him to cope with the situation.

In 1868 the General Conference session elected Andrews to a second term as president when it became clear that White needed further time to heal. This time, however, White was added back on to the executive committee. Initiatives introduced by Andrews to this session included the opening of evangelistic work for the first time in California. Adventism under the Andrews-White partnership was expanding its horizons. The role ambiguity, however, clearly made things difficult for Andrews as White became more aggressive in taking back the reins and became more assertive in telling Andrews what he should be doing and how and when.⁵² Faced with the overpowering drive of his colleague, who subjected him to frequent criticism, sometimes quite publicly, Andrews slowly lost confidence in himself and in his own decision-making ability. Previously, in 1862, in order to survive in the relationship, Andrews found himself reasoning that White filled an "apostle"-type role in Adventism and he proactively adapted to this concept. This made it easier for Andrews to accept the harsh criticism and it provided a basis for leaving all the difficult decision-making to White and simply do what he was told.⁵³ Now he found himself doing the same again and others of White's closest colleagues, such as J. H. Waggoner, Uriah Smith and G. I. Butler would eventually take a similar approach. Andrews realized that it was not a healthy state of affairs for himself or for the young Church.

At the end of his second term as president of the General Conference, in mid-1869, Andrews was appointed as president of

⁵² J. H. Waggoner, "An Explanation," *ARH*, August, 4, 1868, 108.

⁵³ J. N. Andrews to J. White, February 2, 1862, CAR.

the New York Conference for a two-year term.⁵⁴ Duties, however, initially detained him in Battle Creek where tensions had reached a fever pitch, with many in the congregation being outspokenly critical of the Whites over the matter of dress reform and the Whites' custom of "plain speaking" about backsliding and lack of consecration to the cause. This time, Andrews not only submitted to their criticism for the good of the cause, but found himself defending James and Ellen White.

James White had also been publicly critical of business decisions taken by the interim president of the publishing house, Jotham Aldrich, during the time of Andrews' early General Conference presidency.⁵⁵ This had contributed to sharp factionalism among the workers. Uriah Smith had stoutly defended Aldrich and had quarreled about it with James and Ellen. After refusing to apologize or back down, he had been released from his editorship. As soon as he had completed his presidency therefore, Andrews found himself replacing Smith as editor of the *Review*, a position he held for a period of nine months until Smith was reconciled with the Whites and resumed his duties once again.⁵⁶

Under the oversight of Andrews during 1869 the church paper took on a more intense exhortatory and revivalist focus supplemented by expository and exegetical articles. Andrews' editorials set the tone. Each week he had a major exhortatory piece and often short, supplementary pieces reflecting on passages of scripture that he considered problematic or especially applicable to the times. The overriding theme was exhortation to faithful living set in the context of the approaching judgment. In early November he commenced a series on the order of events in the judgment that ran continuously for nineteen weeks until mid-March. He had not intended the series to run so long, he observed apologetically near the end, but once he got going he had "been led to speak more fully than he designed."⁵⁷

⁵⁴ "Camp-meetings in New York," *ARH*, July 20, 1869, 28, 30, 32 and August 3, 1869, 48.

⁵⁵ Kevin Burton provides a carefully documented analysis of Aldrich in "An Adventist Gentleman in Battle Creek: The Leadership of Jotham M. Aldrich, 1866-1868," *Journal of Asia Adventist Seminary* 16, No. 2 (2013): 127-152.

⁵⁶ John Andrews, "Explanatory," *ARH*, June 15, 1869, 196.

⁵⁷ "The Articles on the Judgment," *ARH*, March 8, 1870, 96.

During this particularly difficult period of church development, John Andrews, in addition to carrying the editorship of the *Review*, was requested to conduct a church trial at Battle Creek with the assistance of school master G. H. Bell and *Review* corresponding editor, J. H. Waggoner. John Kellogg kept the trial records. Each member of the congregation was investigated and interviewed and eventually ninety-seven percent of the four hundred members were disciplined by being disfellowshipped. Individuals were later re-admitted after suitable confessions and upon demonstrating other evidence of good faith. The committee of three felt they were defending the ministry of the Whites and doing what the church and the Whites expected of them.

Before he finished his service as caretaker editor of the *Review and Herald*, Andrews, along with G. H. Bell and Uriah Smith, undertook the task of responding to attacks on James White's business practices and the genuineness of Ellen White's charismatic ministry from the Marion party in Iowa and other critical voices in New England. The 155-page publication they produced was used to defend the denomination for many years.⁵⁸ Quarrels and disagreements did not dent the convictions of Andrews and his colleagues about the rightness of the Adventist cause.

Ministry and Research in the East (1870-1874)

In 1870, following his service as editor of the *Review and Herald* and his involvement in the church trial in Battle Creek, John Andrews returned to Rochester as the primary base of his ministry. During the next four years he stayed away from Michigan as much as possible, although councils, new institutional developments, and recurring crises drew him back occasionally for extended stays. The early 1870s was an unsettled period of development for the Adventist church. Membership growth (22 percent in 1872) was matched by an even more rapid growth in the number of ministers.⁵⁹ The increasing demands from various

⁵⁸ J.N. Andrews, G.H. Bell, and U. Smith, *Defense of Eld. James White and Wife: Battle Creek Church to the Churches and Brethren Scattered Abroad* (Battle Creek, MI: Steam Press, 1870).

⁵⁹ 1872 witnessed membership growth from 4,801 to 5,875, a 27% increase in ordained ministers (40 to 51) and an 80% increase in the number of licensed ministers (46 to 83), as reported in "The Conference," *ARH*, March 25, 1873, 116.

fields for pastoral care and guidance by leaders like Andrews added to the stress on leaders.

On a personal level, this period of Andrews' ministry was also a troubled and unsettled time. Personal tragedy, uncomfortable, intractable conflict with his senior colleague, and a worrying loss of confidence in himself darkened his life. The requirement for him to submit to the will and counsel of others eventually undermined his sense of self and hollowed out confidence in his own judgment. A strong sense of religious duty remained as the core motivation for his life and exerted relentless pressure along with an abiding sense of guilt at having never done enough. Yet, at the same time, this was also a period of great fulfillment for Andrews. During these years he was able to write extensively on the theme of the Sabbath from various perspectives. He authored a fifteen-part series of articles replying to Thomas Preble's book advocating the first-day Sabbath and worked on the revision and enlargement of his *History of the Sabbath*.

In late 1870, he also published a 225-page volume of eleven sermons on the Sabbath that was designed for a popular audience. The eleven chapters outlined both the biblical and secular history of the Sabbath in reader-friendly summary form. The book paralleled the content of his larger, more scholarly book and it helped bridge the gap until the revision of longer volume could be completed.⁶⁰

Andrews' research and writing on the Sabbath history was traumatically interrupted when, on Saturday night, February 17, 1872, his wife Angeline suffered a paralytic stroke.⁶¹ In the month that followed, to the joy of her husband and children, Angeline made an almost complete recovery. But on March 19 she suffered a second much more severe stroke that took her life. Nine days previously she had celebrated her 48th birthday. A pastoral colleague from the New York Conference conducted a simple funeral service in the parlor of their home, and Angeline was buried beside the couple's young daughter Carrie in the Mt. Hope cemetery. The family was devastated.⁶² Shortly

⁶⁰ J. N. Andrews, *Sermons on the Sabbath and Law: An Outline of the Biblical and Secular History of the Sabbath* (Battle Creek, Steam Press, 1870); see also George A. Amadon Diary, January 31, 1870, CAR.

⁶¹ "The Sickness of Sister Andrews," *ARH*, March 5, 1872, 92.

⁶² "Death of Sister Andrews," *ARH*, April 16, 1872, 124.

afterwards Andrews placed his house on the market and moved with his two children to South Lancaster, Massachusetts, where he boarded with family friends and tried to assuage his grief in study.

By the end of 1872 Andrews completed work on a supplementary book manuscript on the Sabbath in the writings of the church fathers which he planned to publish separately. His approach in this supplementary volume was to cite the fathers themselves, using their “exact words,” rather than citing secondary sources. With this more “proper method,” he pointed out, the reader could have “the facts in full.”⁶³ The new book appeared in early February with the lengthy title *The Complete Testimony of the Fathers of the First Three Centuries Concerning the Sabbath and First-day*. Resident editor Smith, in his lead editorial endorsement in the Review and Herald, observed that Andrews’ study was “a most triumphant showing” that the church fathers of the first three centuries of Christianity “did not regard Sunday as a divine institution.”⁶⁴

Andrews’ expanded 512-page *History of the Sabbath* was finally published in February 1874 after years of painstaking work and was celebrated with press notices within the church and beyond.⁶⁵ “Eld. Andrews has shown great patience, energy and perseverance as well as skill, learning and judgement . . . nor has he wanted candor or courage in the presentation of the facts,” wrote a reviewer in the *Sabbath Recorder* who was sure the book would “become a standard work.”⁶⁶ Andrews’ study constituted the weightiest and most serious scholarly publication the church had yet produced and it established Andrews’ reputation as Adventism’s foremost champion of the seventh-day Sabbath.⁶⁷

In 1887 a posthumous revised edition was issued. When, in 1891, European church leader Louis R. Conradi undertook the translation of the book into German, he substantially modified the work by using German original sources where Andrews had used

⁶³ J. N. Andrews, “The Fathers on the Sabbath Question,” *ARH*, November 29, 1872, 188.

⁶⁴ “New and Important Work,” *ARH*, February 11, 1873, 72.

⁶⁵ “The Preparation of the Sabbath History,” *ARH*, December 2, 1873, 196; “History of the Sabbath,” *Ibid.*, 200; “The First-Day Sabbath vs. the History of the Sabbath,” *ARH*, December 9, 1873, 204, 205.

⁶⁶ “History of the Sabbath,” *ARH*, January 27, 1874, 56, book review reprinted from *Sabbath Recorder*, December 3, 1873.

⁶⁷ “History of the Sabbath,” *ARH*, January 6, 1874, 32.

English translations of the German sources. Conradi also introduced more contemporary German church history authorities in place of the English scholars Andrews had cited and he expanded the scope of the book by adding seven new chapters providing further detail about the Sabbath in Europe. In 1908, with the encouragement of the General Conference, Conradi undertook a further significant rewrite of major sections of the English version to better align the two editions. In 1912 a fourth revision expanded to 599 pages was issued acknowledging the joint authorship. The volume has had enduring influence.

Missionary to Europe (1874-1883)

On September 15, 1874, John Andrews left Boston for Neuchatel, Switzerland as the first official overseas missionary of the Seventh-day Adventist Church.⁶⁸ He was accompanied by his sixteen-year-old son Charles and twelve-year-old daughter Mary, and a Swiss Sabbath-keeper, Ademar Vuilleumier. A group of about fifty adult Swiss Sabbath-keepers in a network of inter-related families, largely watchmakers by occupation, clustered in five or six mountain villages north of Neuchatel, had invited the church to send a missionary to them to be their minister and to use their community as a base for taking the church's message of the Sabbath and the imminent Second Advent to Europe.

This network of Sabbath-keepers had formed seven years earlier as a result of the labors of Michael Czechowski, conducted under the auspices of the Advent Christian denomination based in Illinois. After he withdrew from the Swiss group due to conflict over finances, they had discovered the existence of the Seventh-day Adventist church in Battle Creek and asked for assistance. John Andrews had been the correspondent and over a three-year period, two young men from Switzerland were sent to study at Battle Creek. The objective in sending Andrews across to Europe was that he would be their pastor and educate their leaders and their young men for evangelistic outreach. At the time, the Adventist church had no policy framework for overseas mission work and no experience, although they had set aside a modest mission fund. Andrews was a willing and experienced scholar-evangelist who could read French although he could not speak it.

⁶⁸ J. N. Andrews, "Our Embarkation," *ARH*, September 22, 1874, 112.

The expectation held both by Andrews and church leaders in Battle Creek was that within a very short time the mission would become self-supporting, as had all other new churches in new territories as the church expanded westward across America. This did not work out as anticipated. The launch of the mission to Europe coincided with the commencement of the longest and deepest financial recession America and Europe had experienced in the modern era. Before the decade was out, the church in Battle Creek would face a severe financial crisis which threatened the bankruptcy of its publishing houses. Extreme financial pressures, the conservative social circumstances of the European venture, the lack of an adequate system of financial support, and a lack of experience in cross-cultural relations prevented the mission from quickly becoming self-sustaining and posed immense challenges for Andrews. A lack of understanding in Battle Creek that cultures in Europe were very different from American culture and that mission needed to be adapted to local circumstances greatly complicated Andrews' work, causing deep personal anguish and anxiety. Frequently impoverished, his family suffered economic hardship that severely threatened their well-being. Persevering for nine years, he succeeded in establishing an enduring missionary publication that continues to the present and a church community that has helped serve as a base for further mission in the Francophone world.

Andrews' name had been considered by church leadership as the most suited for the anticipated mission to Europe for some time in the early 1870s. President George Butler reported in 1873 that there had already been "considerable said in the *Review*" publicly about Andrews going "to attend to the extension of missionary operations in Europe."⁶⁹ Not only had Andrews been the designated correspondent with the Swiss group, but he had also helped as an agent for the sale of some of their watches in the United States, and had personally mentored one of their young trainee ministers, Jakob Ertzenberger. The young Swiss-German had stayed in Andrews' Rochester home in 1870 as he prepared for ordination.⁷⁰ But leadership uncertainty had caused procrastination and delay in a final decision to send Andrews.

⁶⁹ "The General Conference," *ARH*, November 4, 1873, 164.

⁷⁰ "Communication from Br. Ertzenberger," *ARH*, July. 26, 1870, 45.

Tensions among the senior leadership group of James White, J. H. Waggoner, Uriah Smith, John Andrews and George Butler had been exacerbated by the increasing demands of a rapidly expanding church, the uncertainties occasioned by James White's seriously declining health and the increasing frequency of his severe mood cycles. White's heavy-handed leadership style accompanied by an increasing paranoia led to misinterpretation of his colleagues. White felt threatened while his colleagues felt intimidated. A struggle over White's role as the ailing senior leader came to a head in 1873 at a hastily called General Conference session. The conflict resolved itself with the adoption of a policy statement on leadership framed by George Butler that set forth James White's role as a "Counselor" though it was modeled on the concept of an "apostle." This gave him a spiritual and organizational authority with which the others in the leadership group would comply without criticism or objection.⁷¹

In the process of achieving resolution of the tensions at the 1873 session John Andrews endured harsh criticism over well-intentioned actions as well as perceived failings. He felt obliged to make a humiliating public confession and state his willingness to be even more submissive than he felt he already was. As a result of the leadership crisis, action on the sending of Andrews on his overseas mission was postponed.⁷² Finally, at the conclusion of the following General Conference session in 1874, George Butler insisted that delegates make a decision on Andrews. They agreed to instruct the executive committee to make the decision to send him overseas.⁷³ It was clumsy and awkward but the decision constituted a crossing of the Rubicon for the church. Adventist mission would now become world mission.

Andrews arrived in Neuchatel too late to prevent his new Swiss parishioners from ambitiously, and he thought unwisely,

⁷¹ Kevin Burton, "Centralized for Protection: George I. Butler and his Philosophy of One-person Leadership" (MA Thesis, Andrews University, 2015), 55. Rather than posing his own view of leadership the document is an attempt to theorize about James White's leadership as his colleagues actually experienced it. The policy proved unworkable and was modified and then abandoned a few years later.

⁷² "The General Conference," *ARH*, November 4, 1873, 164; J. N. Andrews to Ellen G. White, February 6, 1874, EGWE.

⁷³ The convoluted process reflected the uncertainty about where authority lay. "Proceedings of the Thirteenth Annual Meeting . . .," *ARH*, August 18, 1874, 75.

investing in a major new family business that for the next several years locked up finances that Andrews thought could have been used for mission activities. It also absorbed the energies and attention of key personnel whom Andrews was counting on to join him in fulltime mission. Andrews thus faced a greatly changed set of circumstances from what he had anticipated. Over the first few months, as he adjusted to the new situation, to culture shock and to the realization that he was an expatriate with very limited conversational language skills, he experimented with a newspaper advertising campaign to generate interest in the Sabbath. After rehabilitating his lapsed former trainee, Jacob Ertzenberger, he visited Sabbath-keeping groups in Germany and conducted pioneering evangelistic meetings that helped establish Adventism's first German church. With the advice of his Swiss church members, a decision was taken to launch a French-language monthly journal modeled on James White's Californian evangelistic paper, *Signs of the Times*. Both the new leader and the local believers considered this the best way of reaching across the many cultural, geographical, religious and social barriers that confronted them.

Birthered in July 1876 with Andrews as midwife and editor, *Les Signes des Temps* was intended to develop a readership and be supported by village and town-based evangelistic preaching programs in homes and hired halls. American-style tent evangelism was not possible. French-speaking Canadian Daniel Bourdeau joined the group in late 1875 and then in March 1876 Andrews moved his base of operations to the Swiss city of Basel in order to have access to printers. The city was thought ideal also because of its centrality. As a Swiss city it bordered both France and Germany. Here, for the next seven years, Andrews would commit himself to editing and publishing the magazine, engaging in evangelistic preaching in Switzerland and France, and seeking to establish congregations. Groups of Sabbath-keepers were founded even in distant places such as Naples, Italy and Alexandria, Egypt, as well as in Turkey, Russia and other nations where interest had been raised among readers of the magazine. Over time additional workers were sent from Battle Creek to Scandinavia and to England, and Andrews, where it was appropriate and possible, exercised general oversight over these workers as well. In practice, however, because of their different circumstances, they adapted the task of mission to the

local circumstances as best they could. Despite numerous difficulties Andrews' magazine survived and its circulation expanded until in 1883, the year of his death, it was printing 5,000 copies per month. The General Conference, after initial apprehension, eventually strongly affirmed and commended this evangelistic approach.⁷⁴

In mid-1877, church leaders in America faced reduced church income resulting from the continuing "long depression" that began in 1873. When they received reports of limited baptismal results in Switzerland and news of Andrews' recent illness and close call with death caused by impoverished living conditions, James White and his executive committee publicly criticized Andrews for not following the "American Model" in pursuing his foreign mission. They argued that the mission would become self-sustaining more quickly if this had been done. Andrews' vigorously defended his approach and pointed out that mission had to adjust to local circumstances. He also requested that reimbursements for expense be more prompt and predictable and that he be paid a regular salary that would enable him to take care of his living expenses. The request for a salary was denied and due to James White's increasing ill health and dysfunction, the reimbursement of expenses continued in an untimely and erratic fashion. Andrews' explanation that it was difficult to gain a hearing for an American religion in Europe was not understood and the continuing financial recession on both sides of the Atlantic added tension between the leaders. The criticism and lack of confidence in his leadership hurt Andrews badly. Increasingly ill health began to plague his family.

Andrews was summoned back to Battle Creek in early September 1878 to attend the upcoming General Conference session. It was a fortuitous invitation for his sixteen-year old daughter had contracted tuberculosis. She did not recover, despite the best of care, and died in the Battle Creek Sanitarium on November 27. Mary had developed as an invaluable editorial assistant and proofreader for the magazine and as an emotional

⁷⁴ S. N. Haskell, "What is Wanted in Europe," *ARH*, July 18, 1882, 456. See also *ARH Supplement*, May 1, 1883, 3-4. For further support of this see Gilbert Valentine, "J. N. Andrews and the "Success" of the European Mission," in *Contours of European Adventism: Issues in the History of the Denomination on the Old Continent*, eds Stefan Hoschele and Chigemezi N. Wogu (Friedensau, Germany: Institute of Adventist Studies, 2020), 43-46.

support for her father. He was shattered by the loss, staying on in the United States for a further five months trying to regain his own health. During this time of recovery he travelled to New England visiting family and church members and raising money for his European mission.

Because James White, due to a quarrel with colleagues, refused to attend the official opening of the huge new Battle Creek Dime Tabernacle on April 29, 1879, Andrews, as the most senior and respected leader in the denomination other than White, gave the dedication address. The seating capacity of 3,000 was an indication of the growth of the church, not just in Battle Creek but nationwide and internationally as well.

Andrews returned to Europe at the end of May 1879 with determination and hope that his health was improving. Ellen White had urged him to remarry before returning but his loyalty to the memory of Angeline, whom he had so often neglected in the cause of duty, made the prospect of remarriage seem impossible. During his last four years in Europe he assisted for a time in the British Mission, introduced innovations in *Les Signes des Temps* and worked to expand its circulation. Church membership continued to grow steadily but slowly as did the magazine's subscription lists. The onset of consumption, which he had contracted from Mary in 1878 but which was not formally diagnosed until he consulted physicians in Southampton in September 1880, increasingly diminished his energies, confining him to home and sometimes to bed. With increased determination he gave himself to the editing of the periodical and to the training of a Swiss associate whom he saw as having the potential to continue the work after him.⁷⁵ With exceptional effort and dedication Andrews continued his editorship of the magazine until his death on October 21, 1883.

Battle Creek leaders planned various audits after the first public criticism of Andrews' mission strategy in 1877 but only one was eventually formally conducted. In mid-1882 Stephen N. Haskell, a member of the General Conference executive

⁷⁵ Jean Vuilleumier who had worked with Andrews in 1879 and 1880 became his assistant in the last year of his editorship and records in his Diary (JVD) much detail from the closing months of Andrews's life. The diary is held at the Archives Historiques de l'Adventisme Francophone, Campus Adventiste du Saleve 33, Chemin du Perouzet 74160 Collonges-sous-Saleve, France.

committee, accompanied by an experienced layman, William Gardner, undertook a five-month study trip through seven different countries, making a detailed assessment of Andrews' mission strategy, his use of resources, the needs of the field, the attitudes of his colleagues and the distinctive challenges of mission in Europe.⁷⁶ The visit opened Haskell's eyes, persuading him of the validity of Andrews' oft-repeated claim that Europe was different from America and that it warranted an approach to mission adapted specifically to its needs.⁷⁷ "But few in America have been able to realize the difficulties under which those labor who go to Europe from this country," Haskell noted for *Review* readers.⁷⁸

Haskell's summative report, shared with and endorsed by the General Conference Executive Committee and published in a special *Review Supplement* at the time of the 1883 General Conference, exonerated Andrews.⁷⁹ It vindicated his decisions, his use of resources, lamented the limited support the church had provided and the difficulties created, and sought to correct the misunderstandings created by the criticism.

Contribution

John Nevins Andrews has been called the "intellectual giant" of early Adventism, and the "foremost Adventist intellectual of the 19th Century."⁸⁰ He was a pioneer scholar-evangelist who helped shape the church profoundly in manifold ways. He helped shape its early theology and prophetic understanding through his preaching and writing as a Melancthon to the early James White. His early apologetic writing on doctrinal and prophetic understanding helped establish Adventist self-identity over against first-day Adventists, a significant contribution Uriah Smith referenced in the obituary he wrote for his brother-in-law. He credited Andrews with being "especially instrumental in bringing out light upon the subjects of the Sanctuary, the United States in Prophecy and the Messages of Revelation 14."⁸¹

⁷⁶ G. I. Butler, "Eld. Haskell's Trip to Europe," *ARH*, May 16, 1882, 313.

⁷⁷ S. N. Haskell, "What is Wanted in Europe," *ARH*, July 18, 1882, 456.

⁷⁸ S. N. Haskell, "Omens for Good," *ARH*, January 2, 1883, 9.

⁷⁹ *ARH Supplement*, May 1, 1883, 3-4.

⁸⁰ Grady Smoot, "Andrews' Role in Seventh-day Adventist History," in *John Nevins Andrews: The Man and the Mission*, ed. Harry Leonard (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1984) 10, 43.

⁸¹ U. Smith, "The Death of Eld. Andrews," *ARH*, October 30, 1883, 680.

Andrews' apologetic but rigorous scholarly work on the history of the Sabbath gave the church strong confidence in its teaching on the Sabbath as it moved into the wider world and into more educated strata of society. His constant support and validation of the work of Ellen White and his affirmation of her distinctive prophetic charisma, both through his published writings and by the spoken word, helped the church remain united and confident in her leadership. His leadership of the *Review and Herald* and of the General Conference at times of crisis helped stabilize the church, enabling it to weather its way through times that might have caused it to fragment. His ground-breaking service in mission in Europe helped shape and establish the future of Adventist work across national and cultural boundaries. As he learned how to adapt to local circumstance in the cause of mission, he helped the church to learn as well.

It has sometimes been difficult for students of Adventist history to feel comfortable making an assessment of the contributions made to the church through the life and work of John Nevins Andrews. The effectiveness of his mission is debated. Some scholars have been inclined to regard Andrews' mission to Europe as a failure on the basis of James White's 1877 criticism, while others have noted the strength of Andrews' defense of his strategy and the General Conference's 1883 vindication of his work.⁸² Complicating the task is the fact that the many Ellen G. White letters of correction and rebuke, sent as private cautions and testimonies to Andrews, are now public. Even in his own day they were often circulated around the other leaders. These

⁸² See for example Erich Baumgartner, "Charisma and Contextualization: Leadership Lessons from the Emerging Adventist Church in Central Europe, 1864-1914" in *Parochialism, Pluralism, and Contextualization: Challenges to Adventist Mission in Europe (19th-21st Centuries)*, eds. David J. B. Trim and Daniel Heinz, (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2010), 67; Daniel Heinz, "The Development of Seventh-day Adventist Missionary dynamic in Europe: Assessing the Contributions of Michael B. Czechowski, John N. Andrews, and Ludwig R. Conradi," *Ibid*, 55. A more nuanced and comprehensive account of the success is found in Gilbert Valentine, "J. N. Andrews and the 'Success' of the European Mission," in *Contours of European Adventism: Issues in the History of the Denomination on the Old Continent*, eds Stefan Hoschele and Chigemezi N. Wogu (Friedensau, Germany: Institute of Adventist Studies, 2020), 27-57.

communications have shaped perceptions and challenged assessments.⁸³

The letters from Ellen White assist in providing helpful insights into Andrews' life and philosophy and it is clear that she was often critical of his philosophy of work and his scholarly temperament. To accept this perspective as a kind of final verdict or even as the dominant interpretive lens without a careful understanding of the "time and place" of these communications and without a careful study of John Andrews' personal responses to the criticism is to misunderstand both the letters and the person to whom they were addressed. The correspondence needs to be sensitively interpreted, taking into account the distinctive temperament of Ellen White's bi-polar husband, his autocratic leadership style and the conflicted attitudes that James White developed towards Andrews, his closest working loyal associate. Ellen White feared that her husband's unreasonable, harsh criticism of Andrews (and of two or three other colleagues) had irreparably intimidated them, destroying their self-confidence and their ability to think and act for themselves. Still, on many occasions, for the survivability of the Advent cause, Ellen White felt called to defend her husband in spite of his dominant leadership style that, while highly effective, was at the same time damaging. Submission was the only alternative for associates like Andrews. It is also necessary to consider the role of a defense of her husband's posthumous reputation as a factor in Ellen White's last negative interaction with Andrews in the highly critical letter sent to him on his deathbed.⁸⁴

The long-running complexities of the relationship between the Andrews, Stevens and White families also need to be factored into interpretation of the correspondence between Ellen White and John Andrews. The relationship was characterized by misunderstandings, offenses given, long memories and carried grudges. A careful consideration of such context provides a more comprehensive and nuanced understanding of Andrews from the

⁸³ Papers read at the J. N. Andrews sesquicentennial celebrations at Andrews University July 20-21, 1979 all illustrate sensitive attempts to find a positive but balanced assessment in the light of negative testimonies. See Roy E. Graham, "J. N. Andrews and Dedication;" Joseph G. Smoot, "J.N. Andrews and the Bible," and Gottfried Ooesterval, "The Legacy of J. N. Andrews." CAR.

⁸⁴ Ellen G. White to J. N. Andrews, June 9, 1883, EGWE. Ellen White had made several earlier attempts at writing the troubling letter.

65 – Valentine: J. N. Andrews: Visionary Missionary Pioneer

perspective of Ellen White and of the way this perspective has shaped the traditional assessment of the contribution made to the church through the life and ministry of John Nevins Andrews.

In 1960 the trustees of the Seventh-day Adventist flagship university in Berrien Springs, Michigan renamed the institution Andrews University in tribute to the life and labor of John Nevins Andrews. A bronze statue of Andrews and his children, “Legacy of Leadership,” created by English-born artist Allan Collins in 1998, occupies a central place on the campus and commemorates the commitment Andrews and his family made to Adventist mission.

Journal of Adventist Archives, Vol. 3 (2023): 66—79
Article copyright © 2023 Ashlee L. Chism and D. J. B. Trim

The Office of Archives, Statistics, and Research: Bringing Together the Past and Present in Order to Inspire for the Future

by
Ashlee Chism and D. J. B. Trim

Introduction

The Office of Archives, Statistics, and Research (ASTR) is an office of the General Conference (GC) of Seventh-day Adventists. While it was founded in 1975 as the Office of Archives and Statistics, ASTR is the successor to the Statistical Secretary's Office (or department) which was established in 1904. This article covers the full history. ASTR's current roles include managing the archives and records management program of the GC, collecting and publishing crucial organizational information and statistics, and supporting the research and analysis needs of the Seventh-day Adventist Church's World Headquarters, particularly strategic planning and executive decision-making by the General Conference officers. ASTR is also responsible for the production of the *Encyclopedia of Seventh-day Adventists*. A secondary but important role is supporting scholarship and Church researchers throughout the world. Those who are interested in Adventist history and Adventist studies may make use of the General Conference Archives and the Rebok Memorial Library, both of which come under ASTR.

Early Recordkeeping

Statistics were compiled and reported by Seventh-day Adventists from an early stage. Immediately after the founding General Conference Session in 1863, a session of the Michigan Conference was also held at which a statistical report about the

Conference, its local churches, and membership, was given.¹ This points to the interest in statistics from even before the denomination was formally organized. At the fourth GC Session in May 1866, the Session voted as follows:

That the delegates from each state conference should . . . furnish to the General Conference the statistics of their respective conferences; and [that] the secretaries of the several conferences . . . furnish the delegates of their own conferences, such statistics, specifying the number of ministers and licentiates, the number of churches, the number of the membership, and the total amount of their systematic benevolence fund, etc.²

The Michigan Conference, which again had its session immediately after the General Conference, promptly embodied the need for this report in its constitution.³ And at the next year's fifth Session, in May 1867, the first annual statistical report was duly presented by Secretary Uriah Smith.⁴ At every annual GC Session thereafter a statistical report was presented by the secretary. By the early 1900s, (by which time GC Sessions had become biennial) a report was given at each year's Autumn Council, today known as Annual Council, given by the statistical secretary (see below). Thus, starting in 1867 an annual report has been presented to a representative body of the Church and published by the Church, initially in the Church's paper, the *Review & Herald*, later in the *General Conference Bulletin*, and, since 1907, as a standalone publication.

Information about how record-keeping was done prior to the 1901 structural re-organization of the Church is relatively thin. Records were kept in the General Conference headquarters as well in the offices of the Review and Herald Publishing Association.⁵ How the GC files were kept in distinction from the publishing association's files is unknown, though based on his

¹ "State of the Cause in Michigan," *ARH*, June 2, 1863, 5-7.

² "Fourth Annual Session of General Conference," *ARH*, May 22, 1866, 196.

³ "Sixth Annual Meeting of the Michigan State Conference," *ARH*, May 22, 1866, 197.

⁴ "Business Proceedings of the Fifth Annual Session of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists," *ARH*, May 28, 1867, 283.

⁵ "Our List and Files," *ARH*, January 6, 1903, 16.

positions as *Review* editor and GC secretary, Uriah Smith certainly had a role in how the files were kept.

In 1901 Church leaders recognized the need to reorganize the Church's organizational structure. They also recognized the need for well-compiled and maintained statistics, and for that they turned to H. Edson Rogers. He had clerked at the General Conference headquarters since January 1889, and had been the "statistical clerk" and clerk of the General Conference Committee since April 1901.

In 1904, at the age of 36, Church leadership appointed Rogers as the Church's first statistical secretary, and the post was made permanent in June 1905.⁶ Rogers' establishment of the Statistical Office laid the foundation for the work done by its successor offices. Indeed, Rogers inaugurated two serial publications of the Seventh-day Adventist Church: *The Seventh-day Adventist Yearbook* (an earlier version of which had been published from 1883 through 1894 and which was revived by him) and the *Annual Statistical Report*, whose publication as a separate volume was evidently Rogers's brainchild.⁷ What Rogers added to the GC Secretariat was formally recognized in an action taken by the 1913 GC Session, which amended the constitution to add to the secretary's formal duties: "to collect such statistics and other facts from division, union, and local conferences and missions, as may be desired by the conference or the executive committee."⁸

While the role of General Conference archivist would not be created until 1973, Edson Rogers was already evidently exercising some responsibilities in the realm of archives and records

⁶ General Conference Committee [hereafter GCC], June 5, 1905, GCC Proceedings, vol. vii, p. 24; *Yearbook 1904*, p. 11. See anon., "Harvey Edson Rogers," *The Student's Journal*, 26:6 (June 1897), 7; "Rogers, Harvey Edson" and "Statistical Secretary," *Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia*, vol. ii, pp. 467, 702; cf. "Harvey Edson Rogers" (obit.), *ARH*, March 25, 1943, 19. Rogers's appointment as Clerk of the General Conference Committee [GCC] was voted by the committee on Apr. 19, 1901, GCC Proceedings, vol. v, pp. 2-3. See also A. L. Chism, D. J. B. Trim, and M. F. Younker, "We aim at nothing less than the whole world": *The Seventh-day Adventist Church's Missionary Enterprise and the General Conference Secretariat, 1863-2019*, General Conference Archives Monographs, 1 (Silver Spring, MD: Office of Archives, Statistics, and Research, 2021), 160-61.

⁷ Rebok Memorial Library, Special Collections, MS 1, unpaginated.

⁸ Thirty-Eighth Session (1913), 14th meeting, May 22, 2:30 p.m., in *General Conference Bulletin*, May 23, 1913, 111.

management in 1904. Such responsibilities probably arose from Rogers's role as head of the stenographic staff for taking minutes at the biennial General Conference Sessions. In 1904 the GC headquarters was in the process of transferring from Battle Creek, Michigan, to Takoma Park, which straddles the District of Columbia and Maryland. Rogers wrote to Clarence C. Crisler, another of the headquarters staff, who was traveling from Takoma Park back to Battle Creek, asking him "to secure some matters from the vault." Rogers continued: "You wished me to tell you where to look. . . . You will find things quite readily, I believe. The Secretary's files are on the South side of the vault, beginning at the east end; the President's on the north side." He noted that: "You will find the year books at the west end of the vault." Rogers suggested to Crisler "that you secure some large envelopes, and when you take any letters from a file that you write on the envelope the number of the transfer case, and whether from the President's or the Secretary's file." Evidently there was some order and Rogers wished to preserve it. The extent to which the GC was administratively intertwined with the Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association (soon to be renamed the Review & Herald Publishing Association) is revealed by Rogers's comment to Crisler, *à propos* of the publishing house: "The General Conference file of papers is in that hall back of the Retail store." He concluded: "Anything that belongs to the General Conference look over, and bring with you anything you will need here."⁹

Rogers's varied and important role in managing stenographic reporting of GC Sessions; collection, analysis, and publication of statistics; and managing official records, was acknowledged when the 1922 GC Session made the statistical secretary an *ex officio* member of the General Conference Committee. In moving the amendment to the constitution that this move required, Secretary William Spicer, with typical warmth, affirmed his longstanding colleague, Rogers: "We have but one Statistical Secretary in the denomination."¹⁰ Rogers was statistical secretary for a remarkable 37 years, retiring in 1941.

⁹ Rogers to C. C. Crisler, July 8, 1904, "Outgoing letterbook of the statistical secretary, 1901-1905," General Conference Archives [GC Ar.], item O 390, RG 29, box O 386-390 (capitalization as in the original).

¹⁰ Fortieth Session (1922), 26th meeting, May 28, p.m., in "Twenty-Sixth Meeting," *ARH*, 99:29, "General Conference Special," no. 9 (June 22, 1922): 30 (capitalization as in the original).

Development of the Archives

Serious consideration began to be given to establishing a separate General Conference archives after World War II. In the spring of 1946, the General Conference Officers voted:

To recommend that a Department of Archives be established to properly look after our legal documents and obtain copies of all deeds and legal papers from all divisions to be on file here in the General Conference office.¹¹

However, eighteen months later, an officers' meeting agenda included an item with the title "Central denominational archives depository" and the officers voted to refer a proposal to the Institutional Planning Board.¹² Yet though nothing more was heard for some years of creating a central denominational archives, work *was* being done on the records of the General Conference, under the direction of Claude Conard, the statistical secretary. In 1953, there was a collection of some kind held in the Statistical Office, for that year the GC Executive Committee voted to "release to the Seminary Library," not only "The former General Conference Library," but also what are described, in the action, as: "The collections in the vaults of the Statistical Office, the upper and the lower vaults, according to the 'Survey and Record' prepared by Claude Conard under date of February 12, 1950, and [the] card files and lists belonging thereto."¹³ Some of the listed items were published materials, but the reference to vaults indicates that documents were included.

The 1950s indeed saw renewed discussion of establishing a formal way of protecting Church records. These arose partly arising from Cold War concerns (serious enough to prompt the GC officers in the spring of 1951 to discuss whether to safeguard Church records by storing copies outside Washington, D.C., or by constructing "a bombproof vault" in Takoma Park; they preferred

¹¹ General Conference Officers' Meeting [hereafter GCOM], March 24, 1946, GCOM Minutes, 2nd series, p. 6375.

¹² GCOM, Oct. 19, 1947, GCOM Minutes, p. 47–293.

¹³ GCC Meeting, Jan. 22, 1953, GCC Minutes, vol. xviii, p. 1061. Since the Seminary Library was transferred to Andrews University, we strongly suspect that some of the collections at the Center for Adventist Research originally came from the materials collected by Rogers and Conard.

the former.)¹⁴ But there was also a desire to preserve the records themselves, and a recognition of their value. According to minutes of the GC Officers' Meeting in late 1955, Everett D. Dick, former GC secretary, wrote to the GC officers in his capacity as president of the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary and member of the General Conference Executive Committee,¹⁵ "to suggest that in planning for denominational archives they be planned for in the new Seminary building." This of course reveals that the concept of founding an archives had been the subject of preliminary discussion. However, at the same Officers Meeting, the minutes tell us that "a number of questions were raised with reference to just what material would be in need of housing." These questions led to the following decision: "It was *Agreed*, To hold the matter in abeyance."¹⁶ This abeyance would last for a decade and a half, though the question of how to preserve and store the Church's records was a recurrent one. The General Conference officers saw the preservation of the Church's documentary heritage essential, though at this time they did not see a need for it to be open to scholars engaged in research.¹⁷

While the desire for an archives was growing, the Statistical Office's leadership and role continued to evolve. When Statistical Secretary Henry W. Klaser was called to be the secretary-treasurer of the Southwestern Union Conference, the GC Executive Committee asked E. Lee Becker, the auditor of the General Conference, to take on the statistical secretary's duties. Becker presented the statistical report at the 1962 GC Session. After Becker's report, M. V. Campbell remarked, "Some people consider statistics rather dry, but actually they are history, and history is never dry."¹⁸ The 1962 GC session also saw the discontinuation of the position of statistical secretary; its duties were combined with that of auditor,¹⁹ and Becker was continued in the position. This combined role only lasted through Becker's tenure, from 1962 to 1964. Despite its official discontinuation, Becker was still referred

¹⁴ GCOM 1 Apr. 1951, GCOM Minutes, p. 51-85.

¹⁵ *1956 Yearbook of the Seventh-day Adventist Denomination*, 12.

¹⁶ GCOM, Sept. 26, 1955, GCOM Minutes, p. 55-199.

¹⁷ See, for example, GCOM, Oct. 10, 1955, GCOM Minutes, p. 55-216.

¹⁸ "Proceedings of the General Conference," Third Business Meeting, July 27, 1962, *ARH*, July 30, 1962, 69.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 70. This move was possibly predicated by the "real interest" that Becker had shown for the statistical duties.

to as the “Statistical Secretary” in the *Yearbook*.²⁰ Robert J. Radcliffe, one of the assistant auditors, succeeded Becker into the dual role in 1964, when Becker left the position.²¹ At the 1966 GC Session, the role of statistical secretary was officially revived and its duties separated from those of the auditor.²² Radcliffe remained as auditor, while Jesse O. Gibson became the new statistical secretary. It was during Gibson’s tenure that the archives portion of the department was formally established, probably due to Gibson’s recognition of the need for organized archives and records management.

Like most administrative decisions at the General Conference, the formal establishment of the Archives in 1973 was a long time in the making. In 1967 Associate Secretary Clyde O. Franz corresponded with a retired associate secretary, Norman W. Dunn, concerning “the records in the General Conference attic that the Committee on Microfilming and Safeguarding of General Conference Records” had asked Dunn “to review.”²³ Such initiatives evidently gave rise to discussion of the specific question of whether there should be a proper archives and records management program at the GC headquarters. This was a matter “under study” by GC administration at least as early as May 1971. The response to a request of the Statistical Department to send someone for further archival training is telling. The officers, after discussion of the matter, voted “To express to the Statistical Department appreciation for what is being done on the matter of archives and records under present unfavorable circumstances.” It is clear, then, that such *ad hoc* records management as took place in the GC prior to 1973 fell under the aegis of the statistical secretary, as had been the case in the 1950s. The officers further minuted: “The whole subject of General Conference archives and archivists is now under study.”²⁴

²⁰ See 1963 *Yearbook of the Seventh-day Adventist Denomination*, 12, and 1964 *Yearbook of the Seventh-day Adventist Denomination*, 12.

²¹ GC Executive Committee meeting, November 12, 1964, 10am, in GC Ar., GCC Minutes, p. 900.

²² “Proceedings of the General Conference,” Sixth Business Meeting, June 20, 1966, *ARH*, June 21, 1966, 103.

²³ Secretariat General Correspondence, GC Ar., box 10563, fld. “1967 General Correspondence D.”

²⁴ GCOM, May 19, 1971, GCOM Minutes, p. 71–188.

Four months later, in September 1971, Associate Secretary David H. Baasch brought an item to the officers, asking for the standing Special Items Committee to “give further study to headquarters archive materials” and “offer suggestions about personnel, financing, space, etc.,” to the Officers.²⁵ While the Special Items Committee was giving the matter further study, strides were being made by Adventist scholars to promote the study of the Church’s history, which necessitated archives and records management. On December 28, 1972, a group of thirteen Adventist historians in attendance at the meeting of the American Historical Association held their own meeting alongside it; they listened to Arthur L. White, secretary of the Ellen G. White Estate, describe church recordkeeping at the headquarters and relay his “long-standing belief” that “more effective” recordkeeping was needed. At this meeting, the historians voted to form the Association of Seventh-day Adventist Historians (ASDAH) and “endorsed a document urging the General Conference to establish a records management program and archival organization” at the headquarters. The historians also voted to request the General Conference to establish an archives and allow scholars to research in it. Arthur White was a conduit for this request to church leaders.²⁶ It is widely thought that this endorsement is what directly led to the creation of the General Conference Archives,²⁷ but as we have seen, the matter was already under consideration by Church leadership. What may well be the case, however, is that White presented the case for access by scholars, for whereas there is no evidence in minutes for any plan to allow external use of a future GC Archives, in the end the Archives did so from the beginning.

In January 1973, the Officers received a report from the Special Items Committee, whose terms of reference had been narrowed a little, to “give study to the subject of headquarters archives material and the need for an archivist at headquarters.”²⁸ Its suggestion was to create another committee,

²⁵ GCOM, Sept. 15, 1971, GCOM Minutes, p. 71–330.

²⁶ D. R. McAdams, “Southwestern Union,” *ARH*, February 15, 1973, 23; telephone interview, D. J. B. Trim with D. R. McAdams, March 21, 2022; interview, D. J. B. Trim with F. D. Yost, Augusta, GA, December 16, 2011.

²⁷ [Gary Land and Brian Strayer], “About ASDAH,” <http://www.sdahistorians.org/about-us.html>.

²⁸ GCOM, Jan. 3, 1973, GCOM, p. 73–1.

noting: "It is felt this responsibility should be transferred to an *ad hoc* committee, with the suggestion that recommendations be made for the care of correspondence and denominational records and that an archivist for the General Conference be favorably considered." In response, the Officers appointed an *ad hoc* Archives-Archivist Committee, chaired by Willis J. Hackett, a GC general vice president, with Baasch as committee secretary, and three other members: C. O. Franz (by this time General Conference secretary), M. E. Kemmerer (undertreasurer), and A. L. White (White Estate).²⁹ This high-powered membership, along with the terms of reference given by the Officers, signaled that the committee's real role was not to discuss whether there should be an archivist, but to decide what an archivist's responsibilities would be, to identify how to fund the position, and who should be appointed to the sensitive post.

Whether Arthur White, at the instance of the newly formed historians' association, used his considerable influence with "the brethren" at the GC to fast track the creation of the General Conference Archives or to ensure historians had access to it is uncertain. The former is a tradition maintained by ASDAH. Yet as well as ignoring the committee work that was in progress, the tradition underplays the influence that several of the historians had at the Church's headquarters. At least two founding members of ASDAH, Jerome Clark and Godfrey T. Anderson, were members of the "Denominational History Textbook Planning Committee," an *ad hoc* committee which was appointed in March 1973, met June 18-21, 1973, and made recommendations to PRADCO (President's Administrative Council).³⁰ Part of what the committee discussed were: "Problems connected with source materials and archives."³¹ Clearly there were ongoing discussions between the Church's scholars and its administrators about the need for an official archives and what that would look like.

The major step forward came in April 1973, when the Archives-Archivist Committee appointed by the GC Officers in

²⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁰ GC Executive Committee meeting, March 1, 1973, GCC minutes, p. 73-1402; ADCOM meeting, July 16, 1973, ADCOM Minutes, p. 73-17. The nine pages of the Denominational History Committee minutes are between pp. 73-18 and 73-19 of the ADCOM minutes. Anderson and Clark's presence at the founding meeting of ASDAH is taken from the Trim interview with McAdams, cited in n. 27.

³¹ Textbook committee minutes, cited above, p. 1.

January presented to the 1973 Spring Meeting of the GC Executive Committee a “report on the need within our church for an archivist here at the headquarters office.” It asked for the appointment of an archivist, observing: “This service will be of great value in caring for our documents and records, et cetera, that have historical and cultural value to the church.” The Executive Committee voted to hire “one archivist and a secretary to the archivist up to 1975” while stating that other matters would continue to be studied.³² The Archives-Archivist Committee continued its work, including reaching out in the spring of 1973 to F. Donald Yost, then editor of *Insight*, who was visited by Willis J. Hackett, and told of plans to create an archive—and asked whether he would be interested in the position of archivist.³³ Yost was formally called to the position on June 6, 1973,³⁴ and he started the new position on July 1, 1973.³⁵

Between 1956 and 1973, a paradigm shift had happened: the “significant and valuable materials” related to the Church’s history would both be properly preserved and made available for research.³⁶ This is emphasized by at least one of the guidelines formed by Yost for the new position of archivist: “That he supervise the research possibilities of the archives, screen those who request access to the materials, and assist researchers in their work.”³⁷

From an early stage there was an intention to merge the Archives with the Statistical Office, though this required a constitutional amendment and thus had to wait on the 1975 GC Session. In mid-June 1973, a special *ad hoc* Committee on Organization and Decision Making met; one of its

³² GC Executive Committee meeting, Apr. 3, 1973, in GC Ar., GCC Minutes, 73–1487.

³³ Trim–Yost interview; F. Donald Yost, “How God Prepared Me to Become an Archivist” (unpubl. typescript, April 17, 2013), in Rebok Memorial Library MS Collection no. 2.

³⁴ James R. Nix, personal diary, record of conversation with Yost, during which Yost was called by Hackett, shared with the authors.

³⁵ Confirmed at GCOM, June 27, 1973, GCOM, 73–254.

³⁶ *General Conference Communique* [in-house newsletter], June 8, 1973, p. 1.

³⁷ ADCOM, Nov. 1, 1973, ADCOM Minutes, p. 73–151; “Guidelines for the GC Archivist,” undated (one page, numbered p. A), filed with ADCOM minutes, following p. 73–152; received by PRADCO, Nov. 7, 1973, PRADCO Minutes, p. 73–71, and approved by the Executive Committee on November 8, 1973, GCC Minutes, p. 73–1866.

recommendations was the first “organizational chart for the General Conference,” which included an Archives and Statistical Department; this department would report to the secretary.³⁸ In mid-July 1973, the recently created ADCOM (GC Administrative Committee) and PRADCO acted to create an Archives Committee, with Secretary Franz as Chair (the members of the Statistics–Yearbook Committee were appointed also to serve as an Archives Committee, but it was to be a separate committee; whereas Jesse Gibson, statistical secretary, was secretary of the Statistics–Yearbook Committee, Yost was secretary of the Archives Committee).³⁹ A week later, the GC Executive Committee voted to “reconstitute and rename the Statistical-Yearbook Committee to include the work of the General Conference archivist.”⁴⁰ This foreshadowed what took place in Vienna at the 52nd GC Session, when the GC Archives and the Statistical Office were officially merged into a new entity, entitled Archives and Statistics, with its director replacing the statistical secretary in the GC Constitution.⁴¹ F. Donald Yost, the archivist, was elected to succeed the retiring statistical secretary, Jesse O. Gibson, and became the first Director of Archives and Statistics.⁴²

After 1975

Since that time, the *Seventh-day Adventist Yearbook*, *Annual Statistical Report*, general statistical collection, and the Archives have been under one office. However, it continued, like the Statistical Office that preceded it, to be under the GC secretary and thus, in effect, a part of the GC Secretariat. The department remained in this configuration under its next two directors, R. William Cash (1995-1998) and Bert Haloviak (1998-2010). The two directors oversaw technological innovation; the “*Seventh-day*

³⁸ Committee on Organization and Decision-Making, Denver, Colo., June 10-14, 1973, p. 1, in GCOM Minutes, following p. 73–240.

³⁹ ADCOM, July 12, 1973, ADCOM minutes, p. 73–16; this was a recommendation to PRADCO, which was voted by it at its meeting of July 18, 1973, PRADCO Minutes, p. 73–16.

⁴⁰ GC Executive Committee meeting, 19 July 1973, GCC Minutes, p. 73–1592.

⁴¹ Amendments to the GC Constitution: 52nd Session, 14th and 15th meetings, 9:15am and 3pm, July 17, 1975, proceedings in *ARH*, 152:37, General Conference Bulletin no. 9 (July 31, 1975): 31-32, creation of post of Director of Archives and Statistics at p. 32.

⁴² Fifty-Second Session, 13th meeting, July 17, 1975, proceedings in *ARH*, 152:35, General Conference Bulletin no. 7 (July 18, 1975): 4.

Adventist Yearbook on disc” was introduced in 1998 and in the early 2000s a Yearbook database was developed which became the basis both for the publication of the printed book and of a dedicated website (adventistyearbook.org) which made the *Yearbook*’s contents available far more widely. Soon after, it was followed by websites that presented Church statistics and the *Annual Statistical Report* (adventiststatistics.org) and 1.75 million pages of digitized historic Adventist publications and documents (documents.adventistarchives.org).

At Annual Council 2010, David Trim was appointed as director of Archives and Statistics, succeeding Haloviak.⁴³ In June 2011, after a decision by the three GC executive officers to expand the scope of the Office of Archives and Statistics, it was formally renamed the Office of Archives, Statistics, and Research.⁴⁴ This was subsequently formalized by an amendment to the GC Constitution at the sixtieth GC Session in 2015.⁴⁵ It was also at the 2015 Session that the *Encyclopedia of Seventh-day Adventists* project was officially launched.⁴⁶

The addition of “research” was due to Church officers’ desire for social-scientific, human-subject research to be done, measuring and gathering information on church members’ demographics, attitudes, spiritual-life practices, and beliefs. Since 2011, ASTR has conducted two global church-member surveys, a global survey of pastors, two studies of lapsed or former church members, a major study of tithing in conferences on five continents, and two surveys of administrators at union, division, and GC level. A major survey of church institutional employees, a third global church-member, and a second pastors’ survey were in progress as of 2022. It has also undertaken evaluations of several major denominational ministries or programs, including *Adventist Review* (twice), *Adventist World*, Adventist World Radio, and the Hope Channel, all of which were based on large-scale research

⁴³ GC Executive Committee meeting, October 20, 2010, GCC minutes, p. 10–101.

⁴⁴ GC ADCOM meeting, June 14, 2011, ADCOM minutes, pp. 11–156, 157.

⁴⁵ Thirteenth Business meeting, General Conference Session transcript, July 9, 2015, pp. 22–23. Accessed March 24, 2022 at <https://documents.adventistarchives.org/Minutes/GCSM/2015/GCST20150709AM.pdf>.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 55. Accessed March 24, 2022

at <https://documents.adventistarchives.org/Minutes/GCSM/2015/GCST20150709AM.pdf>.

projects into the attitudes of readers, viewers, and listeners around the world.⁴⁷ A partnership with Avondale Academic Press led to the creation of a book series, “ASTR Research Monographs,” which publishes findings from or related to the research that ASTR sponsors, undertakes, and coordinates. In 2021, ASTR began publishing a series of short books, the “Adventist Research” series, which presented in largely graphic form, with some commentary, results from the most recent global church-member survey.

However, the “R” for “research” in ASTR came to mean more than human-subject research; ASTR undertook a number of historical research projects for the GC officers. These include: the history of Adventist mission in the Middle East, and in China; the development of officers’ councils; changing concepts of conference and union conference status; and the history of the church’s missionary enterprise and in particular the role therein of GC Secretariat. The last of these studies was developed substantially and published in 2021 as the first book in a new series: General Conference Archives Monographs.⁴⁸

Even as its role expanded, ASTR also found new ways of delivering traditional obligations. In 2017 a new scheme of accreditation for archives and records centers, both at administrative headquarters and at denominational higher education institutions, was introduced, in order to introduce benchmarks and raise standards. The first archives, at Newbold College (which included the Trans-European Division’s historic archive) was accredited in 2018. Before the COVID-19 pandemic intervened, three more archives centers at Adventist universities and colleges were accredited and two division records centers.

While the title of the department has changed and the responsibilities expanded, the Office of Archives, Statistics, and Research still holds true to the legacy laid down by H. E. Rogers and his successors in the years following 1904. Compiling, analyzing, and publishing statistics; preserving, managing, and

⁴⁷ For more on the research done by ASTR see Galina Stele and D. J. B. Trim, “ASTR, AHSRA, and New Horizons for Adventist Human-Subject Research,” in Petr Činčala (ed.), *A Fresh Look at Denominational Research: Role, Impact, and Scope* (Lincoln, NE: AdventSource, for Institute of Church Ministry, 2018), pp. 55–62; and <https://www.adventistresearch.info>.

⁴⁸ Chism, Trim, and Younker, *Seventh-day Adventist Church’s Missionary Enterprise*.

79 – *Chism and Trim: Archives, Statistics, and Research*

facilitating access to records; conducting historical and human-subject research; and organizing the *Encyclopedia of Seventh-day Adventists*—all this and more is done to make sure that the Seventh-day Adventist Church is able to remember its past history, evaluate its present, and plan for its future.

Statistical Secretaries and Archives Directors

Name	Title	Tenure
H. Edson Rogers	Statistical Secretary	1903-1941
Claude Conard	Statistical Secretary	1941-1950
E. J. Johanson	Statistical Secretary	1950-1952
H. W. Klaser	Statistical Secretary	1952-1962
E. Lee Becker	Statistical Secretary / Auditor	1962-1965
Robert J. Radcliffe	Statistical Secretary / Auditor	1965-1966
Jesse O. Gibson	Statistical Secretary	1966-1975
F. Donald Yost	Archivist; Director of Archives and Statistics	1973-1975; 1975-1995
R. William Cash	Director of Archives and Statistics	1995-1998
Bert B. Haloviak	Director of Archives and Statistics	1998-2010
David Trim	Director of Archives and Statistics; Director of Archives, Statistics, and Research	2010-2011; 2011–.

Book Review

Valentine, Gilbert M. *Ostriches and Canaries: Coping with Change in Adventism, 1966-1979*. Westlake Village, California: Oak and Acorn Publishing, 2022. 450 pp.

In *Ostriches and Canaries: coping with change in Adventism, 1966-1979*, Gil Valentine grapples with what he sees as the clash between fundamentalism and progressivism, between anti-intellectualism and proper scholarship, between stagnancy and creativity, and between the Church's administrators and its scholars.

The book is engagingly written and provides a broad overview of the administration of Robert H. Pierson, which lasted between June 16, 1966 and January 3, 1979 (though his successor was elected on October 17, 1978, due to Pierson announcing his retirement due to health issues). Valentine makes the argument that Pierson and his administration were akin to the proverbial ostrich sticking its head in the sand and that the scholars who resisted them were the canaries in the coal mines of Seventh-day Adventism. Ostriches don't actually do that (a fact which Valentine acknowledges [xvii]) but are rather only perceived to be doing so. Still, Valentine anchors this metaphor in an unsourced 1976 conversation between Richard Coffen and Robert Pierson, wherein Pierson supposedly said that he would only be an ostrich "if he refused to do anything about the problems he thought he was seeing" (xvii). Beyond being a paraphrase lacking a footnote documenting the conversation, the clause "he thought he was seeing" implies that Pierson himself did not believe the problems existed, when likely the opposite is true. Whether or not the problems were actually problems is a matter of historical interpretation and definitions.

However, definitions are not something clearly set forth in the text. Valentine deliberately and explicitly states, "I have not tried to use the terminology more strictly but have endeavored to allow the meaning of terms as used by the different personalities to be

determined by the context in which they use them. This may be frustrating to a reader who wishes a more precise and consistent definition of the terms” (xxvii). This is indeed frustrating, as the lack of an attempt to provide what definitions *Valentine* was working with makes it more difficult to determine what “the different personalities” meant by the same terms. One may have a precise and consistent definition of a term while allowing space for the variation in meaning employed by those in a particular time period. This lack of an attempt to define terms is also muddled when Valentine then provides a chart (xxxii) providing his own schema (and thus his own definitions) of various terms, some of which clash with regularly used definitions of the same terms.

This lack of precise and consistent definitions has the effect of flattening the people under discussion in the text. Reuben Figuhr, General Conference president from 1954 to 1966, is held up as an able administrator who benevolently allowed scholarship to blossom, while Pierson is depicted as an inept, cowering figure frantically and desperately conniving to put the scholars in their place. Other figures in the text find themselves cast as progressive or reactionary (whatever those mean in Valentine’s schema), though the focus is on Pierson. Yet these caricatures do an injustice to all involved. Valentine relies on the intellectual/jock stereotype to draw a contrast between Figuhr and Pierson, and, while Pierson was not an accomplished scholar (86), he was not thoughtless. The new Pierson Collection at the General Conference Archives, which consists of manuscripts, transcripts, sermon outlines, and notes from throughout Pierson’s career, and which has recently been processed, will be of immense use to any historian seeking in the future to round out Valentine’s image of Pierson and his thought, as they capture what Pierson was thinking about how the Church could and should cope with the changing world and with itself changing.

However, his decisions were not made in an administrative vacuum; the history of the Pierson Administration is not a history of a singular person. A deeper exploration of those around Pierson, such as the General Conference vice presidents and departmental directors, (and not just those involved with the creation of what is now the Biblical Research Institute [Chapter 9]) perhaps would have strengthened Valentine’s overall argument. For example, if any one person at the General Conference headquarters was driving a crusade against liberalism

(however defined), it was Arthur L. White, who by the time of Pierson's administration was a deeply respected and influential elder statesman of the Church, and his appearances in Valentine's text (see index entry for him on 449) leave no doubt as to where *he* stood on the subject of liberalism (however defined): he was against it wholeheartedly. His influence on Pierson, as well as the influence of others at that level of administration, should not go unexamined.

Valentine is to be commended for his rich use of new archival sources. The diary entries of Siegfried Horn certainly provide insight into the events that he records, though historians should be careful to not see Horn's view of the events as the *only* view of the events and to remember that Horn had his own biases which were reflected in his views. Valentine leans a little heavily on the writings of Horn and of Raymond Cottrell, and this could likely have been balanced out with more utilization of sources from the General Conference Archives. The text would have been additionally bolstered in places by a broader pool of archival sources, such as in the section about a proposed government hospital near Loma Linda University (345); it is likely that additional sources on the event exist at the Ford Presidential Library, the US National Archives, the Library of Congress, or even in the Pettis Papers at Loma Linda University, but none of these places are cited.

Horn's diaries, as well as the collections of archival material cited in the footnotes as being personally held by several prominent historians of Adventism (among them Eric Anderson, Ron Graybill, and Valentine himself), should be donated to the appropriate repositories for those materials. Holding onto the materials endangers their long-term preservation and makes them inaccessible to other scholars wanting to view such primary sources themselves.

Valentine expresses a desire in his epilogue to see “[a]dministrators...achieve a more open environment where the sense of loyal belonging is valued in the church as much as loyal believing, where an atmosphere of trust and security balanced by responsibility nurtures the task of expressing faith and conviction in harmony with known facts—in the spirit of the valued tradition of hope and expectation with which Adventism anticipates its future” (436-437). How this is to be achieved, Valentine leaves as an open question. Yet it cannot be left to administrators alone to

achieve this, especially if it is true that, as Valentine states, said administrators are ostriches. As with any relationship, the one between the Church's administrators and its scholars goes both ways, even if the dichotomy of administrator/scholar is a false one.

Valentine deftly points out a thread of anti-intellectualism within the Seventh-day Adventist Church. That subject was not the focus of the book, as anti-intellectualism is a broader subject than the theological and historical-theological scholarship under discussion in the text. However, an intellectual history on that thread of anti-intellectualism, delving into its origins and investigating its effect on all branches of Adventist scholarship, as well as on Adventist culture, and not just on its effect on Adventist theology, likely would be of benefit to the Church. Historians of Seventh-day Adventism have plenty of work to do, as it may be easier to anticipate the future of Seventh-day Adventism when its past is better understood in all its complexity by the Church's ostriches *and* its canaries.

Ashlee L. Chism
Office of Archives, Statistics, and Research

astr
Office of
Archives, Statistics,
and Research



© General Conference
Corporation of Seventh-
day Adventists.