

PIONEERS, PANTHEISTS, AND PROGRESSIVES:

A. F. BALLENGER AND DIVERGENT PATHS TO THE SANCTUARY

By Bert Haloviak

Assistant Director
Office of Archives and Statistics

Materials used in this paper have been drawn from published and unpublished sources housed in the Archives of the General Conference and at the White Estate.

June, 1980

Office of Archives and Statistics
General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists
Washington, D.C.

INTRODUCTION

In 1898, during his campmeeting efforts in behalf of the churchwide emphasis "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," A. F. Ballenger wrote and set to music the following:

'Tis a glorious time for the church today;
For the trump again has blown;
And the hosts of God, by the Pillar led,
Move on to their promised home;
And the Holy Ghost in the 'latter rain,'
With his peace and joy and power,
O'er the church now falls with refreshing floods,
Like a glorious summer shower.¹

On May 24, 1905, Ellen White gave Ballenger a testimony that, among other things, urged him to "take heed how you mystify the gospel." An examination of the context of that May 24 testimony is the primary aim of this paper.²

In attempting to outline the central strands of denominational thought between 1897 and 1911, the writer has rather loosely used such terms as "pantheistic," "mystical," "spiritualistic," etc. A precise theological definition is unnecessary, in the writer's opinion, for the purposes in which they are used. In her use of those terms, Mrs. White did not depend upon their precise theological meaning.

An examination of the background to the Ellen White statements concerning Ballenger reveals three major movements within the denomination that may be loosely labeled "pantheist," "pioneer," and "progressive," not so much for evaluative purposes, but rather as labels to identify the "paths" followed by those groups. While certain denominational leaders as W. W. Prescott and others might have moved from one group to another over a period of time, the lines within each camp were fairly well defined.

(1) The pioneers, in general, were those ministers and leaders who emphasized as central, such fundamental denominational teachings as Revelation 14, the Sabbath, and the prophecies. They were relatively inflexible toward theological variations and applied the Spirit of Prophecy writings quite literally.

(2) The group that became the pantheists sprang largely from those who in 1888 to 1890 would have been termed progressive. By 1897 this group was teaching

concepts that were strongly tinged with pantheism and that seemed to nullify the fundamental teachings of the church. Initially the pantheists were also literalistic in their interpretation of the Spirit of Prophecy, and in their literalism, believed the writings of Mrs. White supported their positions. This factor led to a close attachment between the pioneers and the pantheists at times. After Mrs. White strongly condemned their positions, the pantheists eventually completely discarded and worked against the writings. In their stress upon the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, the pantheists came to believe that each individual would eventually possess the spirit of prophecy. This also led to a negative attitude toward denominational organization since, in their mind, strong organization would inhibit the workings of the Holy Spirit.

(3) The progressives, coming to the forefront in 1901, were strong on the fundamentals, flexible on theological insights, strong on organization and nonliteralistic regarding the Spirit of Prophecy.

The reader should realize that the special terms used here are intended only to provide a broad generalization about 15 years of denominational history. Within this period no group took a pre-eminent position or maintained a monopoly on truth. It should also be recognized that all of the groups contained members who would eventually leave the church. The pantheists, however, held such a vital error, that their teaching, when developed, could have shattered the denomination and nullified its central message.

"RECEIVE YE THE HOLY GHOST"

In late 1898, G. A. Irwin, president of the General Conference, described the campmeetings currently being held within the United States to E. G. White, who was then in Australia. In noting the "unusual degree of the Spirit and blessing of the Lord," Irwin informed Mrs. White that the "most spiritually-minded" leaders were sent to conduct the meetings. Those specifically named were: Mrs. S. M. I. Henry, A. F. Ballenger, William Sadler, and J. A. Brunson. Within a decade, three of

the four would be actively working against the church.³ Others actively involved in the "Receive ye the Holy Ghost" movement would likewise leave and work against the church. Those who left were regarded as the most dynamic preachers and leaders within the church. They included: A. T. Jones, E. J. Waggoner, J. H. Kellogg, J. W. Scoles, William Hutchinson, Harry Champness, A. R. Leask, William Robinson, G. C. Tenney, L. A. Phippeny, R. S. Donnell, S. S. Davis, J. A. L. Derby, E. J. Dryer, Irving Keck, L. H. Crisler, M. E. Kellogg, G. E. Fifield.⁴

The message was born out of the "prolonged" debate over the acceptance of the justification by faith message of 1888 and the conviction that, after the acceptance of righteousness, the Lord would pour out His Spirit to enable the finishing of the work and the return of Jesus. That theme occupied a central position in the Review and Herald, as well as the campmeetings during 1897 to 1899, and was led primarily by A. T. Jones, recently-named editor of the Review, and A. F. Ballenger. As editor, Jones concluded practically every editorial for over a year with the words "Receive ye the Holy Ghost." As a revivalist Ballenger traveled from church to church and campmeeting to campmeeting preaching that same theme.

By 1897 Jones had added a significant ingredient to the message, one that seemed to have the potential of uniting the medical and ministerial elements of the church. Those elements had been antagonistic to each other for some time:

Perfect holiness embraces the flesh as well as the spirit; it includes the body as well as the soul. Therefore, as perfect holiness can not be attained without holiness of body, and as holiness of body is expressed in the word "health," so perfect holiness can not be attained without health. . . . Do you not see by all this that in the principles of health for the body and righteousness for the soul, both inwrought by the Holy Spirit of God, the Lord is preparing a people unto perfect holiness, so that they can meet the Lord in peace, and see him in holiness?

The connection of health reform with the indwelling of the Holy Spirit was consistently emphasized in the Review between 1897 and 1900.⁵

As did others who preached the Holy Ghost message, Ballenger considered that message the culmination of the 1888 emphasis. As did the others, he seemed to exhibit a negative attitude toward those leaders who he believed inhibited the

acceptance of that message. He emphasized that the Holy Spirit had begun to be poured out at the 1893 GC session, but that certain leaders had labeled the movement as fanaticism and thereby hindered the work designed for that time. He noted in 1897, however, that the reception of the Holy Spirit was then present truth. Righteousness by faith, according to Ballenger, "was given us of God to stop our sinning. Let no man say that he has received righteousness by faith until he has stopped sinning." He continued: "We are in the time of the latter rain, but the outpouring of the Spirit is withheld because of our sins." He summarized his concept as follows: "Something to tell; power to tell it. Righteousness by faith furnishes a man something to tell; and the baptism of the Holy Spirit furnishes him power to tell it in a mighty power to the world."⁶

Ballenger emphasized that, just as Christ cleansed the temple before he could perform miracles, so must the church ministry and membership be purged from their sins before the power of God could come upon the church. He urged individuals to seek the cleansing of themselves from sin and then the power to witness against the "uncleanness of the church." He noted:

I must have a clean church to invite the people into, before I can stand before the people to give the loud cry in all its glory. . . . The world is waiting for us to get the victory. We want power for witnessing. . . . If the Lord should give you tremendous witnessing power before that besetting sin was rooted out, you would become a tremendous witness against God by that failure in your life.

Ballenger believed that the time had come to "get an experience so far beyond the experience of 1844 as to eclipse that period with the fulness of the loud cry."⁷

He presented his concept of the Holy Ghost message in five essential steps:

First, repentance of sin; second a claiming of pardon, or the imputed righteousness of God by faith; third, the claiming of the keeping power of God, or imparted righteousness by faith; fourth, the claiming of "the promise of the Spirit through faith;" fifth, the claiming of the gift of healing by faith.

According to Ballenger "physical healing is now present truth to Seventh-day Adventists, but only to those who will give the Lord the glory." He urged the church to "clear the King's highway" of sins so that "signs and wonders may be done by the name of his holy child Jesus." Consistent reports of physical healings

accompanied the reports from those campmeetings where A. F. Ballenger preached.⁸

The theological base for Ballenger's concept of physical healing is of vital concern because of its relationship to his later sanctuary teaching. His concept of the atonement included more than Christ bearing the sins of the world in its behalf. It likewise included, for Ballenger, Christ bearing the physical illnesses of the world upon the Cross. He stated:

It is clear that our Lord took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses that we might not have to bear them--that we might be loosed from them--that they might depart from us. Jesus bore them, therefore, that He might bear them away from us, that we might bear them no more. All this proves that the Gospel includes salvation from sickness as well as salvation from sin. . . . Does not the surprise manifested over miracles of healing show a lack of appreciation of the miracle of the new birth, and a disposition to transpose it from the realm of the miraculous to the sphere of the natural?

To confirm his point Ballenger spoke of the time when he himself lacked faith in physical healings. At the same time, he noted, he "had not experienced God's miraculous saving power." When he had experienced the latter, Ballenger affirmed, he immediately obtained "faith in God's power to heal the sick." He reasoned that it required no greater miracle for God to save him from sins and keep him from falling than to heal physical ills. He continued:

Thus arose my faith in God's healing power for the body. And as I received it, so must I walk in it. If there comes a shadow of a failure in my personal experience touching my salvation from sinning, there is a corresponding failure in my faith and practise concerning the healing of the sick.

Ballenger noted that his faith was anchored "within the veil."⁹

That teaching was reasserted by Ballenger in his book Power for Witnessing, published in 1900. He stressed that anyone who could believe in the resurrection of the body, could readily believe in the healing of the body, "which is only a kind of first-fruits, or part payment, of the promised redemption of our body." He continued:

Thus do the Scriptures teach that He bore our sins that we might not bear them. . . . This is the blessed truth which we teach the sinner when he comes to us seeking salvation from sin. Why did He take our infirmities and bear our sicknesses? . . . It is clear that our Lord took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses that we might not have to bear them; that we might be loosed from them; that they might depart from us. Jesus bore them therefore, that He might bear them away from us, that we might bear them no more.

All this proves that the gospel includes salvation from sickness as well as salvation from sin.¹⁰

It seems very possible that Mrs. White, in 1905, would react negatively to the Scriptural base for this concept of the atonement when Ballenger presented his sanctuary views at the 1905 GC session.

Soon there were hints of diverging paths with those leaders of the Holy Ghost movement who seemed to be moving toward pantheism, and the pioneers. George Irwin frequently wrote to Mrs. White concerning his fears about the influences that to him seemed to be becoming subversive of the fundamental teachings of the church. Dr. J. H. Kellogg seemed to be moving increasingly away from teaching that could be termed "denominational." Irwin noticed that such younger doctors as David Paulson, D. H. Kress, and Howard Rand, and ministers such as W. W. Prescott, E. J. Waggoner, and A. T. Jones, were "running along extreme lines also." He told Mrs. White, "I feel more and more to thank God for the Spirit of Prophecy; for it is our rudder that will guide us safely over the shoals and breakers that are before us." Irwin became so concerned over the diverging paths that he urged it as a vital necessity that Mrs. White return to the United States from Australia. He pleaded:

I think you will fully appreciate the fact that we here are in a measure powerless to turn the tide without your personal presence; and believing this to be true, I again urge, for the sake of the cause of God in general, and for the sake of some souls who are liable to lose their hold on God and become lost in the mist and fog, that you come to this country at the earliest possible moment after you receive this letter.¹¹

Irwin turned to the pioneers to restore the fundamentals. He noted that Stephen Haskell in his work brought out the "great underlying principles of the message, which exploded many errors and beliefs that have been gaining a foothold in the minds of some." He wrote Mrs. White that Haskell's preaching "on the right lines in which the message should be carried, and his effectual way of showing from the Word the fallacy of the many errors that have been creeping in, is all having a good effect." He noted that elements were coming into the church that Haskell and J. N. Loughborough could combat because of their previous experience

in dealing with fanaticism.¹²

Review and Herald articles by S. N. Haskell, R. A. Underwood and J. N. Loughborough, emphasizing the personality of the Holy Spirit and depicting earlier fanatical movements within the church, seemed designed to exhibit a pioneer reaction to the developing pantheistic teachings. Even A. T. Jones observed:

I am afraid that there has been a tendency to go over to the other end now, and preach the faith of Jesus without the commandments. We must guard ourselves against such a thing as that.¹³

In the next administration both W. A. Spicer, secretary of the General Conference, and A. G. Daniells, president, observed that Irwin had spent considerable toil "facing the mystery" of a developing apostasy.¹⁴

Throughout the 1890s, Mrs. White warned against the mystical, spiritualistic theories that she saw entering the church. She wrote:

Christ has given many warnings to the effect that false doctrines, false prophets and false christs would arise, and deceive many. From the light that God has been pleased to give me, his humble servant, I know that these prophecies have been fulfilling, and testimonies have not been few that have been given to meet these things as they have come up all along through our religious experience. Great delusions will arise, and "even of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them."

She warned her son, James Edson White, about professed "interpreters of the word of God" who mystified the "spiritual import of the sacred gospel" and thus covered up the truth. She noted: "We need not go outside of our own ranks to see the deep plottings of Satan. He is working through some of our own number, and they are deceiving the people."¹⁵

Mrs. White seemed to summarize the major developments within the church in the decade of the 1890s, and also the varying alignments when she wrote the following to J. H. Kellogg in 1898:

Some who read the word catch at ideas which they suppose give them great light. They present this supposed light as truth, but as they have not really studied the word as some have done, they will, full of ardor and zeal, present theories which, if received, will counterwork the efforts which have been put forth since 1844 to give the people of God a connected chain of truth. They do not know what they are doing, but they disturb those who suppose they have a solid foundation. These crave for new ideas and suppositions, which mar the symmetrical development of character. Under the influence of the Holy Spirit,

those with this enthusiastic temperament would be enabled to do the highest service. The quickening influence of the life in their message would give character to the work, and advance it, diffusing the grace and spirit of truth in all its lines. But let such a one put his whole mind upon some idea which is not correct, and deformity rather than symmetry is developed.

She urged the church:

In the work at our campmeetings we should give prominence to the truths of the Third Angel's Message. We are in danger of giving this message in so indefinite a manner that it does not impress the people. . . . The trumpet is to give a certain sound. Lift up the standard, the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. Make this the important theme. Then by strong arguments wall it in, and make it of still greater force. Dwell more on the Revelation. Read, explain, and enforce its teachings.¹⁶

"HOLY FLESH"

Ballenger's campmeeting appointments included Indiana in both 1897 and 1898.

In reflecting upon his 1898 meeting in Indiana, he observed:

At the Indiana meeting, between thirty and forty from the city arose for prayer. As I stood there that Sunday afternoon, and called the people of the world and other churches to repentance, and saw them forced to their feet by the power of God, I thought, What power will be manifested when God's people are clean! When I am conscious that I am not clean, I can not preach with power, neither can I preach with "unwonted power" when I know that my people are not clean. Cleanse the Seventh-day Adventist Church of all uncleanness, and I will promise the loudest cry of the loud cry the same day.

Among those impressed with Ballenger's messages were the conference president, R. S. Donnell, and one of its leading ministers, S. S. Davis, both of whom were to become the leaders in what was called the "Holy Flesh" teaching.¹⁷

Although a few years later the Indiana apostasy in its outworkings seemed at war with the fundamental teachings of Adventism, the core error seemed to escape detection. A. J. Breed, president of District No. 6, which included Indiana, noted:

I could see nothing especially in it more than simply Justification by Faith, put in another way. It is not so much of what they are preaching as the way they are doing it.

Breed noted that the entire group at the campmeeting he attended in 1900 seemed in harmony with the teaching. He observed that as far as the teaching went his only complaint was that none of the fundamental teachings of Adventism were prominent.¹⁸

The fact that pantheistic teaching had been so widely accepted within the denomination by the late 1890s hindered Breed from detecting its fundamental error.

Stephen Haskell, upon returning from an overseas trip in 1899, was shocked at some of the "queer doctrines preached by some of the leading ministers of the rising generation" and was further shocked that quotations from the Bible and testimonies would be given in apparent support of those teachings. Haskell's observations present a colorful, but tragic picture of the consequence of a false concept of the atonement. His distinctive grammar is retained in the following description to Mrs. White:

Some of the strangest doctrines I have heard is the Seal of God cannot be placed on any person of Grey Hairs, or any deformed person, for in the closing work we would reach a state of perfection, both physically and spiritual, where we would be healed from all physical deformity and then could not die, etc. I said to Brother Breed and also to the brethren in reply that I expected the next I would hear we could get a new set of teeth in this life, etc. Well Bro. Breed said that was preached by some. After Brother Warren had preached this he had in a tent all that was sick and deformed to meet and they would consult as to what to do. One woman said how convincing it would be to her friends to see her return home with her hairs all restored and believed it would be soon. She wept as she spoke. Another deaf man in one ear said the hearing was returning back even then. So an hour or two was spent in testimonies of like nature. I was astonished at the sight and more astonished that such preaching should have any effect on the people. And still more astonished to hear such preaching from a minister of such repute and from one that stood at the head of a mission. . . .

In the morning I arose early and got together all of the brethren and sisters, ministers included, and read a testimony you sent me several years ago at the time Brethren Jones and Waggoner was carrying the praying for the sick to an extreme and it fully described the meeting of the sick we had the night before. We told them of the nature of the testimonies how it had ever come to correct errors and suppress fanaticisms, etc. . . .

I then sought a personal interview with Brother Warren and he said the leading ministers, teachers and doctors believed it. I told him that made no difference with me if every body believed it. Well this is only a sample of what is going around here. I have had much freedom in speaking. But the truth is there is light which is greatly perverted.

It seems significant to note that Haskell was describing meetings held in Battle Creek. It likewise seems significant that Ballenger was shortly assigned to work with Stephen Haskell in his campmeeting assignments.¹⁹

Mrs. White responded to Haskell's description by noting that such teachers "having lost the grand truths of the Word of God, which center in the third angel's message" had supplied those truths with "fables." She continued:

Those who present the idea that the blind, the deaf, the lame, the deformed, will not receive the seal of God, are not speaking words given them by the Holy Spirit. . . . No one is to put truth to the torture by cheap imaginings, by putting a forced, mystical construction upon the word. . . . They are starting in a course which will lead to the greatest, most God-dishonoring fanaticism. . . . The idea that persons who are deformed must be healed in order to be saved is a fable originated by some one who needs inward cleansing before he can receive the seal of God. In the great day of God all who are faithful and true will receive the healing touch of the divine Redeemer. The Lifegiver will remove every deformity, and will give them eternal life.²⁰

Mrs. White later questioned the thrust of the entire Holy Ghost movement. She wrote Haskell the next year: "Much is being said regarding the impartation of the Holy Spirit, and by some this is being so interpreted that it is an injury to the churches." She also wrote:

My brother, there is danger of those in our ranks making a mistake in regard to receiving the Holy Ghost. Many suppose an emotion of a rapture of feeling to be an evidence of the presence of the Holy Spirit.

Mrs. White likewise saw the movement as subverting the fundamentals and related it to past fanatical movements within the church.²¹

The core of R. S. Donnell's teaching, in this writer's opinion, is similar to that found in Ballenger and others: a misapplication of the benefits of the atonement. Donnell, as did Ballenger, applied to this life that which is reserved for the future life. Donnell taught that at conversion both the mind and the body were fully cleansed and brought back to the condition of man before the fall, "so far as its life or actions are concerned." He noted:

I teach that those who fully appropriate the power of the Gospel of Christ need not to die. . . . As to what men might have attained unto in the past, my burden does not rest. Now is the time for the Laodicean or cleansing message, and the gathering out of those who are to be translated when Jesus comes.²²

Although Donnell sought to bolster this teaching by a literalistic application of Ellen White writings, she neither addressed herself to his specific theological underpinnings nor to a thorough exposition of his error. The testimony he received at the 1901 GC session, however, contained sufficient information to reveal his error had he given it close examination. However, as did most of the others who followed false paths, he apparently never renounced his erroneous teaching. Mrs. White informed the Indiana leaders:

When human beings receive holy flesh, they will not remain on the earth, but will be taken to heaven. While sin is forgiven in this life, its results are not now wholly removed. It is at his coming that Christ is to "change our vile body." . . . When Christ shall come with a great sound of a trumpet, and shall call the dead from their prison house, then the saints will receive holy flesh.²³

Rather significantly, in this testimony Mrs. White alluded to previous fanatical movements within the church all of which seemed to claim full sanctification and the present application of benefits not to be received until the return of Jesus. She also noted:

These things bring a reproach upon the cause of truth, and hinder the proclamation of the last message of mercy to the world. . . . Many such movements will arise at this time, when the Lord's work should stand elevated, pure, unadulterated with superstition and fables.²⁴

ENGLAND, 1901-1905

In 1903 E. J. Waggoner attended a farewell gathering held in his honor as he prepared to leave England after 12 years of service. Among the items presented to him as a farewell gift was a nine volume set of "Quain's Anatomy," designed to facilitate Waggoner's medical studies that he intended to continue in Battle Creek. Events leading to the departure of Waggoner from England, however, were not as harmonious as the farewell gathering. While representatives of diverging paths came into conflict within the United States, the confrontation was likewise severe in England where A. F. Ballenger was asked to serve in 1901.²⁵

Waggoner edited the British Present Truth during his entire term in England. A glimpse of some of his writings between 1902 and 1903 affords insight into the nature of the confrontation.

Waggoner, as did Ballenger, taught that the power by which a person received forgiveness of sins was the same power that healed disease. Waggoner asserted:

As long as we may expect forgiveness of sins, we may likewise expect healing of disease, and as there is no sin too great to be forgiven, so there is no disease that we may not ask Him to heal, with confidence that He will do it. . . . In the forgiveness of our sins by the life which we lay hold of by faith, we have the healing of all our diseases, if we but grasp the fact.

He also stated:

Nothing could be plainer than this. There is such a thing as victory over

disease and death, through Christ. The flesh is corrupt and sinful; but Christ has "power over all flesh," so that His life can repress sin even in "sinful flesh," and by the same power He can resist the encroachments of disease even in our mortal flesh.²⁶

That power, Waggoner taught, became accessible through the atonement. "The perfect, death-destroying life of Jesus," Waggoner asserted, "must be fully manifested in the mortal flesh of some people before the Lord returns to this earth again." He affirmed:

Holiness, perfect purity of body and spirit, is not only possible, but absolutely necessary; and this state is to be ours in this present, evil world, before the resurrection; for we are told that without it no man shall see the Lord.²⁷

While it is unnecessary to trace the varied conclusions based upon Waggoner's assumptions about the power released through the atonement, the following will serve as an example:

When the sunlight destroys disease germs, cleansing our earth, and making it habitable, and putting colour into the cheeks of people, as well as upon the roses, it is the working of the same life of Christ that cleanses from all sin. Thus the whole creation preaches the Gospel.

At the same time, Waggoner could believe in a Christ who "is our High Priest in the heavenly places at the right hand of God, yet He is on earth in our flesh, even in our sinful flesh."²⁸

Ballenger noted that his work in England was similar to that in the United States except that he sensed "a deepening experience and growing power." He wrote of receiving letters from 13 churches he had visited by January of 1902 all telling of "new power which has come into their lives for personal victory and aggressive service." Ballenger mentioned his own "deeper conceptions of sin and greater conceptions of the cross of Calvary." He asserted to the delegates of the first European General Conference that the focus of his teaching had somewhat changed and he was now preaching a greater Gospel than he had ever preached before. He noted:

I have been telling people that if they would do something, the Lord would do something; but now I have turned it round, and am telling the people that the Lord has done something, and wants them to receive it.²⁹

Soon after his arrival in England in 1899, E. E. Andross took issue with the nature of the teachings of Prescott, Waggoner, and Dr. Kress that Andross defined as:

What, when, and how to eat, and how to teach the same to others. Eating the body and drinking the blood of Christ in our every meal and every time we took a drink of water, etc. This was the all-important theme, continually.

Andross decried the absence of such themes during evangelistic endeavors as the Second Coming, Signs of the Times, Three Angel's Messages, sanctuary, sealing work, "or any of those subjects that to me is the distinctive message for this time."

Andross observed:

If you will ask Eld. Loughborough why he decided to take passage for America it may throw some light on the exode of laborers from here within the last year.³⁰

By 1903 the pioneers in England became sufficiently concerned with the work of Waggoner and others to press for some changes. Issues were drawn at the British Conference meeting at Southsea, England, in that year. G. A. Irwin, who represented the General Conference at the meeting that was designed to complete the organization of the British Union Conference, observed that the organizational battle was similar to that at the Oakland GC session when Waggoner, Jones, and others strongly opposed what they considered moves toward centralization, except:

The controversy was much more fierce and determined, because that was the field where much of the spirit and sentiment that prevailed at the General Conference saw its birth. These men seemed to believe that it would be a Waterloo for them to be defeated on their own ground.³¹

Compounding the frustration of Waggoner's attempt to prevent the establishment of the British Union Conference was an attack from the North England Conference relating to his teaching at the Bible School and in the Present Truth. The question of financial support for both was pointedly raised. Irwin reported that "the brethren there just came right up and took their stand, and said they could no longer sanction such teaching that was tearing down all order and organization." According to Irwin, Waggoner retorted that

He was right at Minneapolis, he had been right ever since, was right now, and that the whole denomination was in the dark, and that sometime they might possibly see it if they did not drift entirely away and merge into a papacy.³²

In his letter of resignation, Waggoner presented his version of the confrontation. He expressed intense opposition to sending Irwin as Daniells' representative and noted that "Brother Irwin did his duty nobly for 'the old landmarks.' Whether

the people were benefited or not was a secondary matter." Waggoner again raised the question of the pioneer reaction against the Minneapolis message. He noted:

It was solely due to the fact that while, after much opposition, the denomination had officially accepted the advanced truth of the message, they had not taken it practically. . . . Worst of all, they did not accept the ADVANCING LIGHT (emphasis added) of the message. Having made one move, they felt irritated at the intimation that they ought to go on. . . . An earnest effort was made two years ago to improve the state of things. . . . The trouble was, as before, that it was thought possible to effect reforms by the same means, and mostly the same men, that caused the trouble. . . . To me the outlook (now) seems less hopeful than ever; because hitherto the men in charge had never seen the light; but now men who have seen it have been captured by the reactionary element. I can not comprehend it; but it is plain to me that officially the denomination is back the other side of Minneapolis. The cry now, as then, is, "Stand by the landmarks."³³

Waggoner clearly considered himself still within the progressive category.

L. R. Conradi, leader of the denominational work in Europe observed:

I am in harmony as to the principles of justification by faith set forth at Minneapolis, and I believe they were God-given, and that as a people we needed them, and need them yet, and that they brought light and life to us, but I fear that the pendulum swung too far, and we lost again a good deal of what we gained by neglecting the message as such. If the third angel's message is preached properly, it is the everlasting Gospel, and it will have its telling effect.³⁴

A path very similar to Waggoner's had previously been followed by three of the native British workers, Harry Champness, A. R. Leask, and J. Stokes. Champness, who had ministered for 13 years in England, and was the most popular minister there, according to O. A. Olsen, president of the British Union Conference, left the denomination in opposition to its "legalistic" emphasis to work along non-sectarian, evangelical lines. Leask joined a holiness movement, but eventually joined Champness in active work against the denomination. This group would shortly be joined by others following a similar path. Those leaders who had the responsibility for following up in the areas where Champness and Leask had earlier ministered in the denomination were amazed at how uninstructed the church members were in the fundamental teachings of Adventism. The cost in church membership would be heavy.³⁵

After Waggoner's departure, the change in tone in the Present Truth and the work in general in England was remarkable. E. W. Farnsworth was sent from Australia to help restore the fundamentals. It seemed merely a matter of time before

a confrontation with Ballenger would occur. Indeed, Ballenger had not only worked closely with both Champness and Leask, but, according to Champness, "had professed previously to be with us in our work of reform." Waggoner reported that Ballenger had fully apprised Leask of the pioneer opposition to acceptance of the Waggoner message at Minneapolis in 1888, and also Ballenger's contention that certain pioneers had continued to controvert that message. Although Ballenger had not fully followed the pantheists in 1903, he would shortly face a dilemma.³⁶

During the winter of 1903-04, during the time Ballenger was superintendent of the Wales mission, he wrestled for three months with a problem that, when resolved, would nullify his confidence in the Spirit of Prophecy. The question in Ballenger's mind revolved around the identification of Babylon in the 17th chapter of Revelation. Since he believed that the Babylon of chapter 14 and that of chapter 17 of Revelation were identical, Ballenger, after three months of intense agonizing concluded that Mrs. White's statement in Great Controversy, that the Babylon of Revelation 14 "cannot refer to the Roman church" was in error. His intense trauma over that prolonged period, and his inability to find means of harmonizing this problem with his understanding of the nature of the inspiration of the Spirit of Prophecy, afford insights into his later actions. If he had taken into account the context in which Ellen White's statement on Babylon occurred or had sought to understand the point she was making rather than becoming caught on individual words, he might have reached far different conclusions.³⁷

"LIVING TEMPLE"

If the battle between the pioneers and pantheists in England was intense, the battle between the progressives and the pantheists in the United States was explosive. The event that made divergent paths apparent was a book written by J. H. Kellogg entitled The Living Temple.

The roots of Kellogg's philosophy reveal a remarkable similarity to that of Ballenger, Waggoner and others who would fall generally within the pantheistic camp. Kellogg's path led from his belief that Christ's atonement applied aspects of

glorification to the present. While Ballenger stressed more of a mediatorial role for Christ and Kellogg an indwelling role, both had a similar concept of the atonement and the power available through it. Both sets of concepts in their stress and development warred against the fundamentals of the church. Notice Kellogg's 1902 view of the atonement:

Christ came to this earth with a mission of deliverance, whose scope was large enough to comprehend the whole world, with all its needs, all its infirmities, mental and physical as well as moral, all its woes, its misery, its pain, its diseases and deformities,--to open all the prison doors and to set its captives free. . . . Man needs physical healing as much as moral regeneration, and complete success is not possible in either one without the other.³⁸

Thus through the atonement, according to Kellogg, there was present in nature and in every living being, in man, a beneficent intelligence which is continually creating, restoring, renewing, building, and rebuilding, always doing the best that could possibly be done under the circumstances. This is the real healing power, active in every living cell, and particularly in the blood.

At the same time, Kellogg expressed his belief in a personal God in heaven. He wrote Mrs. White:

Some of the brethren have gotten the idea that we do not believe in a personal God, which is certainly very wrong. There could be no worship without a personal God.³⁹

Kellogg denied pantheism, mysticism, or any false teaching, and considered attacks against him as largely manufactured. He noted that he believed the concepts presented in The Living Temple since the 1890s and pointed to instances where those concepts were published during the 1890s. He specifically mentioned the writings of Mrs. S. M. I. Henry, W. W. Prescott, and claimed to find similar concepts in the writings of Mrs. White. By 1903 Kellogg believed he saw the source of the difficulty. He wrote W. W. Prescott:

When we say God is in the tree, the word "God" is understood in its most comprehensive sense, and people understand the meaning to be that the Godhead is in the tree, God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit, whereas the proper understanding in order that wholesome conceptions should be preserved in our minds, is that God the Father sits upon his throne in heaven where God the Son is also; while God's life, or Spirit or presence is the all-pervading power which is carrying out the will of God in all the universe. The whole thing is now clear to my mind. I confess it was not quite clear before, and I felt a distrust and an uneasiness with reference to the matter, though I could not for the life of me see where there was an error.⁴⁰

The dimensions of the Living Temple crisis are beyond calculation. I. H. Evans, who had observed the beginnings of the apostasy from within the Irwin administration noted:

Sometimes I almost wonder if we have come, as other denominations have come, to a crisis, where there shall be stagnation, or, if not stagnation, there shall be splits, and we break up into fragments, and one branch go this way, and another another.

Prescott considered the movement an attempt to substitute a "false philosophy in place of the pure gospel," while Daniells observed:

I consider the whole matter a deeply laid scheme to overthrow our cause and work, and to thwart the efforts we are making to reach a perishing world; in fact, to turn aside the purpose and object of our whole work, and to defeat the movement for which this denomination has been called into existence.⁴¹

Daniells quoted a testimony from Mrs. White where

It is stated that if all of us from this time on give our whole lives to the undoing of the counterworking of the evil influences that have taken root among us in this evil teaching, we shall not be able to fully undo it. God alone can check and undo this evil thing.

Daniells continued:

You will see, too, that our ministers are blamed for not being wideawake, and understanding this thing.

He believed the movement was designed to "prevent the loud cry of the third angel's message from being experienced by this denomination," and that "the welfare and stability of this cause are at stake."⁴²

Daniells spoke from the background of one who himself had almost fallen into the subtleties of the Kellogg apostasy. He wrote:

Hardly a day passes but what I look up to God in heaven, and thank him for delivering me from the snare that was laid for me. All the conditions then existing were well calculated to ensnare me. Had I not been delivered by my merciful Father in heaven, I certainly would have been working with Elder Jones now in the preparation and circulating of the wicked misrepresentations he is sending out to our people. . . . I am humbled every time I review the terrible road over which I have journeyed since the 1901 conference.

Daniells confided to Evans that the crisis "almost ruined" him physically, and wrote

W. C. White:

At one time I found myself in a position where it was only a step to much more than doubt and unbelief. . . . And I know for a fact that both Brother Prescott and Brother Spicer were most horribly tempted. Their experience was far more acute and dangerous than mine. But they both feared God, and he delivered them from the snare of the fowler.⁴³

Part of the reason for the depths of the crisis from 1902 onward related to the long-term roots of the "spiritualistic" teaching within the denomination. R. A. Underwood alluded to developments in the 1890s, noting that Daniells was learning "by experience some things that others had known before." He affirmed:

There has been creeping in for years certain things in the interpretation of the scriptures by some (it is not all confined to Battle Creek) that is as certain to make the Third Angel's message as we have believed and preached it nothing less than a fable and a delusion.

H. W. Cottrell considered that "for many years," the "rank and file of the denomination were largely sidetracked from the main line," and G. B. Thompson pointed to a "teaching which has been taking the edge off the message for years." Daniells, Prescott, and others observed the lengthy roots of the teaching. Indeed, they, with others, saw the movement within the denomination as a part of a worldwide philosophy that was sweeping other denominations.⁴⁴

As did others, Mrs. White, in dealing with the Living Temple crisis, noted that such "spiritualistic sentiments, the strange, misleading theories," had "for years been coming in." She frequently used such terms as "scientific theories which are akin to pantheism," "fanciful and spiritualistic interpretations of the Scripture," "perversion of truth," "mysticism."

In testimonies relating to the crisis we often find descriptions of symbolic scenes shown to Mrs. White through vision. She reported such scenes as Kellogg pushing a long car up a steep ascent, riding a horse and carrying a banner, armies in terrible conflict, ships and icebergs, etc. Especially noteworthy is the fact that Mrs. White did not deal with the specific theological errors plaguing the path that Kellogg and others were following. She urged close Biblical study to ascertain the error.

Mrs. White stated, after a full year and a half of testimonies relating to the crisis:

Many are so blind that they do not yet discern the misleading character of some of the sentiments contained in the book "Living Temple." Such ones, whether they be ministers, doctors, or teachers, would better go apart and study the Scriptures alone with God.⁴⁵

W. C. White applied this methodology after a critical meeting on the crisis:

I studied the Bible; I reviewed the teachings I had received regarding God and His relation to man; I studied the "Living Temple"; I carried the question to God upon my knees. I felt that I must know for myself the answer to these perplexities that have been gathering in my mind as a result of the teachings I had heard at our camp-meetings and in San Francisco. I received a revelation of God's goodness and clear views regarding His personality and His power that have set me free from the doubts and perplexities that have arisen in my mind.⁴⁶

Mrs. White believed that direct revelation from the Lord should not have been necessary in order for the church leaders to discern the erroneous teachings in Living Temple. She was further shocked that men "who have had a long experience in the truth" should have accepted the teachings. She noted:

That those whom we thought sound in the faith should have failed to discern the specious, deadly influence of this science of evil, should alarm us as nothing else has alarmed us.

She reported the following vision:

The heavenly messenger turned to those professing to be medical missionaries, and said, "How could you allow yourselves to be led blindfold? How could you so misrepresent the name you bear? You have your Bibles. Why have you not reasoned from cause to effect? You have accepted theories that have led you away from the truths that are to stamp their impress upon the characters of all Seventh-day Adventists. Your leader has been moving the foundation timbers one by one, and his reasoning would soon leave us with no certain foundation for our faith. He has not heeded the testimonies that God through his Spirit has given. The books of the Bible containing most important instruction are disregarded because they say so much about a personal God. He has not known whither his feet were tending. But in his recent writings, his tendencies toward pantheism have been revealed."⁴⁷

In addressing herself to the Living Temple crisis, Mrs. White applied a number of terms that two years later she would relate to the Ballenger crisis. She noted that Kellogg was misapplying scriptures and taking them out of their connection and "giving a wrong application" to them; he was advocating erroneous views that were destructive to the landmarks; he was accepting erroneous theories that had been met time and time again in the past; his system led to a downplaying of the Sabbath; it taught, in effect, that "My Lord delayeth his coming"; it subverted the truths found "in the revelation given by Christ to John to give to the churches."⁴⁸

The dimensions of the crisis can be seen by noting A. G. Daniells' observation of Mrs. White after a dramatic meeting at Berrien Springs in 1903. After leaving the meeting, Daniells noted that Mrs. White "seemed terrified"; she shortly had "terrible revelations" of the course Kellogg and his associates would pursue. "From

that time to the present she has been simply terrified day after day and night after night. I have never seen her so thoroughly aroused and so intense over anything as she is over this at present." Daniells noted that she had since written Kellogg and "other physicians what may truly be called terrifying communications." The consequence of those communications reacted upon those that Spicer considered "drunken on the wine of this new mysticism." Waggoner was "dazed," "astounded, and, like Job, he could simply put his hand on his mouth and keep silence." He later noted, however, that merely receiving word that he was wrong did not show him precisely where his error was. Paulson was "dazed and stunned." A. T. Jones stated that now that the testimony had spoken, he was done.⁴⁹

Daniells considered the teachings of the pantheistic group "one of the most subtle deceptions of these last days," and urged that "every form and feature of it should be unmasked." W. W. Prescott, as well as Daniells, saw a continuing role for the Spirit of Prophecy in this regard:

The instruction of the Testimonies does not have reference simply to one man or one book. There is no doubt that repeated efforts will be made to introduce error into the teaching of this message; and the instruction given in these Testimonies is designed to prepare our people so that they may be able to discern between truth and error by whomsoever presented.⁵⁰

The testimonies made the divergent paths apparent. Properly received they would have pointed out to the pantheists that they had been traveling a devious and destructive path and would have to examine their beliefs closely to discover the error. To some extent this was done. E. A. Sutherland, P. T. Magan, David Paulson, S. H. Lane, W. W. Prescott, C. L. Taylor, M. E. Olsen, Luther Warren, among others profited from the testimonies relating to the Living Temple. Others did not look deeply enough. E. J. Waggoner, in 1904, wrote Daniells and Prescott:

I am not conscious of any change whatever in my attitude towards you or towards the truth which we unitedly proclaimed when we were associated together in the work. No doubt both of you would say the same thing for yourselves; and therefore I am compelled to believe, as I did from the beginning, that the present strained situation is the result of misunderstanding.

In contrast, O. A. Olsen, president of the GC from 1888 to 1897, wrote Mrs. White:

I can assure you that I have the fullest confidence in the testimonies, and I know that God is leading in the 3d Angel's Message and this work. There was

a time when I was somewhat perplexed. The reason being that some things were taught and pressed quite strongly by certain ones which I could not harmonize with the underlying principles of the truth, nor the Testimonies, and at the same time these views were pressed upon us, from the standpoint as stated in one of the special testimonies something like this, "These men have light for the people," meaning Waggoner & Jones. I did want the light God had for us, but some things were presented as light that I could not understand as such. And yet not to accept it, was held to be rejecting the Testimonies. I did not want to reject the Testimonies, so all I could do for the time was to await the matter to be cleared up, and this has been done, and the perplexity fully vanished, and I think I have my clear bearings.⁵¹

In calling for the assistance of the pioneers, Daniells wrote Mrs. White:

I have felt deeply impressed as I have met these brethren and sisters that we greatly need to have the third angel's message revived and preached in the simplicity and power that it was presented in the early days. I have not the slightest doubt but what the message of righteousness by faith that came to us in (1888) at the Minneapolis Conference was from God, and that it was greatly needed; but I feel sure that the enemy came in to make that message of none effect by swinging many of our ministers away from the fundamental truths for this time. It certainly is not necessary to abandon the prophecies, and drop the distinctive features of the message, in order to lead people to receive the righteousness of Christ. We can preach that message, and we can preach the third angel's message of Revelation 14 with all the zeal and earnestness we can command. They are in harmony; they are really one message. But we lose a great deal by abandoning the great fundamental doctrines of the third angel's message, and preaching a sort of goody-goody message, similar to the moral essays delivered by the ministers of other churches. I appreciate as never before the call you made at the Oakland Conference for us to come back to the peculiar and special truths given to this people at the beginning of this movement. I believe that the same grand message preached at that time is the message to be preached today, and that it will have the same effect on the hearts of the people that it had then, provided it is preached by men who have the same good, practical experience that the preachers of those early days had.⁵²

Daniells' position was taken against the backdrop of a decade of weakened fundamentals and of the need for a dynamic alliance with pioneers in order to uproot the entrenched teachings of the pantheists. It is of more than passing interest to note that at the time of Daniells' firm attachment to the fundamental teachings of the church and his overwhelming confidence in the Spirit of Prophecy, he was quietly moving to a new view of the sanctuary that would later result in the disintegration of the alliance he was forming.

During the 1901 GC session Mrs. White, through vision, was instructed in a number of ways to attempt a more proper balance in the relationship between the law and the gospel that seemed out of focus within the denomination. In addition to the testimony concerning the Indiana apostasy, Mrs. White wrote Kellogg:

Before I went to the (1901) General Conference, I was instructed that I could

help you. The Lord told me that I must bear my testimony at this meeting against the incorrect ideas that had been coming in in regard to forbearance and Christlikeness. My work was to present the standard of Christianity that had been presented to me. As one with God-given authority, I was to bear my message against the wrong principles that had been coming in.

She also wrote Daniells:

I have often been warned against overstrained ideas of sanctification. They lead to an objectionable feature of experience that will swamp us, unless we are wide-awake. . . . During the General Conference of 1901, the Lord warned me against sentiments that were then held by Brethren Prescott and Waggoner. These sentiments have been as leaven put into meal. Many minds have received them. The ideas of some regarding a great experience supposed to be sanctification have been the alpha of a train of deception. Because of some overdrawn expressions frequently used by Brother E. J. Waggoner at the Conference, I was led to speak words intended to counteract their influence.⁵³

Other statements and testimonies given by Mrs. White between 1901 and 1904 indicate definite attempts to more properly restore the balance. Indeed, her call for renewed emphasis upon the fundamentals, stress upon Revelation with its warnings as well as promises, and upon the increased emphasis upon the writings of the pioneers, living and dead, can be seen as an effort in that direction.⁵⁴

1905 GENERAL CONFERENCE

Near the beginning of 1905, W. C. White expressed to his brother the intensity of the burden Mrs. White carried because of the continuing crisis. He informed James Edson White that "last winter Mother nearly died of discouragement" because of the burden she carried and noted that she believed "her life depended upon her refusing" to carry those burdens as she had previously. He informed his brother that Mrs. White urged him "to do all we can to bear the burdens and keep them from her." Despite this Mrs. White sent the following testimony to Dr. Kress the next month:

For a long time I have been unable to sleep as I should. But I am endeavoring by the help of God to write letters that will be a help, not merely to those to whom they are addressed, but to many others who need them.

She then gave the following general counsel:

Our Sanitariums are to reach a class that can be reached by no other means. "Why," asks one and another, "is not prayer offered for the miraculous healing of the sick, instead of so many sanitariums being established." Should this be done, great fanaticism would arise in our ranks. Those who have much self-confidence would start into action, as did certain ones in Indiana, who had a

great deal to say about holy flesh. These were carried away by a spiritualistic delusion. At the General Conference of 1901, they were rebuked by a message given me for them by the Lord. Should we carry out the plans that some would be pleased to have us carry out, companies would be formed who would bring in spiritualistic manifestations that would confuse the faith of many. . . .

Errors will come in and strange doctrines will be advocated. Some will depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils. As far back as the establishment of the first sanitarium, these things began to appear. They were similar to the errors that manifested themselves soon after the disappointment of 1844. A strong phase of fanaticism appeared, calling itself the witness of the Holy Ghost. I was given a message to rebuke this evil work.⁵⁵

At about the same time, the first reports of the A. F. Ballenger teachings on the sanctuary were received in the United States. By April Mrs. White reversed her earlier inclinations and decided to attend the 1905 GC session, scheduled to begin May 11.⁵⁶

It is of value to surmise what Mrs. White could have known, outside of divine revelation, about the Ballenger teachings prior to her arrival at the GC session. Daniells sent W. C. White the correspondence relating to the Ballenger teaching that was received at the headquarters and also sent several brief descriptions himself. It seems likely that W. C. White would have shared at least the substance of this correspondence with his mother. Mrs. White might herself have read the four letters Daniells sent.⁵⁷

The following points were reported from England regarding the Ballenger teaching.

He taught:

1. The atonement was made when Christ died. When He ascended, He went into the Most Holy Place and has been there since.
2. This is substantiated by Hebrews 6:19 which Ballenger compared with "twenty-five or thirty expressions of the same character in the Old Testament where he claims that in every instance the term 'within the veil' signifies within the Most Holy Place. He says the outer veil or the door of the tabernacle" is called the veil of the tabernacle only once, and then by implication, Heb. 9:3; "and does not think that one instance should be so construed as to practically overthrow all the others."
3. His teaching upsets denominational teaching on the two covenants (in E. W. Farnsworth's mind)
4. He believed it impossible to harmonize his position with the Spirit of Prophecy, seeing "irreconcilable" differences. (Ballenger's rigidity in his understanding of the use to be made of the Spirit of Prophecy will be discussed more fully later.)

5. His views would revolutionize views held by SDAs (according to Ballenger's own assertion)
6. The fruits of Ballenger's teaching (not just sanctuary) were negative as far as the fundamental teachings of the church were concerned (in E. W. Farnsworth's opinion)
7. Besides other ministers, influential lay brethren in Ireland and Wales accepted Ballenger's sanctuary views.
8. North England was experiencing problems relating to the sanctuary teaching. It was reported that the Waggoner teaching, "that the sanctuary was a type of the human body, and the cleansing of it relates to the rise and development of health reform," was causing difficulties.
9. After suggesting that Hutchinson and Ballenger be returned to the United States, Farnsworth noted: "There is no sense, in my mind for these lame preachers to try to preach the Third Angel's Message. It will take years for this country to recover from Waggoner's influence."⁵⁸

It will be noticed that the first three points raise very specific theological issues. It is of major interest to note that Mrs. White, at the 1905 GC, did not address her counsel or writings concerning Ballenger to any of these theological questions. It also seems relevant that two of the nine points seemed to identify Ballenger with Waggoner in some manner. The last six points deal with Ballenger's relationship to the fundamental message of Adventism and of course Mrs. White responded to this at the Conference. Other attitudes toward Ballenger, held at the time of the 1905 GC session, likewise have relevance.

After hearing of the possibility that William Robinson, former worker with Ballenger in England and, in 1905, missionary to Spain, was perhaps tainted with the Ballenger teaching, the usually-restrained W. A. Spicer wrote Robinson relative to his opinion of the Ballenger error. He first alluded to the non-denominational, evangelical revival messages prevalent in Wales for several years. He noticed that much of it seemed unbalanced: "We find that the times of greatest power in the work have been times of evenness and well-balanced effort," affirmed Spicer. In an obvious allusion to the Ballenger teaching, he noted: "I confess I am a little afraid of the itching for the marvelous and the sensational." Spicer became more explicit to Robinson after the 1905 session. He revealed:

When I got over to England and Wales I found that some of those things

which had been cited as so wonderful in Brother Ballenger's experience in the matter of manifestations of healing, in one case at least had developed very strange fanaticism and experiences which were manifestly not of heaven. I found also a sort of spiritual egotism which did not savor at all of the things of God. I believe it is these things which have misled our brother.

Spicer consistently held to that opinion regarding the roots of Ballenger's error even into the 1950s.⁵⁹

At the Conference, Ballenger gave three one-hour presentations relating to his sanctuary positions. The presentations were held before a selected committee of 25 beginning at 5:30 a.m., from Sunday, May 21, to Tuesday, May 23. There is no evidence that the writer is aware of that indicates whether or not Mrs. White attended any of the one-hour presentations, or if she attended any of the two one-hour presentations that three members of the committee made in response to the Ballenger positions.

Mrs. White presented a testimony, most likely to this select group, the day following the Ballenger presentations. This message of May 24, was given not only to Ballenger, but "to our people," and was treated as Divine guidance specifically pertaining to the Ballenger situation. Mrs. White frequently used such words as "our Instructor spoke words to Brother Ballenger," "I am bidden to say in the name of the Lord," "thus did the heavenly messenger pronounce," etc. While documentation is unavailable to enable a full understanding of Ballenger's presentations, enough is known to shed considerable light as we endeavor to understand the errors that the May 24 testimony was designed to refute.

We would expect that in God's plan and revelation, Ballenger, as others who received testimonies from Mrs. White, should receive enough information to enlighten him concerning the error of his path and provide guidance in regard to his future teachings, even though Ellen White was not theologically explicit. Certainly the pantheists would have been enlightened if they had closely examined their teachings in the light of the testimonies and their Source. Most pantheists, however, had come to lose confidence in the guidance of the Spirit of Prophecy and thus apparently never considered the testimonies in their intended light.⁶⁰

Ballenger spent his full time the first day in presenting the texts that use the term "within the veil." He also presented what he termed his "Nine Theses," that which he considered nine inconsistencies between SDA teachings and the Scriptures when the denomination placed Christ's first-apartment ministry after the Cross. He concluded:

But when you allow the first apartment work to represent the plan of salvation from creation to the cross, everything is a perfect fit, and all seems beautiful and harmonious and complete.⁶¹

Although a transcript of Ballenger's presentation the second and third day apparently was not taken, a partial transcript of several questions asked him concerning his second presentation makes it clear that Ballenger, at that time, made his presentation on the atonement. Note the following exchange between W. W. Prescott and Ballenger:

WWP: I want to understand the view, and so I wanted to see if I understood you. Then (sic) when Christ paid the penalty on the cross, the whole human family was free from death? I wanted to get your view of it. I wanted to understand clearly.

AFB: When Christ died on Calvary, by that act he had reached down and put his arms around the fallen world, and lifted it right back up to the place where it was before it fell off the platform of the garden of Eden, and left man again free to choose, where Adam was free to choose, between eternal loss and eternal gain.

The exchange reveals that not only did Ballenger present his concept of the atonement during the session, but that quite likely he at least inferred that the benefits of the atonement included physical benefits. It is certain that Ballenger was completely identified with a teaching that claimed physical benefits from the atonement.⁶²

In his book The Proclamation of Liberty and the Unpardonable Sin, published in 1915, but according to Ballenger and his followers, written prior to his 1905 GC hearing, Ballenger again elaborated his concept of the atonement. In the book, Ballenger spoke of his teaching in Wales on the atonement

in its relation to both soul and body healing, and (I) was calling upon those present to accept the gift of healing already given in Christ, when all of a sudden a lifelong sufferer, who for years had suffered from dropsical swellings and from heart-weakness, whose bowels had not performed their functions for

six years without artificial aid, saw the truth and claimed by faith the healing which was already hers in Christ. Instantly she was healed, to the glory of God and her unspeakable joy.

After devoting a section of his book to this healing experience, Ballenger concluded:

Dear reader, will you not let the Lord be glorified in you? O my poor sick one, again I say, Let the Lord have your sickness. Why do you bear it when the Lord is so willing to bear it all for you? Don't you see how useless it is for you to bear it when the Lord has so gladly taken upon Himself our infirmities? In vain for Him to bear it if you bear it also. You are free indeed. The Lord bears it all for you. You need only to believe it, my brother, my sister.

He reaffirmed this teaching again when he wrote "Cast Out for the Cross of Christ," in 1909 and included a section from Power for Witnessing that depicted his view of the relationship between the atonement and healing.⁶³

It is of interest to note that Ballenger's teaching lent itself to accusations of universalism. This was the line that Prescott had pursued at the hearing on May 22. Others throughout his ministry likewise raised that point. His writings make it quite apparent, however, that he did not so believe. It seems relevant also that Mrs. White raised no such question in her testimony to Ballenger.

While a detailed analysis of all Ellen White statements pertaining to Ballenger is beyond the scope of this paper, certain observations seem vital. It appears relevant to this writer, that when Mrs. White met Ballenger the day before his initial presentations, "it came vividly" to her mind that here was a man who had, in 1890, advocated a position that, for the sake of reaching a larger audience, would have downplayed the Sabbath question in the religious liberty publication, The American Sentinel. It would seem in this initial reaction that Mrs. White was noticing the personification of a movement that was, in reality, destructive of the fundamentals of the church. As we have previously seen, very often when Mrs. White spoke about the proper relationship between the law and the gospel, she strongly emphasized the importance of the Sabbath. Note this 1891 example, when Ellen White addressed a council of conference officials:

We must have a sense of both the justice and mercy of God. Those who can blend together the law of God and the mercy of God can reach any heart. For years I have seen that there is a broken link which has kept us from reaching hearts. This link is supplied by presenting the love and mercy of God.

Immediately after making that statement, Mrs. White stressed the importance of the Sabbath truth and spoke negatively of a reaction she saw within the church against presenting the claims of the Sabbath too strongly.⁶⁴

After this initial contact with Ballenger in 1905, Mrs. White also mentioned in her Diary the "most dangerous heresies" that were seeking to find entrance "among us as a people." She concluded her observations with the following:

Those who are so shortsighted that they will begin to do the work that some others have been doing in ADVOCATING THE SENTIMENTS (emphasis added) contained in Living Temple, are departing from the living God in spiritualistic satanic experiences that will not do the souls who receive them any good. They are departing from the faith, seeking to tear down the foundation of truth. . . . I testify in the name of the Lord that Elder Ballenger is led by satanic agencies and spiritualistic, invisible leaders. Those who have the guidance of the Holy Spirit will turn away from these seducing spirits.⁶⁵

The May 24 testimony given to Ballenger contains abundant counsel to show him the false path he was traveling. Mrs. White mentioned "erroneous theories" mingled with truth, compared him with Kellogg and "many ministers among us" who had "departed from Christ's plan," noted his "mystification" of the gospel, considered that his teaching would "undermine the mighty truths" established for ages, and also noted that his teaching was likewise destructive of the fundamental Adventist truths. Mrs. White directly quoted heavenly counsel to Ballenger:

Our Instructor spoke words to Brother Ballenger: "You are bringing in confusion and perplexity by your interpretation of the Scriptures. . . . Put away any exposition of Scripture which means, 'My Lord delayeth His coming.' "

It can be seen that by bringing the benefits reserved for heaven to the present life, Ballenger was, in effect, delaying the coming of the Lord. His de-emphasis of the last warning message of Revelation can also be said to delay the return of Christ. Mrs. White considered that Kellogg also "delayed" Christ's return.⁶⁶

Mrs. White then emphasized the role of the pioneers, living and dead, and urged the reprinting of their articles. It should be noted that the pioneers had previously met fanatical teachings, were strongly grounded in the fundamentals, and also strong on the Spirit of Prophecy, which Ballenger was, in effect attacking, since his concept of the inspiration of the Spirit of Prophecy allowed no way to harmonize his teaching with it. Mrs. White concluded the testimony by affirming that the

Ballenger path meant "the uprooting of faith in God, and the making of infidels."⁶⁷

Other Ellen White statements concerning Ballenger referred to past fanatical movements whose leaders taught doctrines based upon "false experience," "theories of the kind that he has been presenting, we have had to meet again and again."⁶⁸

A portentous event occurred at the conclusion of the 1905 GC session. Mrs. White spoke with great feeling about the spiritualistic sentiments coming into the church and asserted:

I am terrified for our people, to think that they act like blind men, as though they could not call wrong wrong, and righteousness righteousness.

"Her soul was greatly stirred," reported W. A. Spicer, as she recalled experience after experience in the past history of the church that claimed a false sanctification, but eventually led to fanaticism. She compared those sentiments with the Living Temple philosophy. At the conclusion of Mrs. White's talk to the delegates, after she had left the tent, A. T. Jones spoke and directly contradicted much of what Mrs. White had said. Spicer considered Jones' talk, "following Sister White's awful warning," to be most daring. Jones asserted that he was still teaching the third angel's message, and continued:

and I expect to continue to teach it--just the plain, old-fashioned, straightforward truth of the third angel's message, just as in the past, just as I have been teaching it all the years when I was orthodox. And that is the way I intend to do, without a compromise or anything of the kind with anything or anybody. I have no respect for pantheism, spiritualism, or any other ism under heaven or anything that is existing; but only for the third angel's message, and just as it is, just as I have always taught it.

At the same time, he refused to disavow the teachings of The Living Temple.

AFTERMATH

In her May 24, 1905, testimony to Ballenger, Mrs. White quoted portions of Matthew 7:

Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. Ye shall know them by their fruits.

This test, applied to Ballenger, affords further evidence of the false path he was traveling.⁷⁰

A. F. Ballenger appeared before the General Conference Committee on May 30, 1905, and affirmed that he continued to believe as he did before his hearing at the GC session. We might observe that Ballenger's central hope for light was the May 24 testimony from Mrs. White since the three theological responses to his presentations were completely inconsistent with each other. E. E. Andross, who, with E. W. Farnsworth, heard the Ballenger presentation for the third time at the session, stated in 1911:

I tell you (the Ballenger theory) is not a thing to be passed by lightly. There was not one of us that could answer it at the beginning. We could turn to the Testimonies and say it was not true. We knew that it was wrong, but we did not know how the Bible taught that it was wrong, but somehow our hearts said That is not right, and the testimonies confirmed the language of our hearts, but we could not say, "Brother Ballenger, you are wrong, for the Bible teaches it differently from that." While we believed the old position, we could not answer the new position. That was the situation that confronted us. But, thank the Lord, we can answer it to-day from the Bible, and the Bible alone, too.

Ballenger retired from the ministry to his 25-acre farm in Virginia.⁷¹

The general rule that the consequence of pantheist teaching resulted in havoc to the fundamental teachings of the church again held in the case of Ballenger. After leaving the ministry both Ballenger and William Hutchinson maintained correspondence with their former congregations in Ireland and Wales. Practically all the believers in Ballenger's church in Wales, including the elders and a Bible worker, left the denomination entirely and according to Andross, gave up the Sabbath. Only the active labors of Daniells and Andross in Ireland and Wales prevented greater losses.⁷²

Ballenger remained relatively quiet in denominational affairs until 1909, when he wrote a letter to Mrs. White that he later published that same year in his pamphlet "Cast Out for the Cross of Christ." In that letter he quoted 12 passages of scripture that use the terms "within" and "without the veil." He also quoted Mrs. White's use of the term "within the veil" in Great Controversy. His assumption that Mrs. White used the term "within" in a strictly theological manner guided his conclusions as his earlier understanding of her comments concerning Revelation 17 had. He thus believed that the Spirit of Prophecy was not in harmony with Biblical teaching.

In the same letter Ballenger further exhibited his literalism regarding Mrs. White's use of the term "daily." The following illustrates his dilemma:

As my secret trial four years ago, three leading brethren were chosen to answer me. (It is interesting to note in passing that two out of the three were then and are still under your condemnation inasmuch as they both teach that the "daily" of Dan. 8:13 refers to the heavenly service instead of paganism as taught by you in Early Writings.) In private conversation with me one took the position that "within the veil" meant within the sanctuary, but did not refer to either apartment. Another asserted at the trial that the term applied to the first apartment as you have interpreted it. The third, compelled by the witnesses (Biblical) quoted above admitted in his answer that the term "within the veil" does apply to the holy of holies, but that it is spoken prophetically, and although the scripture says Christ is entered "within the veil" we are to understand it to mean that he will enter it in 1844. This babel of voices did not help me to see my error, if error it be.⁷³

Ballenger assumed, given his manner of interpretation of the Spirit of Prophecy, that F. M. Wilcox and W. W. Prescott, referred to in the earlier quotation, who held to the "new view" of the "daily" had to be "under your condemnation" since that view, to Ballenger, opposed Mrs. White's use of that term in Early Writings. He likewise assumed they were condemned by the Spirit of Prophecy in their 1905 interpretation of the terms "within the veil." The next year Mrs. White would completely deny that she used the term "daily" in a theological sense. The year following, in 1911, by her approval in placing the word "alone" in her discussion of Babylon in the revision of Great Controversy, Mrs. White would likewise deny using the earlier expression in a strict theological sense. We can thus see that, because of his literal and specific reading of the Spirit of Prophecy, Ballenger lost his faith in the guidance of that gift over three words: "alone," "within," and "daily." His assumption that Mrs. White used the term "within the veil" in a strictly theological setting guided Ballenger's actions for the remainder of his life and his conclusions followed:

If I accept the testimony of the Scriptures, if I follow my conscientious convictions, I find myself under your condemnation; and you call me a wolf in sheep's clothing.

Ballenger apparently never admitted that his "path" to the sanctuary might be his error.⁷⁴

After 1909, Ballenger began more actively working against the denomination. He

aligned with A. T. Jones in 1911 and by 1912 was visiting churches throughout the country espousing his cause. He assumed publication of the periodical The Gathering Call, which he edited until his death in 1921. The publication assumed an anti-organization tone and closely identified with the Pentecostal movement, stressing divine healings, speaking in tongues, and "Receive ye the Holy Ghost." The following report to the General Conference office in 1916 seems relevant:

A letter from Elder R. A. Underwood states that A. F. Ballenger is doing some serious damage to the work in College View. Brother Underwood says that about 200 of our people have been attending his meetings and that he is making a decided impression upon many minds. His special point of attack is the Testimonies. He takes up the theory of verbal inspiration and infallibility, which has been advocated by Brethren Irwin, Haskell, Loughborough, and others, and then cites the facts to prove that this theory is not correct. Brother Underwood states that many are being thrown into confusion by this attack. This experience emphasizes the necessity of instructing our people concerning the true nature of the Spirit of Prophecy.⁷⁵

Ballenger's actions after 1909 were part of a more general attack upon the denomination coming primarily from former denominational workers who were active in church work in the late 1890s, but who followed paths that led them into pantheism. Attempts were made as early as 1905 to enlist the support of the pioneers in that movement. Haskell, in 1905, believed it providential that Kellogg should invite him to teach at the sanitarium in Battle Creek for several weeks, since he feared the inroads the Ballenger teaching was making there. He was somewhat surprised at Mrs. White's reaction, however, when she wrote Haskell and his wife:

I have been instructed that an effort would be made to obtain your names as teachers to the nurses at Battle Creek, so that the managers of the Sanitarium can say to our people that Elder and Mrs. Haskell are to give a course of lessons to the Battle Creek Sanitarium nurses, and use this as a means of decoying to Battle Creek those who otherwise would heed the cautions about going there for their education.

I warn you against doing anything which would help those who are working directly contrary to the counsels of God. to carry out any of their deceptive plans. I know you would not willing place yourself in any such position. and I warn you because I know the men and the plans better than you do.⁷⁶

At about the same time Mrs. White was writing to Haskell. Daniells was seeing concerted efforts leading to "a subtle, flanking movement . . . which will carry the day unless we do something decided." He saw the movement spreading beyond Battle Creek and made appeals to Mrs. White and the pioneers for a united front.

This alliance between pioneers and progressives against the pantheists became complete by 1906 because of counsel from the Spirit of Prophecy as well as the overt attacks of the pantheists upon the Spirit of Prophecy. Butler underwent "one of the most remarkable changes in his life," and offered his full support to Daniells. Others, such as Haskell, Loughborough, and S. H. Lane, moved away from any support or sympathy of the Battle Creek group and offered their fullest support to Daniells.⁷⁷

Between 1905 and 1911, an amazing recycling of the message of the 1890s began with such men as J. W. Scoles, L. K. Morgan, Irving Keck, L. H. Crisler, A. T. Jones, A. F. Ballenger, E. J. Dryer, E. J. Waggoner, W. L. Winner, E. E. Franke, L. C. Sheafe, G. E. Fifield, J. A. L. Derby, S. S. Davis, L. A. Phippeny, and a number of others. The essential difference between this movement and the movement of the late 1890s was that now this group was working outside of the church and calling for a revival that would bring God's true people out of the existing church organizations. This seemed a logical conclusion from the assumption of the group that all believers possessed the spirit of prophecy and could themselves distinguish inspired from uninspired evidence. The alliance included a score of publications, tracts and periodicals.

J. W. Scoles summarized the message in the Platform and Voice periodical with his article entitled "The Harvest Message." After his observation that "those who . . . see clearly their privileges under the New Covenant" would not die, Scoles offered these general characteristics of that message:

1. It symbolizes a work of coming out from existing organizations. . . . 2. The Harvest Message is a message of holiness. . . . 3. This message is also to be a message of power. . . . Power for witnessing, power for service, power for sacrifice, power for healing, power to live as becomes those whose God is the Lord; in short, the power of the Holy Ghost in and upon them. . . . "Receive ye the Holy Ghost."⁷⁸

In his publication, The Straight Testimony and the Harvest Message, L. A. Phippeny had a similar message in October of 1911. He recycled the 1890s experience in an article entitled "Absolute Freedom for Spirit, Soul and Body." Phippeny asserted, "To be free from the evils human flesh is heir to is the present privilege of every son and daughter of Adam." The root to this freedom, according

to Phippeny, was the atonement. He observed:

Beloved, there is healing of sin, of sorrow, of fear, of fret and impatience, and of sickness, all on the same basis of the atonement in the BLOOD of the Cross, and all on the same plane of living faith in the power of the living NAME, to work miracles today just as when Jesus walked the earth, or when "signs and wonders" were performed through Spirit filled believers in the early church.⁷⁹

The path of L. H. Crisler, president of the Florida Conference from 1893 to 1901 and 1906 and 1907, was similar. Crisler, father of C. C. Crisler who was then working at the Elmshaven office with Mrs. White, gave evidence of his non-interpretative or literalistic stance relative to the Spirit of Prophecy, when he made a major issue of the butter question during his last year as president of the Florida Conference. He was stunned when volume nine of the Testimonies was published in 1909 and Mrs. White seemed to take a position more flexible than in the early volumes on the butter question. After reading Ballenger's tract, Crisler soon left the church and believed that the Lord worked with the few outside of the organization rather than with the many within the church. C. C. Crisler reported that his father was "looking for the manifestation of special power" among those few. He likewise noted his father's sympathies with A. T. Jones, Ballenger, Waggoner, E. J. Dryer and E. E. Franke.⁸⁰

W. A. Spicer commented on the Crisler experience:

He . . . seems absolutely committed (to his position), and repudiates all the Testimonies. It is the logical next step after what he did with the testimonies on the butter question. There are some others who will go the same road if they are logical, unless they reform.

Rather significantly, Spicer concluded this thought with the observation that he believed there were "streaks of reform" occurring "on the manner of handling evidence and using documents." He also made the following general observation on the pantheist movement during the period:

Men swing from one side to the other, from over-spiritualization and the fanciful, to repudiation of fundamentals; from using the testimonies as the supreme test of doctrine, to repudiating them altogether.⁸¹

By 1911, many within the denomination questioned why no adequate response to the Ballenger pamphlet, "Cast Out for the Cross of Christ" had been published. Butler, in 1911, had written six articles for the Review for such a purpose, but reactions

to those articles were negative. Reflecting upon the situation, Irwin observed that since no one in 1905 had adequately responded to the Ballenger theology "to the satisfaction of either Brother Ballenger or those who listened," and in 1911, no one seemed pleased with the Butler response, another attempt be made by E. E. Andross, who had been responding to Ballenger throughout California. Daniells had fears of such a project, however. He wrote W. C. White:

I have traveled all over the United States, as you know, during the last year, and have had opportunity to interview hundreds of our ministers, and I do not think there are very many east of the Rocky Mountains who feel very anxious to have a book on this subject appear at the present time. The subject is complex, and many feel that for the present the least that is said the better. I suppose you know that there is quite a difference of opinion among our ministers regarding some features of the Sanctuary question. Some of us feel that Ballenger, Jones, Crisler, and Keck could have nothing better placed in their hands than positions concerning which our leading men could not agree. I have wondered if silence just for the present would not be as golden regarding this question as the Daily. I am sure that some of the arguments presented by Brother Andross in his manuscript would be repudiated by a large number of our ministers.^{81a}

The committee appointed to examine the Andross manuscript, consisted of W. W. Prescott, F. M. Wilcox and C. M. Snow. After reading what was to become chapter three of the Andross book, they sent a seven-page evaluation to Andross which stated in part:

When you adopt the interpretation which you follow in your manuscript, you really deny the efficacy of the new covenant previous to the cross, and really affirm that the Word of God and the oath of God were not sufficient to make the new covenant sure. This seems to us to be a very serious perversion of the teaching of the gospel, and that it involves if possible, worse consequences than the teachings of Ballenger.

Andross' position on the covenants, later published in his book, make it clear that he, along with others such as Underwood and R. S. Owen, who had previously reverted to the pre-1888 to 1890 position on the covenants, never accepted the new view of the covenants, endorsed by Mrs. White in 1890. When it is recognized that Owen's dispensationalist position was published in the Sabbath School lessons in 1907 and Andross' sanctuary manuscript was published in 1912, it seems apparent that theological positions were given a wide range of flexibility during the period. That is, up to a certain point as the debate on the "daily" was to reveal.⁸²

AN ALTERNATE PATH TO THE SANCTUARY

In 1911, when the denomination was still waiting for an acceptable response to Ballenger's attacks, F. M. Wilcox, editor of the Review and Herald, suggested that Prescott refute Ballenger. Prescott could not do so, the latter affirmed, because Ballenger's book, according to Prescott, could only be refuted by thoroughly examining Daniel 8. By 1911, however, a thorough contextual study of that chapter was not possible in any public manner. The reason involved the rapidly crumbling alliance between the pioneers and the progressives.⁸³

One of the tragedies of the period we have been examining is the loss the church sustained when the dynamic ministers of the 1890s subverted its truths. The apostacies of the pantheists served to partially eclipse certain of the advanced truths that they held. Changes in theology relating to the law in Galatians and the covenants illustrate that fact. It is of interest to note that most of the pantheists also held to certain specific concepts relating to sanctuary theology. Their pantheistic views, however, eclipsed any contribution they might have made relative to the specifics of sanctuary theology. G. E. Fifield, minister in the New England Conference, presented as early as 1897, the ingredients of what was to become known as the "new view" of the "daily." The denominational debate on the meaning of the term "daily" in Daniel 8:11-13 became in some ways, as intense as the conflict with the pantheists.⁸⁴

From 1898 onward, L. R. Conradi held to a view of the "daily" that considered the term to refer to the continual mediation of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary and that view was accepted and taught in England by Prescott and Waggoner. The potential for conflict became apparent at least by 1900 when E. E. Andross wrote Haskell that the new view conflicted with Mrs. White's statement concerning the "daily" in Early Writings.⁸⁵

Conradi and Prescott presented the new view to Daniells as he traveled through Europe in 1900 on his way to the 1901 GC session, and at the session, Waggoner and Prescott sought to present this view to Mrs. White. At that same session, Kellogg

informed Haskell and perhaps others that the denomination was incorrect in its sanctuary teaching, perhaps indicating that Kellogg held to the new position. Mrs. White's reaction is of intense interest.⁸⁶

According to W. C. White, Mrs. White was instructed not to listen to the views of Waggoner and Prescott "because that which they were counting as of superior value was mingled with views that were misleading." It must be recalled that it was at this session that Mrs. White, through vision, was warned against "overstrained ideas of sanctification," and the sentiments then held by Prescott and Waggoner. Indeed, at the Conference, Mrs. White, in her public addresses, "was led to speak words intended to counteract their influence." As previously noted, she had been given similar warnings for Kellogg. Daniells later wrote Mrs. White regarding this matter:

I have read with care what you say regarding the question of sanctification as presented in the statements by Brethren Prescott and Waggoner at the General Conference of 1901. I have read this to Brother Prescott, and talked with him freely regarding the matter. I can not fully grasp all that there seems to be in this matter from your brief reference to it. Brother Prescott says he can see very clearly the dangerous path he and Brother Waggoner were then traveling in. He says that it had gradually been dawning upon his mind in England before he came to the Conference. I think that what occurred at the Conference set Professor Prescott to thinking; for since that time, it has seemed to me that he has taken up the fundamental truths of the third angel's message, and given them a prominence that they have not received for many years. Our brethren everywhere recognize that Brother Prescott is reviving the grand old truths as they were brought out and presented by the pioneers in this work.

A completely different path was pursued by Kellogg and Waggoner. Mrs. White wrote Kellogg in late 1901:

You are carrying out your plans zealously, and may bring about things that I supposed the testimonies borne at the last conference would forever place in a different light. You mingle with many good and important interests, the wisdom of your own mind and planning; and who shall in the future separate the erroneous from the true?

Despite this background, it is of great significance that Mrs. White did not herself either examine or condemn the theology of the new views that Waggoner and Prescott wanted to present to her. Mrs. White instead suggested that they present their positions to Uriah Smith to get his reaction.⁸⁷

During the pantheist crisis of 1902 to 1907, the dispute over the "daily" was, in general, submerged, or at least carried on in a veiled manner. Beginning

in 1907, the denominational position as enunciated in the books of Uriah Smith and others, concerning the context of Daniel 8 came under severe attack by non-Adventists and former Adventists. M. E. Kellogg and John Kolvoord, formerly denominational editors, demonstrated the problems the denomination would face if it held to the Smith interpretations. Prescott observed:

It is only a question of time when the present teaching concerning the daily will be discarded, and the sooner we do it, the easier it will be to do.

The former editors would shortly be joined by Ballenger, L. A. Phippeny, and a host of others. The GC Committee in the fall of 1907, studied the subject rather fully and at that time, Daniells fully accepted the views held by Prescott and Conradi. That view had already been widely accepted among European believers.⁸⁸

During the 1909 GC session, the two views of the "daily" were given a public airing for the first time. The writing and distribution to the delegates of a tract by O. A. Johnson that supported the old view that contended that the "daily" represented paganism provided the spark for a two-evening discussion of the subject following the session. W. C. White, who chaired the meetings, noted that, in most cases, the discussions were not antagonistic, except for a paper by L. A. Smith, son of Uriah and editor of the Southern Watchman, that he left with the delegates after he departed for Nashville. Smith and F. G. Gilbert, then a minister in the Atlantic Union, shortly thereafter published a tract that greatly inflamed the situation. Daniells asserted that the tract entitled "'The Daily' in the Prophecy of Daniel" contained

grave and unwarranted statements . . . concerning the Bible students who had become convinced of certain weaknesses in our former exposition of Daniel 8: 9-14, and who had been endeavoring to place upon this portion of scripture an interpretation that would be more fully in harmony with the reading of the Bible and with the facts of history. These statements were of so serious a nature as to tend to undermine confidence in the orthodoxy of many who today are standing in positions of responsibility in the cause of God; and it was deemed imperative that some reply be made, in order that those who could not otherwise have an understanding of the real facts, might not be left to make the mistake of withdrawing their confidence from those who were striving to be true to the highest interests of the cause of God, and true to their brethren.⁸⁹

Smith and Gilbert contended that the new view completely and consciously attacked the fundamental teachings of the church, both in terms of doctrine

and in the role of the Spirit of Prophecy, "the infallible interpreter of the Bible."

They alleged:

Never in the history of this cause have we been obliged to confess ourselves in error. Never have we been obliged to retract one thing that we have proclaimed to the world as a part of this message.

They quoted the statement in Early Writings:

Then I saw in relation to the "daily," Dan. 8:12, (sic) that the word "sacrifice" was supplied by man's wisdom, and does not belong to the text; and that the Lord gave the correct view of it to those who gave the judgment hour cry.

and then raised the question

as to whether the Lord means what he says or whether he says one thing when he means another. . . . This new view of "the daily," therefore, squarely contradicts the Spirit of Prophecy. There is no possible escape from this conclusion. . . . That a view contradicts the Spirit of Prophecy should, we think, be sufficient condemnation of it in the minds of all Seventh-day Adventists to cause them to drop it at the start.⁹⁰

The writers also made other significant contentions:

(1) The church of God has always had an infallible interpreter of the Word of God; were it not for this fact where would the people of God have been all through the ages? Why did God have prophets? Why did he give the church the gift of prophecy? Was it not that the church might have the true understanding of the Word of God? There are scores of texts in the Bible of which, if the Holy Ghost had not given the true interpretation of them, through the prophets of the Lord, we should never have known the meaning.

(2) At the end of the 2300 days, says the prophecy, "then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." The new theory of "the daily" makes the prophecy say, "then shall the sanctuary be justified," meaning that then shall the knowledge of Christ's ministration in the sanctuary be made known, as has been done by Seventh-day Adventists. But "justified," in this sense of the word, does not mean "cleansed" by the investigative judgment. . . . Was the sanctuary to be "justified," as here described, or was it to be "cleansed"? The prophecy does not say it was to be both justified and cleansed. If it was to be "justified," as the new theory explains, then there is no prophecy that the sanctuary is to be "cleansed" at all! But we cannot relinquish the fundamental doctrine of the cleansing of the sanctuary; and we must emphatically protest against any teaching which would tend to throw that fundamental doctrine into the background.⁹¹

L. A. Smith had further ammunition to attack the new view by 1910 for E. J.

Waggoner had, probably inadvertently, entered the controversy when he wrote to

C. P. Bollman, vice president of the Southern Publishing Association:

I was intensely interested in that intra-denominational war over the "daily." I knew the view that Prescott held in London and which Conradi teaches in his German book on Daniel and do not see how anybody who has regard to the Scriptures can hold any other view. I mean any one who regards the Scriptures as above

all other books and sufficient in themselves. But the interest becomes the greater when I hear that W. C. White holds with the "new view" since "Early Writings" most clearly and decidedly declares for the "Old view." . . . I do not believe that there is really any difference of opinion as to what Sister White's words on the subject mean. I should hate to have to think that the leaders of the denomination are unable to arrive at the meaning of a simple unequivocal statement.

Smith identified both Jones and Waggoner as believing in the new view "as he positively knew." He observed, however, that their holding that view was insufficient to keep them in the denomination and although they both "left the truth and turned against the Testimonies," they continued to believe in that new view.

Daniells noted:

When A. T. Jones was last in Takoma Park, he had a long talk with one of our brethren endeavoring to convince him that the Testimonies were absolutely at variance with the Bible on the "daily." His manner of reasoning and presenting the matter was so plain and apparently so correct, that it gave this brother quite a shake up, and set him to studying. The result is that he sees that the new view is the only tenable position for us to take as regards both the scriptures and the Testimonies.⁹²

It is of interest to note that since 1900, at least, both Jones and Waggoner held to a view of the "daily" that they believed was completely at variance with the Spirit of Prophecy. That belief was forced because of their understanding of the nature of the inspiration of Mrs. White. From that standpoint alone, it seemed that their break with the church would be forthcoming, unless they obtained another view of the inspiration of Ellen White.

In responding to the Smith-Gilbert pamphlet, the progressives stressed the context of the Early Writings statement as well as the context of Daniel 8 and emphasized that by doing so the new view of the "daily" was consistent. Likewise stressed were Ellen White articles written between 1890 and 1892 relative to the reception of advancing light, as well as her statements about the importance of studying the books of Daniel and Revelation. Spicer noted, "when the Testimonies have urged us to study the books of Daniel and the Revelation, it surely has not been with the idea that we have nothing to learn." The new view was widely presented at Union Conference sessions and other meetings and pamphletized by Prescott and Conradi during 1909 and 1910.⁹³

In addition, Prescott, in the last stages of his editorship of the Review and Herald in 1909, presented, in a veiled way, some vital implications stemming from his support of the new view. He asserted:

When the great prophetic periods recorded in Scriptures had either come to a close or were nearly fulfilled, the providence of God raised up a body of teachers, who after much prayerful study, were able to present to the people instruction adapted to the time. . . . Emphasizing the acceptance of the Word of God as a sufficient rule of faith and practise and the obligation of obedience to its plain instructions, the teachers in this movement have in a special way directed the attention of the people to the following truths: 1. The literal second advent of Christ. . . . 2. The priesthood of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary. . . . 3. Obedience as the fruit of righteousness. . . . 4. The observance of the original Sabbath of the Lord.

In an article used as the Week of Prayer Reading for 1909, Prescott fairly clearly outlined the contextual implications of the new view in his discussion of Daniel 8:

The Papacy, symbolized by the later phase of the little horn, in order to establish itself as an ecclesiastical power, would take away the true worship of God. . . . The Papacy would set aside the true service of God carried on by our High Priest in the heavenly sanctuary, would tread under its feet both God's sanctuary and God's people, but that in the divine plan a limit was set to this work--the end of the 2300 days or years. . . . (After that time) the people of God were again privileged to restore the true service of God in the heavenly temple. . . . The message to be given to the world at the end of the 2300 years should be a message of deliverance from Babylon, and that it should restore what the Papacy had taken away in fulfilment of Daniel's prophecy. A central feature of this message should be the restoration of the knowledge of the heavenly sanctuary and the work of our great High Priest therein. This would give the right form to the gospel truth, and would make known what it is essential that the people should know in order to cooperate intelligently with heavenly agencies in the work of preparation for the coming of the Lord.

Other Prescott articles stressed the "Bible, the Bible only (is) the religion of Protestants." He contended:

There is no exposition of the Bible that can take the place of the Bible itself. There are no helps to the study of the Bible that can profitably be substituted for the Bible itself.⁹⁴

It soon became apparent that the alliance between the pioneers and the progressives that had resulted in the defeat of the pantheists was being shattered over varying interpretations of the position the Spirit of Prophecy should occupy relative to the discussions on the "daily." By mid-1910 it seemed that Irwin, Haskell, Loughborough, and Butler would publicly join Johnson, Smith, Gilbert, J. S. Washburn, G. B. Starr, and a host of other pioneers to publicly oppose those holding the new view, by then, according to Daniells, numbering hundreds of ministers. In writing

to Mrs. White about his intention of publishing on the subject, G. I. Butler stated:

This movement on the "daily" I have no faith in. I note what you said in the testimony to Dr. Kellogg and the new doctrine in Living Temple, and wondered why there was not a single person among your brethren who would "speak out" on this new departure in Pantheism. I confess that I have felt totally opposed to this whole ("daily") movement, and have felt it my duty to write out my views on the subject. If I know anything about being impressed by the Spirit of God to write on any subject, I felt it in writing what I have written on this. . . . I sent the manuscript to Brethren Loughborough and Haskell to read and consider, and, if they agreed it should be published, I requested them to write an endorsement of it. And then we would put it in a small pamphlet and send it out. I thought, coming from us all, that it would carry considerable weight. It is my opinion that our misguided brethren would find it a pretty big chunk to climb over. I cannot see why we old hands ought not to speak out on this great innovation, and stand for the old positions our people have endorsed, led by yourself, and your testimonies. I for one feel that I should act the coward, as one of the old hands in this cause, to keep still while they preach in Washington and in every union conference that which I consider an utter heresy. . . .

Now, my precious mother in Christ, if you say the Lord has shown you that I am wrong in my views, and in my conduct, I will shut my mouth and remain utterly silent. I cannot conceive how I could hold other views, in view of the Scriptures and your Testimonies; but I can keep still and say nothing. And that I will do out of respect to you as a servant of God. What more can I say?

Mrs. White would shortly intervene in the "daily" crisis.⁹⁵

At least as early as 1905 Mrs. White had warned of the retarding effect upon the advancement of the warning message because of the church "having to wait and stand against the devisings of Satan, which have been striving to find a place in our work." She observed "we are years behind" because of the pantheism crisis. That same year Mrs. White admonished, "Now, just now, we are to proclaim present truth with assurance and with power. Do not strike one dolorous note." The church needed to re-establish its fundamental message after a decade of pantheist inroads and it needed to maintain the pioneer-progressive alliance to do so.⁹⁶

Between 1908 and 1910, Mrs. White had issued a number of warnings concerning the possibilities of a division over the question of the "daily." Her counsel had prevented earlier expositions of the issue in the Signs of the Times and the Review and Herald. As late as May of 1910, however, Mrs. White expected that the issue would be resolved by a thorough Biblical study of the issue. She wrote Stephen Haskell:

I have been waiting for the time when there should be an investigation of the doctrines that Brother Daniells and others have been advocating. When is this to be?

If Elder Daniells thinks that some of the interpretations of Scripture that have been held in the past are not correct, our brethren should listen to his reasons, and give candid consideration to his views. All should examine closely their own standing, and by a thorough knowledge of the principles of our faith, be prepared to vindicate the truth. . . .

Is not the present a favorable time for you and others of our ministering brethren in this conference to meet with Elder Daniells for a thorough examination of the points of faith regarding which there are different views?

At the same time, Mrs. White noted: "At present there is not that unity that should exist among our brethren, and the Lord says, 'Come together.' " Only when the proposed conference did not take place and Butler was on the verge of publishing did Mrs. White issue the two testimonies on the "daily."⁹⁷

As W. C. White, who supported the new view, analyzed the debate on the "daily" he, as did others, looked beyond the theological dispute itself, and hoped that the debate might afford opportunity to resolve certain larger questions. He wrote Daniells in March of 1910 concerning two such questions:

I have told some of our brethren that I thought there were two questions connected with this ("daily") matter that were of more importance than the decision which shall be made as to which is most nearly correct the old or the new view regarding the "daily." The first is, How shall we deal with one another when there is difference of opinion? Second, How shall we deal with Mother's writings in our effort to settle doctrinal questions?

White hoped that the proposed meeting between the main disputants might resolve not only the "daily" question, but also work toward resolving these additional questions.⁹⁸

Rather significantly, the testimonies sent by Mrs. White to the central figures in the debate, Butler, Loughborough, Haskell, Smith, Gilbert, Prescott, and Daniells, dealt with these larger questions. Mrs. White requested that her writings "not be used as the leading argument to settle questions over which there is now so much controversy." In noting that she had no specific instruction from the Lord on the "point under discussion," she again urged that her writings not be used in the debate. The testimony, dated July 31, 1910, was significantly entitled "Our Attitude Toward Doctrinal Controversy." The second testimony, dated August 3, 1910, contained the following call for unity:

We must blend together in the bonds of Christlike unity; then our labors will not be in vain. Draw in even cords, and let no contentions be brought in.

Reveal the unifying power of truth, and this will make a powerful impression on human minds. In unity there is strength.

Mrs. White, in the latter testimony, presented a special message to George Butler:

"The Lord has not placed upon you a burden regarding this matter." She also counseled:

"The duty of God's servants at this time is to preach the Word in the cities."⁹⁹

A remarkable consequence developed when Daniells moved vigorously into work for the cities. He first became amazed at the negative caliber of the ministry and as a consequence reestablished the concept of ministerial institutes that had languished since the beginning of the 1890s. The strong emphasis upon the prophecies and the unique message of Adventism for the world brought a new spirit into the ministry. Daniells observed, as he contemplated the earliest institutes:

One topic of study in our institutes will be the supreme importance of our ministers giving themselves up to the preaching of the message God has given us. . . . I am glad to tell you that since so much has been said about city work, our ministers are turning their minds to the question of preaching. I have new hope and courage along this line. The pendulum is swinging, and I feel sure that we shall soon see the simple, yet all-important work of preaching restored to its proper place in our work.¹⁰⁰

While the progressives were pleased with Mrs. White's observation that she, in Early Writings, had not used the term "daily" in a technical, theological sense, but rather in a broader setting, they were disappointed in the call for "silence" on the subject and the relegation of it to a minor status. The progressives considered a proper understanding of the "daily" to have great significance, not only relating to the context of Daniel 8, but to an understanding of the mediatorial role of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary. Daniells stressed its importance to W. C. White:

The burden of Brother Prescott and myself also in this is not merely to have a controversy over Paganism, and when it was taken away. That matter pales before the importance of the glorious truth the Bible teaches regarding the ministry of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary. The papacy has done its best to hide from a perishing world the efficacious work of Christ in heaven. . . . Now, when this was revealed to Daniel, the question was raised, how long this substitute that could not save, should hide from the world that which can save. The answer that was given was that it should be until the expiration of the 2300 years. Then the sanctuary was to be cleansed. Some translations add the idea of vindication or restoration. Elder Olsen tells me that is the idea presented in the Norwegian. The proclamation of the third angel's message is the means by which the Lord is to bring back to the knowledge of the world the sanctuary and its saving ministry. I saw again, that this glorious truth is so important that the question of when paganism was taken away shrivels up into a mere trifle. . . . I have now taken the time to make the effort to go over the best I can in my busy life the whole range of study, and I can not

tell you the blessing that has come to me in this investigation. I believe that this truth regarding the ministry of Christ should have gone right along with the message of righteousness by faith that was given to us in 1888.

Although the call for "silence" on the "daily" was designed to reestablish unity, the Bible versions controversy, the Columbia Union-General Conference friction, the reorganization battles over the 1931 Omaha Fall Council decisions, and indeed, disputes that continued at least into the 1950s, all directly related to a basic difference of interpretation over the inspiration of the Spirit of Prophecy and might be traced to the basic alignments that formed over the pioneer-progressive dispute over the "daily." In view of the contention over the implications of the new view of Daniel 8:13, an open look at the implications to Daniel 8:14 seemed remote indeed.¹⁰¹

The tragedy of the pioneer-progressive confrontation is that both held strongly to the fundamentals of the church. It should be noted that, while Irwin did begin a confrontation with the pantheists, it was Daniells, in harmony with Mrs. White's counsels, who exposed their teachings. It was tragic that the pioneers and progressives could not harmonize their understanding of the function of the Spirit of Prophecy and become a united front. The consequence was that the insights of the progressives never advanced or could advance beyond the "daily," except in the most indirect fashion.

Practically everyone who became exposed to the new view of the "daily" believed that the view enabled a far more harmonious presentation of Daniel 8 than had been possible previously. Spicer affirmed:

When I used to give Bible readings in the earlier days in London, and took the people through the eighth of Daniel, I always skipped hastily over those texts where we made the sanctuary one minute in heaven and the next on earth, and the host one time the angels and the next the pagans, and I skipped over the statement that the taking away of the "daily" meant the taking away of paganism by suggesting that the rendering in the original was a bit obscure so that the translation was difficult. That is what we used to be taught in the Bible school in Battle Creek in the old days. And all that was making no particular use of that particular portion of Scripture. It was simply passing over it to get down to the cleansing of the sanctuary. . . .

I have noted in recent years, since the new view came in, particularly in Europe, that this new interpretation, just as one would naturally get it

from reading the Revised Version and some other versions, deals a sledge hammer blow at the Papacy. There is no other portion of Scripture that brings to Catholics themselves such a picture of the substitution of the mass and the earthly sacrifice for the heavenly. Our workers among the Catholics who are using this in this way find splended and strong use for this little portion of Scripture for which in years past we have had practically no use.

Conradi, Daniells, Prescott, and a host of others testified to the strengthened denominational position that came with the harmonization of the contextual problems that the new view allowed. Daniells testified that, after his presentation of the new view at a teachers' convention:

These Bible teachers told me that they had never been able to expound the eighth chapter of Daniel to their satisfaction until they got hold of this view.¹⁰²

On numerous occasions between 1903 and 1914, Prescott presented publicly, but in a veiled manner, his understanding of the contextual background of Daniel 8 and the implications relative to the significance of 1844. Stressing the "continual" mediation of Christ, Prescott asserted in 1903:

That principle of continuance was brought to the flesh in the person of Jesus Christ, himself taking the flesh, and becoming in his own person the high priest, and ministering in himself his own presence, his own personality in the Holy Spirit. Leave out that connection with heaven, and you leave out salvation. Put your leader on the earth, put your temple on the earth, put your priest on the earth, and you have taken away the one thing in the sanctuary ministry which means salvation. It was prophesied by the prophet Daniel that this should be taken away; it has been taken away. It is the purpose of this message to restore in the sanctuary and its services, to restore in the church, and to the church, that which has been taken away. And when that is restored,-- and it can be restored only through the restoration of the true sanctuary idea and the true conception of God as salvation through that ministry,-- when that is restored, the work is done.¹⁰³

In 1930, W. W. Fletcher made an observation relative to the denominational sanctuary teaching. He noted that in Bible Readings, pp. 224-29, was the new view of the "daily" and he observed:

The sanctuary and the people of God are trodden under foot by the papacy. The continual service or mediation of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary is taken away from Him by a false system of the Papacy.

Now if these things constitute the need for a work of justification or cleansing (and I do not deny that they do), what must be the nature of the work of justification or cleansing? Manifestly it must be the setting right or correction of the wrong that has been wrought through the false system, by a vindication of the true service or mediation of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary, and the relief or deliverance of those who with the sanctuary have been trodden under foot.

The other side of the teaching affirms that the sins of believing men and women are "transferred, in fact, to the heavenly sanctuary," and that the actual cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary is to be accomplished by the removal, or blotting out of the sins that are there recorded.

Do these two sets of teaching agree? I would earnestly urge upon the consideration of the brethren that they do not at all agree together.

Fletcher's observation seemed to coincide with that of L. A. Smith and F. C.

Gilbert, made some 21 years earlier. Likewise agreeing was G. B. Starr in 1930. That pioneer's solution to the problem posed by Fletcher follows:

I wish to appeal to all S.D.A. ministers to return to the original and "correct view of the Daily," as interpreted in 1844 and endorsed by the Spirit of God in Early Writings, pages 74, 75. That all the trumpets may give the same certain sound of the announcement of the "Hour of His judgment come," and that at the end of the 2300 days, in 1844 and onward, the sanctuary was to be, and is being cleansed. Here I have always stood and continue to stand.¹⁰⁴

The progressives were striving for a different solution, but one that likewise involved an understanding of the nature of the inspiration of the Spirit of Prophecy.

Forced by the pantheists from without and by the pioneers from within the church, the progressives, including W. C. White, while Ellen White was still alive, were making some evaluations of just what role the Lord desired that the gift of prophecy should occupy within the church. It seemed, however, that no useful dialogue in this area was possible. Once the pantheists left the church and began their direct attacks upon the Spirit of Prophecy, most of the pioneers called for a Spirit of Prophecy that was an "infallible interpreter of Bible principles." This left the progressives rather isolated in their attempts to come to some conclusions. Daniells affirmed to W. C. White, "We must not allow these men to force us to take a position regarding your mother's writings that will put her in an indefensible position," and the latter observed:

If we fail to stand firmly for correct principles (relative to the Spirit of Prophecy), we may soon be plunged into a condition of things wherein many earnest and radical minds will feel free to select a passage here and a passage there from the Testimonies, and without proper regard to the context and to the teaching of the Bible and other passages in the Testimonies, proceed to teach a mixture of truth and error that is unprofitable to the church.

Still, however, no fundamental agreements seemed to be possible.¹⁰⁵

Both Prescott and Spicer joined Daniells in feeling the frustrations resulting

from the widespread misuse of the Spirit of Prophecy. Spicer noted in 1914:

A larger question than the question of the mere detail of a correction or of an erroneous statement (in the Spirit of Prophecy books) is the question as to how we shall treat these matters that have been passed through the hands of the various editors. We have had quite a battle, some of us, for several years, trying to make the brethren see that it was not right to claim any extraordinary authority for matters of this kind. While this is conceded freely enough privately, the difficulty has been, it seems to me, that courage has been lacking to take a straight and consistent position. Years ago, when I was out at St. Helena, I urged W. C. W. to have a statement in the revised "Great Controversy" that would relieve the whole situation. I hoped it would be there, but it has not been made. People are left to run across places where the revised edition corrects statements in the old edition, and then some poor soul has a worrying time over it, when it is altogether unnecessary. . . . There is one thing sure, Brother Conradi, it is firmly settled that phrases and historical statements in these books have to be corrected just the same as in other books. Of course we are supposed to take full counsel with the author in making corrections.

Prescott wrote W. C. White:

The way your mother's writings have been handled and the false impression concerning them which is still fostered among the people have brought great perplexity and trial to me. It seems to me that what amounts to deception, though probably not intentional, has been practised in making some of her books, and that no serious effort has been made to disabuse the minds of the people of what was known to be their wrong view concerning her writings. But it is no use to go into these matters. I have talked with you for years about them, but it brings no change. I think however that we are drifting toward a crisis which will come sooner or later and perhaps sooner. A very strong feeling of reaction has already set in.¹⁰⁶

Rather interestingly, Spicer made the following observation after the issuing of Mrs. White's testimonies concerning the "daily":

I am very glad she did not indorse the new opinion, for that is not what is needed. We do not want any infallible declaration as to our own views about it, for we shall study more and learn more.

He also observed:

All through its history that gift (Spirit of Prophecy) has insisted that it should not be advanced in place of the Word, and that its design was not to give new doctrines not found in the Word of God. The Bible is complete, and thoroughly furnishes the man of God unto all good works. But the Scriptures which do this teach us very plainly that as truly as the church should have other spiritual gifts in its midst, so truly it should have in its midst the spirit of prophecy. . . . It is sure that the remnant church must have this gift, and one mark of the latter-day church would be missing if this gift had not appeared in connection with this Advent Movement.¹⁰⁷

In 1909, E. J. Waggoner explained to the president of the Western New York Conference, that since he (Waggoner) found everything in the Bible that was to be

found in the Spirit of Prophecy, that the Ellen White writings were unnecessary since they afforded a lazy way to study the Bible. H. W. Carr stunned Waggoner with his response:

When I asked him to find in the Bible where the matter contained in Living Temple was declared to be Pantheism, it was evident that he had not looked for that statement.¹⁰⁸

As Spicer noted, "It is sure that the remnant church must have this gift."

CONCLUSION

In 1902, despite his pantheistic path, E. J. Waggoner penned a relevant truth:

No man drops in one day from perfect faith to gross error; much less do multitudes of people apostatise all at the same time. Error is insidious in its working, and the people who fall away are rarely conscious that any change is taking place in them.

Perhaps that is the reason for the counsel given by Mrs. White during an interview with C. C. Crisler in 1913:

Men of varied minds, varied temperaments, varied experience, are to be associated in Christian work; and as they take counsel with one another, and exchange views and convictions, and humble themselves before God, and pray together for heavenly wisdom, light will be given them, and they will be enabled to go forward unitedly, pulling in even lines, and allowing God to rule. This is not after the natural heart of man; it is God's way of managing His work; man is prone to set up his individual judgment as a criterion for others to follow.

It is apparent that each of the groups within the church needed the advice and counsel of the other. Daniells observed: "But for the good counsel of splendid friends, and the protection of a merciful God, I certainly should have been snared by the fowler." Mrs. White frequently sought to join "men of strong spiritual experience" with such men as Paulson, Sadler, Morse, Riley and other physicians "who might be saved as Christian workers if they could be saved from the confusing, perplexing influences which center at Battle Creek." She appealed to those working with Kellogg to help him see the error of his ways. The strongest of the pioneers were not immune to the possibility of plunging into pantheism. In 1911 Andross seemed to come dangerously close when he taught: "We are now commanded to go forth and heal the sick even as we are to preach the forgiveness of sin or any other part

of the gospel message." Spicer observed:

We would all apostatize if it were not for the hope of carrying the message to the ends of the earth and seeing the Lord come. That is the only thing that keeps us alive as a people. The moment we forget that we are open to every fanatical turn that comes along, and it would not be worth while professing anything.

Once the pantheists lost sight of the denominational fundamentals, their fanaticism seemed an obvious outcome.¹¹⁰

Besides the diverse temperaments within the church that could have acted as a preventative to the pantheistic developments, the church possessed and still possesses the counsels from the Spirit of Prophecy. Mrs. White warned constantly against the false path of pantheism. She, as did Spicer, suggested a guiding factor when, in 1904, she observed: "The pleasing sentiments of pantheism will lead many souls into forbidden paths," and pointed to the alternative "The commandments of God and the faith of Jesus."¹¹¹

While both pioneer and progressive administrations endeavored to stem the pantheist advance, it was the progressives that had to face the fullest impact from that false path. Because of their endeavors to redress a decade of imbalance between the law and the gospel, the progressives received intense criticism from the pantheists. The issue was crucial to the progressives. Spicer observed:

I have never been so convinced as lately that while there is a message in the world, preparing the way for Christ's second coming, equally there is another message in the world preparing the way for Satan's manifestation as the great healer, as he comes in his final deception.

Daniells noted:

There has been a teaching since the Minneapolis meeting that has not resulted in very much fruit. I believe a mistake has been made. I believe the pendulum has swung too far to the opposite extreme. We have not been growing and developing in any way since the Minneapolis meeting as we should have done. It looks to me as though we must revive the advent message. We must unite the preaching of the prophecies, the law, the Sabbath, the plain truths of the gospel with the preaching of salvation from sin by faith in the Lord Jesus. This is the stand that Professor Prescott and Brother Spicer and I have taken, and now we are practically charged with apostasy, with having gone back to the legalism of the denomination prior to the Minneapolis movement.¹¹²

When the progressives sought to provide a balanced definition of what it considered to be the proper role for the Spirit of Prophecy to occupy within the

church, the progressives received intense reaction from the pioneers. Mrs. White. 21 months prior to her death, expressed another opinion in her interview with Crisler. Although he was not reporting on the question of the role of the Spirit of Prophecy, Crisler asserted:

It is evident, from all I can gather in these conversations, that Sister White has confidence in her brethren who are now in Washington, and that she believes they will have clear discernment as they, as she expresses it, "weigh every consideration, and reason from cause to effect, and weigh the influences that have made trouble in the past, and see whether they can plan for the prosperity of the work."

Daniells' concept of a continuing role for the Spirit of Prophecy within the church is exhibited in his last conscious thoughts. The following report concerned the manuscript for Daniells' last book:

He (Daniells) stated that he wished to express therein the central thought of the book--the idea of the continuing gift with the church in all ages. When "The Abiding Gift of Prophecy" was suggested he was enthusiastic over it. He said it expressed exactly what he wanted to convey. Again and again during his last weeks he expressed satisfaction over the title. . . . On his last day of consciousness, he repeated his sense of satisfaction over the manuscript and its title.¹¹³

This writer believes that the evidence supports the conclusion that Mrs. White, in her reaction to the A. F. Ballenger challenge to the denominational sanctuary position, addressed herself to a far larger question pertaining to Ballenger's experience and philosophy than the immediate theological meaning of the term "within the veil," or the varied theology outlined by Ballenger in the defense of his sanctuary teaching. Although the writer has by no means examined all the Ellen White writings from 1897 to 1911, he found no example in her writings where she undertook to settle a specific theological issue. On the contrary, the examples of the holy flesh movement, the Living Temple apostasy, the Ballenger question, and the issue over the "daily" serve as case studies where Mrs. White dealt either with the question of false philosophies that were destructive to the fundamental mission of the church, or an issue that would bring and did bring disunity at a time when the need for denominational unity was an overriding consideration.

Both the background and aftermath to the Ballenger 1905 experience affords additional evidence that something more fundamental was at issue than a specific

theological point relating to his sanctuary teachings. Further evidence in support of this contention is found in the wide variety of theological positions held by leaders in good standing concerning the sanctuary.

The dimensions of the crisis faced by the church between 1897 and 1911 indicate that the church either would have lost its special message or would have hopelessly fractured without the guidance of the Lord through the Spirit of Prophecy. It seems apparent that the lessons of the experiences between 1897 and 1911 and the counsel of the Spirit of Prophecy during this period continue to have vital relevance.

It was a loss to the church when the pantheists did not accept the counsel from the Spirit of Prophecy, left the church and worked against its teachings. It was likewise a loss to the church when the pioneers attacked the progressives and inaugurated a divisiveness that retarded the possibilities of examining a relevant theological concept. It likewise seems unfortunate that the denomination apparently failed to profit from the testimony Ellen White gave Ballenger. Placed in its contextual setting the Ballenger "path" to the sanctuary is apparent. Its roots could have been scripturally examined and its errors and truths separated by appealing to Biblical evidence. This seems to have been Ellen White's desire throughout the period we have examined. W. C. White asserted: "Mother regards the Bible as the standard of authority in all things, including the position and work of the Spirit of Prophecy."¹¹⁴

Mrs. White's progressive inclinations are exhibited in this statement made in 1899:

Some matters have been opened before me which will be fulfilled ere long. We are to know more than we do at the present time. We are to comprehend the deep things of God. There are themes to be dwelt upon which are worthy of more than a passing notice. Angels have desired to look into the truths which are revealed to the people who are searching God's Word and with contrite hearts praying for wisdom, for greater lengths and breadths and heights of that knowledge which God alone can give. . . .

Those who will devote their powers to the study of God's Word, and especially the prophecies referring to these last days, will be rewarded by the discovery of important truths.¹¹⁵

A.F. Ballenger, before the ministers attending the
General Conference, at Washington, D.C., May 21, 1905, 5:30 A.M.

I want to read to you now some of the misfits that I find in my attempt to place the first apartment work of the earthly sanctuary this side of the cross:--

1. The earthly sanctuary, which was a shadow of the heavenly, located the ark, or throne of God, in the holy of holies, or second apartment, while the priest was ministering in the first apartment. The denominational view of the heavenly sanctuary places the ark or throne of God in the first apartment while the priest ministers in that apartment, in violation of the type.

2. The shadow placed a veil between the priest and the ark or throne of God while the priest ministered in the first apartment. The denominational view has the priest ministering in the heavenly sanctuary in the first apartment, with no veil separating him from the ark or throne of God, but with a veil behind both priest and throne, in violation of the type.

3. The type represents the priest as performing a long ministry in the first apartment of the sanctuary before the blood is shed that pays the penalty of sin. The denominational view teaches that the blood was shed which pays the penalty of sin long before the ministry began in the heavenly sanctuary, thus contradicting the type.

-2-

4. The type taught that the priest ministered for a long period in the first apartment, during which time there was accumulated upon him the sins of the people before the blood was shed which met the penalty of those sins which the priest was carrying. The denominational view locates the death of Christ before any ministry has been performed in the heavenly sanctuary whereby the sins of the world are transferred to him.

(We teach that no sins are pardoned except those that go into the sanctuary by the priestly work, and yet we have the sanctuary closed to the patriarchs for four thousand years, and that Christ began the work of carrying sins into the heavenly sanctuary at his ascension. This leaves four thousand years without any priest by which the sin was carried into the sanctuary.)

5. The shadow placed the death of the Lord's goat, whose blood met the penalty of the law in type, on the great day of atonement. The denominational view places the death of Christ, whose blood meets the penalty of the law, more than eighteen hundred years before the great day of atonement is supposed to begin.

6. The shadow represents the high priest going from his ministry in the court where he obtained the blood, directly into the holy of holies on the day of atonement. (He did not stop in that first apartment; he obtained his blood, and then carried it straight through into the holy of holies.) The denominational view teaches that Christ went from his ministry in the first apartment, and not from the court, into the holy of holies, in 1844.

7. The type represents the priest as unloading forever, through the blood of the Lord's goat, the sins which had been accumulating upon him during the year by his ministry before the veil. (All the sins that had gone into the sanctuary during that one year, and were charged to

-3-

the priest, that penalty was met on the day of atonement in the holy of holies.) The denominational view represents Christ as loading himself up again in the first apartment with the same sins which he had before borne at the cross and unloaded in his death.

8. The shadow sends the high priest directly through the first apartment into the holy of holies as soon as he has in his hands the blood of the Lord's goat, or the blood which pays the penalty of sin.

(Authorities say that the cup or vessel which the priest held that caught the blood in, had a sharp point, so that he could not set it down; he must sprinkle it immediately, and not delay about the matter.)

The denominational view stops our great High Priest in the first apartment when he has in his hands his own blood which pays the penalty of sin.

(The position taken, as I understand it, is that the blood was shed at Calvary, but not sprinkled, in behalf of sins, I mean, for eighteen hundred years later.)

(M.C.Wilcox: Then the blood of Abel's lamb was not typified in the offering of Christ?)

A.F.Ballenger: Yes, yes; it was a type of the death of Christ; but it was the sinner's channel through which to exercise his faith in that blood. The offering which the sinner made represented the sinner's accepting of the blood of Christ. The blood sprinkled within the veil, represented God's giving his Son to die for that sinner, was only an expression of faith on the part of the sinner, an expression of his acceptance of that that was done; but the blood within the veil was God's representing himself as giving his Son to die for the sinner.)

-4-

9. The shadow represents the high priest as going immediately with the blood, the warm blood, of the Lord's goat, into the holy of holies, and sprinkling that blood upon the mercy seat before the veil. The denominational view teaches that our great High Priest did not sprinkle his blood on the mercy seat before the veil for more than eighteen hundred years after it was shed.

The position I hold escapes every one of those nine contradictions between the type and the antitype. I say, To me it is impossible. Brethren, if you can solve it, solve it; but it is impossible for me to take that first apartment work of the earthly sanctuary and apply it to a piece of the plan of salvation without changing almost every cardinal point in that sanctuary, without adding new furniture or moving the furniture around differently, and in every way almost violating the principles of the type. But when you allow the first apartment work to represent the plan of salvation from creation to the cross, everything is a perfect fit, and all seems beautiful and harmonious and complete.

Statement by A.F.Ballenger, May 22, 1905.

W.W.Prescott: I want to understand the view, and so I wanted to see if I understood you. Then when Christ paid the penalty on the cross, the whole human family was free from death? I wanted to get your view of it. I wanted to understand clearly.

A.F.Ballenger: When Christ died on Calvary, by that act he had reached down and put his arms around the fallen world, and lifted it right back up to the place where it was before it fell off the platform of the garden of Eden, and left man again free to choose, where Adam was free to choose, between eternal loss and eternal gain. So that we read in Romans 5, "Therefore, as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous".

W.A.Colcord: Could we have a direct answer to a direct question? I think Brother Prescott's question is very pertinent. Do you understand that he made a final disposition of sin?

A.F.Ballenger: The Saviour did not always answer questions Yes and No when they were asked him.

W.W.Prescott: Only I simply wanted to understand your view. If I understand your view correctly, when Christ died, then punishment of any sin after that would be a double punishment; and I judged from that that your idea would be that no man after that could suffer for the sins, inasmuch as Christ had paid the penalty. I did not want to misinterpret. If that is right, just tell me if I have got your view.

A.F.Ballenger: The trouble is I have only got a few minutes more. And if I throw open things here that would require another hour to explain, it would be---and yet I am not afraid.

W.W.Prescott: Let it drop. I do not mean to quibble. I wanted to be sure I understood your view.

A.F.Ballenger: I will say it plainly. I do not believe that any man will ever groan under the same guilt under which Christ groaned on Calvary; but that men will groan because they reject so great salvation. "Of how much sorer punishment think ye he shall be thought worthy who hath trodden under foot the Son of God?" I know that now I will be charged with teaching Universalism; but this is not universalism.

FOOTNOTES

¹Review and Herald (hereafter cited as RH), Sept. 13, 1898, p. 596. Please note that, except in one instance, footnotes are placed at the end of the full paragraph.

²Ellen White, "A Warning Against False Theories," May 24, 1905, in White Estate, "The Integrity of the Sanctuary Truth: A Group of Ellen G. White Statements Made in 1905, 1906, and 1907 Regarding Elder A. F. Ballenger's Teachings," p. 12, Manuscript Release #760 (hereafter cited as MR 760).

³Although Mrs. Henry died in 1900, the theology in her book, The Abiding Spirit, and her RH articles, clearly evidences that she was following a path similar to the others.

⁴G. A. Irwin to Ellen White, Oct. 3, 1898, Record Group 11, Outgoing Letterbook 19, p. 549, General Conference Archives. Please note that all citations to unpublished materials hereafter are housed at the GC Archives except those cited WE, which are housed at the White Estate. Note: No attempt was made to compile a complete listing of all workers who left the church that were active in the campmeeting movement of the late 1890s. This listing includes only those active in the U.S. and England who clearly fell within the pantheistic category.

⁵RH, Nov. 22, 1898, p. 752. See also E. J. Dryer, "God's Dwelling-Place"; Uriah Smith, "Body and Spirit Are His"; C. H. Keslake, "The Place of Christ's Ministry," and "The Heavenly Pattern"; n.a. (selected) "The God-Man," and "The Living Temple"; RH, July 27, 1897, p. 467; Aug. 9, 1898, pp. 509-10; Sept. 20, 1898, p. 598; July 17, 1900, p. 453; July 31, 1900, p. 485.

⁶A. F. Ballenger RH articles, June 29, 1897, p. 411; Aug. 17, 1897, p. 523; Sept. 28, 1897, p. 624; Oct. 5, 1897, p. 629; Ballenger, General Conference Daily Bulletin, 1899, p. 96.

⁷Ballenger RH articles, July 26, 1898, p. 479; May 16, 1899, p. 316; 1899 GCDB, p. 69; Ballenger Signs of the Times articles, Nov. 15, 1899, p. 738; June 20, 1900, p. 390; June 27, 1900, p. 402.

⁸RH, May 3, 1898, p. 288; Oct. 4, 1898, p. 637; Nov. 15, 1898, p. 740; July 12, 1898, p. 448; June 21, 1898, p. 404; Oct. 31, 1899, p. 708.

⁹Signs of the Times, June 13, 1900, p. 371; July 25, 1900, p. 468; RH, Aug. 1, 1899, p. 494.

¹⁰Ballenger, Power for Witnessing, Pacific Press: Oakland, 1900, pp. 145-49, 176-79.

¹¹Irwin to Ellen White, Nov. 10, 1898, Jan. 20, 1899, July 2, 1900, RG 11, bk. 19, pp. 598, 835, bk. 20, pp. 892-96.

¹²RH, Jan. 30, 1900, p. 74; Irwin to Ellen White, Feb. 15, 1900, RG 11, bk. 20, pp. 494-95.

¹³S. N. Haskell to Ellen White, Nov. 10, 1899, RG 11, bk. 20, pp. 247-48, RH, Sept. 4, 1900, p. 570, Nov. 28, 1899, p. 774, Oct. 9, 1900, p. 650; Underwood, RH, Apr. 26, 1898, p. 262, May 3, 1898, pp. 278-79, May 17, 1898, pp. 310-11, May 24, 1898, pp. 326-27; Loughborough, RH, Oct. 18, Nov. 1, Nov. 22, Dec. 13, 1898, pp. 662-63, 695, 747-48, 794; Jones, RH, June 20, 1899, p. 392.

- ¹⁴W. A. Spicer to Irwin, Jan. 22, 1904, RG AU 11, 1903-04--S; A. G. Daniells to G. B. Starr, Jan. 4, 1904, RG 11, bk. 32, p. 921.
- ¹⁵Ellen White to J. H. Littlejohn, Aug. 3, 1894, RG 11, Special Testimonies, Testimonies on Miscellaneous Subjects, p. 140; Ellen White to J. E. White, Oct. 22, 1895, Ibid, p. 82; Ellen White, May 19, 1898, RG 11, Special Testimonies, 1898.
- ¹⁶Ellen White, RG, May 22, 1900, p. 322.
- ¹⁷RH, June 21, Oct. 18, Nov. 8, 1898, pp. 400-01, 670-71, 720, Apr. 10, 1900, p. 237; R. S. Donnell to L. A. Hoopes, June 26, 1899, and to A. F. Ballenger, June 27, 1899, RG 21, 1899--D.
- ¹⁸A. J. Breed to Irwin, July 22, 1900, RG 9, Irwin, G. A.
- ¹⁹Haskell to Ellen White, Oct. 3, 1899, Haskell, S. N., 1899, WE.
- ²⁰Ellen White to Haskell and Irwin, Dec. 15, 1899, H-207, RG 11, Special Testimonies, L. A. Hoopes Volume, pp. 458, 459, 462-63, 464, 466.
- ²¹Ellen White to Haskell, Oct. 10, 1900, 2SM, p. 38; Ellen White to Haskell, July 4, 1900, H-105, RG 11, Special Testimonies, bk. 11 (1898-1900).
- ²²R. S. Donnell, "What I Taught in Indiana," Controversial Literature, Vol. 1, No. 10, pp. 24-5, WE.
- ²³Ellen White, 1901 GC Bulletin, p. 419.
- ²⁴Ibid, p. 421.
- ²⁵Missionary Worker, Oct. 14, 1903, pp. 157-58.
- ²⁶Present Truth, April 16, 1903, pp. 243-44 and Aug. 14, 1902, p. 516. See also Present Truth, Jan. 23, June 12 and 19, Nov. 6, 1902, pp. 51, 372, 388, 709.
- ²⁷Present Truth, May 6, 1902, p. 148, May 22, 1902, p. 323.
- ²⁸Present Truth, June 12, 1902, p. 380, Feb. 5, 1903, p. 85.
- ²⁹Ballenger to H. E. Osborne, Jan. 23, 1902, RG 21, 1902--B; 1902 European Conference Bulletin, p. 27.
- ³⁰E. E. Andross to S. N. Haskell, Nov. 12, 1900, RG 9, Haskell, S. N. See also Andross to Haskell, Feb. 18, 1900, RG 11, Special Testimonies, Testimonies on Miscellaneous Subjects, p. 125.
- ³¹Irwin to Daniells, July 19, 1903, RG 9, Daniells, A. D., folder 1.
- ³²Irwin to Daniells, RG 11, 1903--I; W. C. Sisley to Daniells, June 23, 1903, RG 11, 1903--S.
- ³³Waggoner to Daniells, July 24, 1903, RG 11, 1903--W, fld. 1.
- ³⁴L. R. Conradi to Daniells, Aug. 19, 1903, RG 21, 1903--C.
- ³⁵O. A. Olsen to Daniells, Dec. 29, 31, 1903 and Jan. 29, 1904, RG 11, 1903 and 1904--O; Homer Salisbury to Daniells, Dec. 29, 1903, RG 11, 1903--S.

- ³⁶E. J. Waggoner to Daniells, Feb. 17, 1903, RG 11, 1903--W, fld. 2.
- ³⁷Ballenger, "What About the Testimonies," n.d., p. 1; Ballenger to Daniells, Mar. 3, 1904, RG 11, 1904--B; Ballenger, "Before Armageddon, 1918, pp. 3-4. See also White Estate, "Babylon--Identification of in "Great Controversy," RG 17, M. L. Andreasen, White Publications folder; D. E. Robinson, "Is It a Contradiction?" April 30, 1931, RG 58, L. E. Froom Reference Files, Plagerism folder.
- ³⁸Present Truth, June 5, 1902, p. 355.
- ³⁹J. H. Kellogg to Ellen White, n.d., c. 1902-03, W. C. White Outgoing Letter-book 31, p. 227, WE.
- ⁴⁰Kellogg to Prescott, Oct. 25, 1903, RG 11, bk. 32, p. 132.
- ⁴¹I. H. Evans to Irwin, Nov. 12, 1903, RG AU 11, 1903-04--E; Prescott to Haskell, Feb. 10, 1905, Prescott, W. W., 1905, WE; Daniells to E. H. Gates, Mar. 20, 1904, RG 11, bk. 33, p. 491.
- ⁴²Daniells to C. McReynolds, Oct. 5, 1903, RG 11, bk. 31, p. 862; Daniells to Ellen White, Jan. 8, 1904, RG 11, bk. 33, p. 20; Daniells to W. J. Stone, Feb. 12, 1904, RG 11, bk. 33, p. 406; Daniells to T. E. Bowen, Oct. 6, 1904, RG 11, bk. 35, p. 24; Daniells to J. O. Johnston, Aug. 14, 1903, RG 11, bk. 31, p. 226.
- ⁴³Daniells to Haskell, June 22, 1906, RG 11, bk. 39, p. 92; Daniells to Evans, July 6, 1904, RG 11, bk. 34, p. 325; Daniells to W. C. White, Oct. 28, 1904, RG 11, bk. 35, p. 217.
- ⁴⁴R. A. Underwood to Daniells, Jan. 2 and Sept. 18, 1903, RG 11, 1903--U; H. W. Cottrell, Statement, Mar. 28, 1903, at GC session, RG 1, Stenographic Report of 1903 GC Session, Mar. 28 Meeting; G. B. Thompson to Daniells, Aug. 11, 1903, RG 11, 1903--T.
- ⁴⁵Ellen White, "The Berrien Springs Meeting," July 25, 1904, RG 11, Special Testimonies, Testimonies During 1904, p. 112. For brief summaries for many of the Testimonies concerning the crisis, see W. W. Prescott to E. L. MacLafferty, April 9, 1905, RG 11, 1905--P.
- ⁴⁶W. C. White to Daniells, Oct. 9, 1903, RG 11, 1903--W, fld. 1.
- ⁴⁷Daniells to C. McReynolds, Oct. 26, 1903, RG 11, bk. 31, p. 956; Ellen White, "Decided Action to Be Taken Now," Oct., 1903, F. M. Wilcox Personal Collection, Testimonies of Special Interest.
- ⁴⁸Prescott to E. L. MacLafferty, Apr. 9, 1905, RG 11, 1905--P; Ellen White, "A Peculiar People," July 6, 1902, RG 11, Special Testimonies, Testimonies Relating to Medical Missionary Work During the Year 1902, p. 216; Ellen White to "Brethren Magan and Sutherland," Oct. 9, 1903, RG 11, Special Testimonies, Testimonies on Various Subjects During 1903, p. 318; Ellen White, "Decided Action to Be Taken Now," Ibid; Ellen White, "An Open Letter," May, 1903, F. M. Wilcox PC, Miscellaneous Materials; Ellen White, "Teach the Word," RH, Oct. 22, 1903, p. 8.
- ⁴⁹Daniells to Irwin, Aug. 11, 1903, RG 11, bk. 34, p. 735; Daniells to Edith Graham, Aug. 11, 1903, Ibid, p. 730; Spicer to Irwin, April 6, 1904, RG AU 11, 1903-04--D; Daniells to Conradi, Nov. 3, 1903, RG 11, bk. 32, p. 273.
- ⁵⁰Daniells to M. C. Wilcox, Oct. 26, 1903, RG 11, bk. 31, p. 949; Prescott to B. F. Anderson, Feb. 18, 1904, RG 11, bk. 33, p. 433.

⁵¹Waggoner to Daniells and Prescott, Sept. 5, 1904, RG 11, 1904--W; Olsen to Ellen White, Aug. 15, 1905, Olsen, O. A., 1904-05, WE.

⁵²Daniells to Ellen White, Sept. 10, 1903, Daniells, A. G., July-Dec., 1903, WE.

⁵³Ellen White to Kellogg, Nov. 11, 1902, K-174-02, RG 11, Special Testimonies, Book 23, Testimonies Received During 1906, p. 266; Ellen White to Daniells, Dec. 14, 1903, D-269-03, WE.

⁵⁴See Ellen White, "Teach the Word," RH, Oct. 22, 1903, p. 8; Summary of Ellen White talk at 1903 GC session, RG 1, Stenographic Report of 1903 Session, Mar. 30, meeting, pp. 1-2; Ellen White, "A Warning Against Present Dangers," Nov. 27, 1903, and "Dear Brethren and Sisters in the South," Jan. 22, 1904, RG 11, Special Testimonies, Testimonies Received During 1903 and 1904 Volumes.

⁵⁵W. C. White to J. E. White, Jan. 12, 1905, W. C. White Outgoing Letterbook 26, p. 395; Ellen White to Dr. Kress, Feb. 17, 1905, Messenger to the Remnant, p. 93, Evangelism, pp. 594-95.

⁵⁶Ballenger was given a hearing before the British Union Conference in early February, 1905. Since the time for the hearing was limited because Ballenger had appointments to return to in Ireland, where he was superintendent of the Irish Mission, additional meetings were held in Ireland. It was there decided to recommend that Ballenger be given a hearing at the forthcoming GC session. Two additional British workers, William Hutchinson and C. F. Marker, also attended the session because of their acceptance of the Ballenger sanctuary teaching. In addition, William Robinson, formerly of England, but in 1905 serving as a worker in Spain, followed the Ballenger sanctuary teaching in 1905 and was relieved of his position.

⁵⁷W. C. White wrote Daniells as follows: "What you have written US about the views which Brother A. F. Ballenger holds regarding the sanctuary and the atonement makes US very sad indeed." (Emphasis added) W. C. White to Daniells, Mar. 30, 1905, RG 11, 1905--W.

⁵⁸E. W. Farnsworth to Daniells, Feb. 22, 1905, RG 11, 1905--F; Daniells to W. C. White, Mar. 16, 1905, Daniells, A. G., Jan.-Mar., 1905, WE; O. A. Olsen to Daniells, Mar. 28, 1905, RG 11, 1905--O; W. C. White to Daniells, Mar. 30, 1905, RG 11, 1905--W; Mrs. V. J. Farnsworth to Daniells, Apr. 6, 1905, RG 11, 1905--F; Daniells to W. C. White, April 7, 1905, RG 11, bk. 36, p. 825; Daniells to E. R. Palmer, April 18, 1905, Ibid, p. 938.

⁵⁹Spicer to W. Robinson, April 10, 1905, RG 21, bk. 40, p. 831; Spicer to Robinson, June 29, 1905, RG 21, bk. 41, p. 383; Spicer to E. E. Andross, July 16, 1905, RG 21, bk. 41, p. 535; Spicer to Daniells, Aug. 6, 1905, RG 11, 1905--S; Spicer to C. H. Watson, Oct. 20, 1929, RG 11, 1929--W; Spicer, "How the Spirit of Prophecy Met a Crisis," 1938, pp. 78-9: "It was mysticism that flavored the theory that set aside the truth of the heavenly sanctuary with its services of the holy and most holy places, when A. F. Ballenger brought the spiritualizing method from his study of the popular commentators in England. . . . Out of it came the teaching about the sanctuary that the Spirit of Prophecy classed with the mysticism of the 'Living Temple' school," RG 21, Special Files, W. A. Spicer Manuscript folder; Spicer, "How Spiritual Pride Led Into Error," RH, May 11, 1905, p. 4. A. T. Jones also affirms that the denomination became skeptical of Ballenger over his "Receive ye the Holy Ghost" message and initially limited his field of operation within the United States before he was sent to England, where he was likewise limited, according to Jones, "Workers Together," The Gathering Call, Sept.-Oct., 1921, pp. 3, 5.

⁶⁰Andross, A More Excellent Ministry, p. 10; A. F. Ballenger, "The Bible in the Reformation," The Gathering Call, June, 1921, p. 2; White Estate, MR 760.

⁶¹Ballenger, "An Examination of Forty Fatal Errors Regarding the Atonement," 1913, p. 2; Ballenger, "The Nine Theses," RG 11, Documents, 1901-50, Reports: Narrative. See Appendix, p. 53 for "The Nine Theses."

⁶²Ibid.

⁶³Ballenger, The Proclamation of Liberty and the Unpardonable Sin, 1915, pp. 94-5, 266; E. S. Ballenger, The Gathering Call, Sept.-Oct., 1921, p. 2, Nov., 1921, p. 4; "Cast Out for the Cross of Christ," 1909, pp. 103-05.

⁶⁴Ellen White, Council of President's Meeting, Mar. 3, 1891, RG 1, Transcript of 1891 Meeting of Council of Presidents; E. G. White Diary, May 20, 1905, MR 760.

⁶⁵Ibid, p. 5.

⁶⁶Ellen White, "A Warning Against False Theories," May 24, 1905, Ibid, pp. 10-17.

⁶⁷Ibid.

⁶⁸Ibid, pp. 24, 38.

⁶⁹Spicer to H. W. Miller, June 29, 1905, RG 21, bk. 41, p. 362; Spicer to D. T. Bourdeau, June 18, 1905, Ibid, p. 176; Irwin to C. McReynolds, July 27, 1905, RG NA 11, bk. 1, p. 201; Remarks of A. T. Jones to delegates of the GC, May 30, 1905, RG 11, Special Testimonies, Testimonies on Miscellaneous Subjects; Remarks of E. G. White, May 30, 1905, Ibid.

⁷⁰MR 760, p. 11.

⁷¹Andross, Transcript of "Studies on the Sanctuary," July 14, 1911, DF 178, WE; Minutes of GCC Meeting, May 30, 1905, RG 1, GCC Minutes.

⁷²Daniells to Spicer, Aug. 25, 1905, Daniells, A. G., Jul.-Dec., 1905, WE; Conradi and Daniells to Haughey, Aug. 27, 1905, RG 11, 1905--H; Daniells to W. C. White, Oct. 3, 1905, Daniells, A. G., July-Dec., 1905, WE; Andross to W. C. White, Andross, E. E., 1908-09, WE; Andross, Transcript of "Studies on the Sanctuary, No. 3," July 16, 1911, DF 178, WE.

⁷³Ballenger, "Cast Out for the Cross of Christ," p. 109.

⁷⁴Ibid, p. 111.

⁷⁵"Notes From the General Conference Office," Dec. 14, 1916, RG 17, W. W. Prescott, 1916-17--D.

⁷⁶Haskell to Ellen White, Sept. 27, 1905, Haskell, S. N., July-Dec., 1905, WE; Irwin to W. C. White, Oct. 5, 1905, Irwin, G. A., 1904-05, WE; Ellen White to Brother and Sister Haskell, n.d. c. Oct. 10, 1905, RG 11, Special Testimonies, Testimonies During 1905, p. 92.

⁷⁷Daniells to W. C. White, Oct. 11, 12, and Nov. 13, 1905, Daniells, A. G., July-Dec., 1905, WE; Ellen White to Prescott and Daniells, Dec. 16, 1905, RG 11, Special Testimonies, Testimonies During 1905, p. 167; Daniells to Butler, Mar. 26,

1906, Daniells to Spicer, April 3, 1906, Daniells to W. C. White, May 17, 1906, RG 11, bk. 38, pp. 219-20, 301-02, 566-67; Daniells to Butler, Jan. 14, 1907, RG 11, bk. 40, pp. 483-84.

⁷⁸J. W. Scoles, Platform and Voice, Sept., 1909, pp. 5-6.

⁷⁹Phippeny, The Straight Testimony and the Harvest Message, Oct., 1911, pp. 4-5.

⁸⁰C. C. Crisler to Daniells, Oct. 20, 1909, RG 11, 1909--C; C. C. Crisler to Daniells, Feb. 19, 1911, Crisler, C. C., 1911, WE.

⁸¹Spicer to Prescott, Nov. 6, 1910, RG 21, bk. 54, p. 432; Spicer to I. Keck, July 18, 1910, RG 21, bk. 53, pp. 910-11.

^{81a}F. M. Wilcox to Daniells, July 12, 1911, RG 11, 1911--W; Butler, "Many Voices, Nos. 1-6, RH, Aug. 17 to Sept. 21, 1911; Irwin to C. H. Jones, Nov. 23, 1911, with Irwin to Daniells, Nov. 23, 1911, RG 11, 1911--I; W. T. Knox to Daniells, Dec. 17, 1911, RG 11, 1911--K; Daniells to Irwin, Jan. 4, 1912, RG 11, bk. 50, p. 222; Daniells to W. C. White, July 10, 1912, RG 11, bk. 50, pp. 1027-28.

⁸²Prescott, F. M. Wilcox and C. M. Snow to Andross, Dec. 5, 1911, RG 11, 1911--A; Daniells to W. C. White, Mar. 20, 1908, RG 11, 1908--W, fld. 1.

⁸³F. M. Wilcox to Daniells, June 5, 1911, RG 11, 1911--W.

⁸⁴G. E. Fifield, "Cleansing of the Sanctuary," RH, Sept. 21, 1897, p. 594.

⁸⁵Andross to Haskell, Nov. 12, 1900, RG 9, Haskell, S. N.

⁸⁶Haskell to W. C. White, Oct. 13, 1905 and Haskell to E. G. White, Oct. 15, 1905, Haskell, S. N., July-Dec., 1905, WE.

⁸⁷W. C. White to H. W. Carr, Sept. 21, 1908, W. C. W. bk. 36, p. 587, WE; Daniells to Ellen White, Jan. 4, 1904, RG 11, bk. 32, p. 929; Ellen White to Kellogg, Dec. 30, 1901, K-188-01, RG 11, Special Testimonies, bk. 23, Testimonies Received During 1906, p. 234; Daniells, Transcript of Remarks Before Faculty of Fernando Academy, Fernando, Cal., May 11, 1910, p. 2, DF 200, WE; Daniells, "A Review of Experiences Leading to a Consideration of the Question of 'The Daily' of Daniel 8:9-14, RG 21, Special Files, "The Daily," Section 1, p. 2.

⁸⁸Daniells, Untitled Manuscript, n.d., RG 21, Special Files, "The Daily," Section 2; Daniells, "A Review of Experiences Leading to a Consideration of the Question of 'the Daily' of Daniel 8:9-14, RG 21, Special Files, "The Daily," Section 1; John Kolvoord and Moses Kellogg, "The Vision of the Evening and the Morning: A Study of the Prophecy of Daniel VIII," Controversial Literature, Vol. 2, No. 12, WE; Prescott to Haskell, Dec. 1, 1907, RG 58, L. E. Froom Files, "The Daily," Folder 2.

⁸⁹W. C. White to J. S. Washburn, Oct. 27, 1910, p. 26-7, RG 17, M. L. Andreasen, "The Daily"; Daniells, "A Review of Experiences . . .," RG 21, Special Files, "The Daily," Section 1.

⁹⁰L. A. Smith and F. C. Gilbert, " 'The Daily' in the Prophecy of Daniel," pp. 2-3, 24.

⁹¹Ibid, pp. 16-7, 30-1.

⁹²Waggoner to Bollman, c. Feb., 1910, RG 11, 1910--W; "A Statement Sent Out by L. A. Smith," c. April, 1910, RG 58, L. E. Froom Reference Files, 1920s-30s,

"The Daily," Folder 2; Daniells to W. C. White, Aug. 4, 1910, RG 11, bk. 47, p. 447.

⁹³Daniells to J. C. Stevens, June 25, 1909, RG 11, bk. 45, pp. 558-59; Daniells, Untitled Manuscript, c. June 1910, RG 21, Special Files, "The Daily," Section 2; Daniells to Conradi, Dec. 23, 1909, RG 11, bk. 46, pp. 317-18; Spicer to Clarence Santee, Dec. 28, 1909, RG 21, bk. 52, p. 870.

⁹⁴Prescott, "The Essential Teaching of the Second Advent Movement," RH, Sept. 30, 1909, pp. 5-6; Prescott, "Our Time and Work From the Prophetic Standpoint," RH, Dec. 16, 1909; Prescott, "The Bible Only," RH, Dec. 23, 1909, p. 4.

⁹⁵Butler to Ellen White, July 3, 1910, Butler, G. I., 1910-11, WE.

⁹⁶Ellen White to Prescott and Colcord, Jan. 16, 1905, RG 11, Special Testimonies, Testimonies During 1905, p. 38; Ellen White to "Brethren Daniells and Prescott and Their Associates," Oct. 30, 1905, Ibid, p. 119.

⁹⁷W. C. White to Daniells, Mar. 24, 1908, RG 11, 1908--W, fld. 2; Ellen White, Letter 226, 1908, DF 202, WE; Ellen White to Haskell, Aug. 28, 1908, in W. C. White to J. S. Washburn, Oct. 27, 1910, p. 21, RG 17, M. L. Andreasen, "The Daily"; Ellen White to Haskell, May 24, 1910, RG 21, Special Files, "The Daily," Section 1.

⁹⁸W. C. White to Daniells, Mar. 13, 1910, Daniells, A. G., 1910, WE.

⁹⁹Ellen White, "Our Attitude Toward Doctrinal Controversy," 1 SM, pp. 164-65, 168; Ellen White, "To My Brethren in the Ministry," Aug. 3, 1910, B-62-10, RG PC 2, F. C. Gilbert, Box 2, Ellen G. White Letters.

¹⁰⁰Daniells to G. B. Thompson, Sept. 22, 1910, RG 11, bk. 47, p. 756; Daniells to Evans, RG 11, bk. 48, pp. 578-79.

¹⁰¹Daniells to W. C. White, Jan. 3, 1910, RG 11, bk. 46, pp. 393-94.

¹⁰²Spicer to Smith, Nov. 9, 1909, RG 21, bk. 52, pp. 351-52; Daniells to W. C. White, June 21, 1910, RG 11, bk. 46, p. 981; Conradi to Daniells, Oct. 11, 1910, RG 11, 1910--C; Prescott, "'The Daily' A Brief Reply to Two Leaflets on This Subject," n.d., p. 19, RG 58, L. E. Froom Reference Files, 1920s-30s, "The Daily," fld. 1.

¹⁰³Prescott, "The Message for This Time," Sermon, Oct. 10, 1903, at Second SDA Church, Washington, D.C., in RH, Oct. 22, 1903, p. 5; Prescott, "The Mediation of Christ," Protestant Magazine, Nov., 1912, p. 251. See also RH, Nov. 19, 26, Dec. 3, 1903 and numerous Protestant Magazine articles between 1911 and 1913.

¹⁰⁴W. W. Fletcher, "Letters to Conference Presidents," as copied by G. B. Starr, Sept. 17, 1930, G. B. Starr Statement attached, RG 58, L. E. Froom Reference Files, 1920s-1930s, "The Daily," folder 4.

¹⁰⁵Irwin, "The Mark of the Beast: Of What Does It Consist and When Is It Received, c. 1911, p. 3, DF 392, WE; Daniells to W. C. White, Feb. 1, 1910, RG 11, 1910--W; W. C. White to J. E. White, June 1, 1909, RG 58, L. E. Froom Reference Files, Elmshaven Materials.

¹⁰⁶Spicer to Conradi, Nov. 30, 1914, RG 21, bk. 63, pp. 618-19; Prescott to W. C. White, April 6, 1915, DF 198, WE.

¹⁰⁷Spicer to Conradi, Sept. 7, 1910, RG 21, bk. 53, p. 960; Spicer to J. S. Burnett, Sept. 4, 1910, Ibid, pp. 913-14.

- ¹⁰⁸H. W. Carr to Daniells, April 13, 1909, RG 11, 1909--C.
- ¹⁰⁹Waggoner, "The Beginning of Apostasy," Present Truth, Jan. 30, 1902, p. 69; C. C. Crisler to E. E. Andross, Oct. 14, 1913, Andross, E. E., 1912-13, WE.
- ¹¹⁰Daniells to Palmer, June 27, 1906, RG 11, bk. 39, p. 148; W. C. White to Daniells, Aug. 13, 1906, W. C. White bk. 30, p. 994; Andross, Pacific Union Recorder, Jan. 26, 1911, p. 3; Spicer to G. F. Haffner, Feb. 9, 1909, RG 21, bk. 50, pp. 59-60.
- ¹¹¹Ellen White, "A Warning Against Deceptive Teaching," June 23, 1904, in W. C. White bk. 29, p. 703, WE.
- ¹¹²Spicer to E. H. Pascal, July 24, 1905, RG 21, bk. 41, p. 648; Daniells to Conradi, Aug. 5, 1903, RG 11, bk. 31, pp. 117-18.
- ¹¹³C. C. Crisler to Andross, Oct. 14, 1913, Andross, E. E., 1912-13, WE; L. E. Froom, "Elder Daniells' Wishes, Requests, and Charges Re His Manuscript," June 8, 1935, RG 58, L. E. Froom, "O-Z."
- ¹¹⁴W. C. White to Lea A. Beach, Feb. 21, 1909, W. C. White bk. 37, p. 552, WE.
- ¹¹⁵Ellen White, May 11, 1899, RG 11, Special Testimonies, Testimonies on Miscellaneous Subjects, "Daniel Section," p. 44.