

FROM RIGHTEOUSNESS TO HOLY FLESH:
JUDGMENT AT MINNEAPOLIS

PREFACE

When God lets man have his own way, it is the darkest hour of his life. For a willful, disobedient child to be left to have his own way, to follow the bent of his own mind, and gather the dark clouds of God's judgment about him, is a terrible thing.—Ellen White, "The True Standard of Righteousness," Sermon at Worcester, Mass, July 31, 1885 in RH, Aug 25, 1885.

In late 1899, Stephen Haskell returned to the United States after an absence of nearly four years. He was horrified by the content and pervasiveness of theology that he considered fanatical. As he traveled throughout the United States, Haskell concluded that "a perversion of the doctrine of righteousness by faith has taken possession of many minds." [Haskell to W C White, May, 1900]

The following brief statements outline the theology to which Haskell was exposed. It would be useful to consider the question of what central theological premise bound each of the following 1898-1900 statements together:

[1] John Harvey Kellogg, leader of SDA medical work, to Ellen White, June 23, 1898: "It is the life of God and the intelligence of God that rules everything in the body of the righteous man and if the will is completely surrendered to God and the individual is absolutely consecrated, the power of God which is in the man must restore all the faculties and functions to their divine perfection."

[2] A T Jones, "Saving Health," RH, Nov 22, 1898: "Perfect holiness embraces the flesh as well as the spirit; it includes the body as well as the soul. . . . 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?"

[3] E J Waggoner at 1899 GC Session: "[God] says that the life of Jesus should be manifested in our mortal flesh; and when that life is dwelling in our mortal flesh, mortality does not have any hold on it. . . . Voice: Do you ever expect to be sick? E J Waggoner: No; I expect to live forever."

[4] R S Donnell, president of the Indiana Conference, leader of "Holy Flesh" movement, 1900: "Men can continually do righteous acts only as God is

incarnate in them; and it was God's purpose from the beginning to dwell in every created being, so that good works, or He himself, might always appear in them. . . . I teach that those who fully appropriate the power of the gospel of Christ need not to die."--"What I Taught in Indiana," pp 5, 25.

Each of the preceding statements represents a theological perspective that has subjectivized its understanding of justification by faith. Its premise has consciously or unconsciously excluded an objective, outside-of-the-individual view of justification. The results of such exclusion are apparent from the statements themselves.

The research and writing of the author has been guided completely by the perspective that justification by faith was the central issue of the Minneapolis experience and from that conclusion all else flows. Because "Minneapolis" and "1888" were about justification by faith and not primarily about a "bad spirit" possessed by Uriah Smith or others and because the basic issue was theological and not emotional, this study has centered upon the theological systems under which the participants operated. That is not to say that the "Minneapolis spirit" did not influence the situation, but the primary focus of this study has constantly been kept uppermost by the author.

One result from a consistent centering upon justification was that the author thus came to the surprising conclusion that there were at least three varying understandings of that subject during the period. The author intends to show how diversionary movements prevented justification by faith from being perceived as the central issue.

This study is not conceived as a polemic for a particular view of justification (although certainly the author's interpretation will be revealed), but is rather an attempt to analyze the varying views of justification held within the church during the period. The nature of this study does not call for an intense analysis of the interrelationship between justification and sanctification or the question of whether sanctifying righteousness is to be considered as embraced within the justification

umbrella. What is vital to this study is to perceive three distinct views of justification held within the church and to notice those differences.

The work has its limitations. Space and time constraints dictated limiting the time span to sources primarily from the 1884 to 1889 period, although some subjects extended the research somewhat. Additionally, the theological positions are analyzed from a layman's perspective and in layman's language. While the author was trained as an historian, he must deal with theological issues, for the central meaning of 1888 was theological. That analysis cannot be relegated to the background.

Fortunately, Ellen White herself, did not write as a trained theologian and her analysis from both a theological and historical perspective is what the author has taken very seriously. The author presents this interpretation with the deepest conviction and sincerest hope that it has merit in helping understand and further the cause he sincerely loves and in which he firmly believes.

Because Ellen White was of such surpassing importance to understanding the issues of 1888 and because the flavor of her analysis can not be fully given in the usual textual treatment, the author has included an appendix that is more documentary in nature and which will enable a more detailed analysis of Ellen White's evaluations concerning the "pharisaism" of the pre-1888 period.

Acknowledgements. [To be written]

Chapter 1

The Centrality of Justification

Ellen White provided the key to SDA history when she defined the significance of the 1888 General Conference session. "The present message--justification by faith--is a message from God," she proclaimed to those assembled at the campmeeting held in Rome, New York, in June of 1889.¹ The next year she informed the church that "one interest will prevail, one subject will swallow up every other,--Christ our righteousness."² Mrs White frequently identified justification as the issue relevant to the 26 eventful days of the 1888 General Conference session and institute held at Minneapolis, Minnesota, October 10 to November 4, 1888.

Did SDAs understand justification by faith prior to 1888? Ellen White responded to that question. "I tell you in the fear of God," Mrs White wrote to the SDA ministry in 1889, "that up to this time, the Bible truths connected with the great plan of redemption are but feebly understood."³

Concerning the future, Ellen White expressed both apprehension and hope. She greatly feared the results that the disunity surrounding 1888 would bring and moaned: "What kind of a future is before us, if we shall fail to come into the unity of the faith."⁴ On the hopeful side, reflect on the statement noticed in the initial paragraph. When Mrs White looked toward the SDA church of the future, she observed that "one interest will prevail," justification by faith will swallow up every other subject SDAs interest themselves in.

In addition to Ellen White, other sources such as the Willie White notes taken at the conference, Review and Herald and Signs of the Times accounts of the conference, the General Conference Bulletin, and even the local newspapers of Minneapolis, all confirm that justification by faith was prominently discussed at the momentous Minneapolis meeting.

It is significant that the SDA church had such a unique opportunity on the very day that marked the 44th anniversary of the disappointment of 1844. On that day Adventists could have advanced, in the public view, as vigorous proponents of this truth: Christ's life and death are the sole basis for justification. How fitting that both the Minneapolis Journal and Tribune, reported on the meetings of that Monday, October 22, 1888 and how fitting that on that day SDAs should discuss the central theme of the Bible and the theme that Martin Luther considered the test of all religious systems.

Minneapolis did indeed offer to SDAs a new analysis of its central message and Ellen White observed that at Minneapolis, "Elder E J Waggoner had the privilege granted him of speaking plainly and presenting his views upon justification by faith and the righteousness of Christ in relation to the law."⁵

As Ellen White prophetically perceived, a close look at justification by faith and its advancement to the center of Adventism, would overwhelmingly challenge the pioneer's entire ecclesiastical system. Placing justification at the center brought into question the past system of ministry, leadership and organization, theology and even personal behaviour. The pioneers clearly perceived their system to be under attack, but didn't recognize that it was the message of justification by faith that was posing the challenge.

Personalities. Personalities are important only in a very limited way to this study. Because there were three varying perspectives about justification, there were essentially three views of the kind of church those holding their views wanted to belong to. The pioneer system was well represented by George Butler, General Conference president, just prior to the 1888 session, and Uriah Smith, editor of the church paper. Alonzo T Jones and Ellet J Waggoner, came to represent Adventism's new time of opportunity that would result from a close

focus upon justification by faith.

The real key to this study, however, is neither the pioneer system represented by Butler and Smith, nor the perspective of Jones and Waggoner, but rather that of Ellen White, who perhaps even unconsciously, combined the best of the pioneer perspective and advanced with the "new" insights. A major aspect of this study will be to exhibit the difference of focus between Jones and Waggoner and that of Ellen White. Such is not done to castigate either of the evangelists of the new message, but rather to illustrate the folly of basing one's theological system upon any individual. Ellen White was entirely accurate when she observed that both of the contending groups at Minneapolis needed each other: "The Lord's work needed every jot and tittle of experience that he had given Eld Butler and Eld Smith," observed Mrs White.⁶ That truth is amazingly apparent as one analyzes the history of this period for it becomes clear that the pioneers held to a concept of justification that could have been useful to the harbingers of the new message.

GEORGE IDE BUTLER. If anyone seemed destined to represent traditional Adventism, it was George Butler. At age 10, George went through the 1844 "disappointment," and was baptized by J N Andrews in 1856. Butler became well known as a tent evangelist and thus was immersed in the debating-style ministry so successful during the evangelisation of the midwest. He was widely acclaimed as defender of the faith during the apostasy of the former president and treasurer of the Iowa Conference and became president of that conference in the 1860s. Butler was elected GC president in 1871 and served until 1874 and then again was president from 1880 to 1888. He was 55 when his health and "other matters" caused his resignation from the GC presidency and he left for retirement in Florida in late 1888.

Emmett Vande Vere, twentieth-century church historian, succinctly

summarized Butler as an administrator: "He had driven hard to inculcate the fundamentals of Seventh-day Adventists and had become a stickler for discipline."⁷ Butler himself admitted to having "too much iron in his nature," but still strongly resented the attitude that certain "fledgling" ministers in California should feel equipped to challenge traditional SDA teachings.⁸ Butler saw in the debate that centered around the question of the law in Galatians as an onslaught against denominational structures most meaningful to him. He had engaged in many an evangelistic crusade whose main emphasis was the importance of the Sabbath and he saw a distinct threat to his concept of ministry if the new position prevailed. Indeed, Butler was convinced that "Seventh-day Adventists have never taken a stand upon Bible exegesis which they have been compelled to surrender."⁹

URIAH SMITH. Like Butler, Smith perceived Adventism to be under seige. The time was inappropriate to the asking of fundamental questions about the basic message of the church. Besides, those basic questions had all been resolved in the past. Smith's forte was prophetic interpretation and he feared what A T Jones' tampering was doing to the validity of the list of the ten kingdoms/horns of Daniel 2 and 7.

Born in 1832, Uriah was 12 during the 1844 experience and joined the Sabbatarian Adventists in 1852. His initial denominational writing was a 35,000-word poem significantly entitled, "The Warning Voice of Time and Prophecy." He too would see the prophetic timetable being fulfilled around the 1888 period and felt that the close of prophetic time hardly seemed appropriate for the developing of new doctrines. Smith was the first General Conference secretary, the first Bible teacher at Battle Creek College and editor of the Review for half a century.¹⁰

ELLET J WAGGONER.¹¹ E J Waggoner, son of Pioneer Joseph Harvey Waggoner,

was born January 12, 1855, in Waukam, Wisconsin, the sixth of ten children. Ellet studied chemistry and anatomy at Battle Creek College in 1875 and later that year entered the University of Michigan, where he received a degree as Doctor of Medicine.¹² In 1880, the recently-married "doctor" began medical work at the Adventist Rural Health Retreat in California, but his disenchantment with that work soon led him to employment at the Signs, where his father had become editor after the death of James White.¹³

The 1882 annual California campmeeting was a momentous event for Pacific Coast Adventists. Held from October 6 to 16, it was "by far the largest meeting ever held in California" by SDAs. It was taken very seriously by all because of the background of Sunday agitation in California and the SDA conviction that final events were transpiring. Indeed, it was that very conviction that pushed Adventists to complete Healdsburg College in time to exhibit it at the meeting and to provide a training ground for workers to give the final message. "Everything indicates that our work is nearing its close," the campers were told. The delegates to the conference passed the following resolution:

WHEREAS, Stirring events at the present time show that important prophecies, upon which we took our stand years ago as a matter of faith, are now approaching their fulfillment, thereby confirming the correctness of our position;

Resolved, That in view of these evidences of the nearness of the end, our faith is greatly strengthened, and we feel called upon to go forward in our work with renewed courage and energy.¹⁴

It was in that setting when Waggoner, sitting aloof from the main body of the congregation during a meeting, seemed to experience a light encircling himself, "as though the sun were shining," and the tent for Waggoner looked "far more brilliantly lighted than if the noon day sun had been shining." Ellet Waggoner then "by actual sight" saw "Christ hanging on the cross, crucified for [me] personally." He referred to this experience 18 years later

and considered it as real as "Paul's experience on the way to Damascus" in terms of its impact upon himself.¹⁵ Was this focus upon the cross as perceived by James White a year earlier and now by Waggoner a solution to the SDA feeling of inadequacy as it moved toward its eschatological destiny?

Waggoner "resolved at once" to "study the Bible in the light of" that personal Christcentered revelation. He "resolved that the rest of [his] life should be devoted" to finding personal salvation in Scripture "and making it plain to others." The writings of Paul, especially the books of Romans and Galatians, would now hold "a peculiar attraction" to Ellet and he would give them "more study than any other portions of the Bible."¹⁶ It was at this 1882 campmeeting that Ellet Waggoner received his ministerial "license to preach."

A T JONES. Alonzo Trevor Jones was born in Rock Hill, Ohio, April 21, 1850. He worked as a "clerk" after his elementary school training until he enlisted in the Army, November 2, 1870. Jones had been promoted to sergeant by 1874 when he was transferred to Fort Walla Walla. In the summer of that year, Isaac Van Horn, SDA evangelist, pitched his tent at Walla Walla City, where the lectures on "the prophecies, the second coming of Christ and the Law and the Sabbath question" attracted Jones along with "a few other soldiers." Following the typical Adventist evangelistic style, Van Horn on the 17th day of the meetings called upon those in attendance who agreed that the evidence favored the seventh-day Sabbath to vote so by standing and 50 to 75 did just that. When the question was reversed, "not one witness, out of a congregation of about 350 arose in favor of Sunday." Jones attended regularly, "bought a Bible and a copy of every piece of [SDA] literature and spent his leisure time when off duty, in study."¹⁷

Jones was baptized into the Seventh-day Adventist Church, August 8, 1874, and continued to devote his leisure Army time to intense study "with the idea

that as soon as he was released from the Army he would immediately enter into the service of the Lord by preaching the truth." Civilian Jones received the denominational license to preach in 1875¹⁸ and in 1884 the "Pacific Coast Council" recommended that he "come to California, where he could gain experience" by associating with the veteran workers there.¹⁹ Jones and Waggoner were now together as writers for the Signs.

Definitions. Because Adventism during the period we are considering was being tested by its understanding of justification by faith, it is necessary to provide a workable definition of that central teaching. The SDA Bible Dictionary definition is helpful for our purposes:

As used theologically, the divine act by which God declares a penitent sinner righteous, or regards him as righteous. Justification is the opposite of condemnation (Rom 5:16). Neither term specifies character, but only standing before God. Justification is not a transformation of inherent character; it does not impart righteousness any more than condemnation imparts sinfulness. A man comes under condemnation because of his transgressions, but, as a sinner, he can experience justification only through an act of God. Condemnation is earned, or deserved, but justification cannot be earned—it is a 'free [unmerited] gift' (v 16). In justifying the sinner God acquits him, declares him to be righteous, regards him as righteous, and proceeds to treat him as a righteous man. Justification is the act of acquittal and the accompanying declaration that a state of righteousness exists. Charges of wrongdoing are canceled, and the sinner, now justified, is brought into a right relationship with God that Paul describes as being at 'peace with God' (Rom 5:1). The state of righteousness to which a sinner attains through justification is imputed (ch 4:22), that is, counted (v 3) or reckoned (v 4). When God imputes righteousness to a repentant sinner He figuratively places the atonement provided by Christ and the righteousness of Christ to his credit on the books of heaven, and the sinner stands before God as if he had never sinned.²⁰

It is the "regards him as righteous," or the "imputed" nature of justification that will become increasingly significant in this study. As used in the previous quotation, justification refers to legal issues, dealing with trial and judgment. God is able to declare a person righteous because the One who represents the individual is righteous. It is the outside-of-the-

individual or objective, or forensic aspect that essentially was lacking in all Adventists except Ellen White, and that observation is overwhelmingly pertinent to this study.

It must again be affirmed that the following work is not a polemic for any particular view, but seeks rather to outline the varying perspectives concerning justification present in Adventism during the 1884-89 period.

Hope During Discouragement: Death of James White. It was at the time of the death of James White in 1881, when Ellen White received divine information that something hopeful loomed upon the horizon for the SDA church. The unexpected death of James White in August of 1881 devastated SDAs. His death seemed to occur at just the wrong time from the standpoint of a new message sounding within Adventism, for James and his wife Ellen had resolved in that year to retire from their constant speaking assignments and together prepare studies on "the glorious subject of redemption [that] should long ago have been more fully presented to the people."²¹

Early in 1881, James White had begun to analyze the dangerous direction the church was unconsciously pursuing and he informed the readers of the Review of his "unutterable yearning of soul for Christ," urging that the ministry "preach Christ more." In informing the church of his intention to refocus his message he stated, "We feel that we have a testimony for our people at this time, relative to the exalted character of Christ, and His willingness and power to save." A fellow minister noted that "as all will remember, wherever he preached the past few months, he dwelt largely upon faith in Christ and the boundless love of God."²²

A month after the death of her husband Mrs White recounted a significant dream she received after a time of "pleading with the Lord for light in regard to [her] duty." She dreamed of riding in her horse-drawn carriage with her

husband driving and seated next to her. When she inquired whether James had been resurrected because "half of me was gone" her husband said "The Lord knows what is best for you and for me." In the dream James continued:

We have made a mistake. We have responded to urgent invitations of our brethren to attend important meetings. We had not the heart to refuse. . . . God would have had [others] bear the burdens we have carried for years. . . . I have made mistakes, the greatest of which was in allowing my sympathies for the people of God to lead me to take work upon me which others should have borne. . . . We might have done a great deal for years with our pens, on subjects the people need that we have had light upon and can present before them, which others do not have. Thus you can work when your strength returns, as it will, and you can do far more with your pen than with your voice. . . . Oh, those precious subjects the Lord would have had me bring before the people, precious jewels of light.²³

In a later reflection upon the death of James, Ellen White recalled her thoughts as she held the hand of her dying husband: "Like a clear chain of light," she perceived that new "workmen" would arise to "take hold" of the message. She clearly understood that "there has got to be more light and power infused into the work," and that others would carry the work "upward and forward." It was also at the bedside of her dying husband that Ellen White understood that her own ministry would take on added dimensions, "a burden stronger than I had ever borne before." While Ellen White vowed to stand by her duty, her vow included the understanding "that God was to bring an element in[to] this work that we have not had yet."²⁴

Justification Moves to the Forefront of Adventism. When the Minneapolis newspapers reported that SDAs were discussing justification by faith, it noted that "Elder Waggoner, of Oakland, Cal, began a discussion of law and Galatians, or Justification by Faith, that lasted an hour and a half."²⁵ It was this very interrelationship between Galatians and justification that enabled the discussion to take place. When, in 1886, George Butler printed his pamphlet on the law in Galatians, he publicly berated E J Waggoner for the latter's public introduction of a controversial subject in denominational history. Almost

proudly Butler observed, "For half a score of years past, the question has lain quite dormant."²⁶

Since the Galatians issue provided the backdrop to the discussions of justification at Minneapolis, it can be seen that attitudes toward doctrinal discussions prevented the issue from coming to the forefront earlier. Indeed, it appears that both Jones and Waggoner sought to parry the attacks of the pioneers by affirming that they were not interested in arguments about the law in Galatians, but instead were interested in discovering the gospel in Galatians. In contrast to Butler's pamphlet entitled "The Law in the Book of Galatians," Waggoner entitled his pamphlet "The Gospel in the Book of Galatians." In describing his procedures as Bible instructor at Healdsburg College in California, A T Jones wrote the following to Mrs White in early 1887:

In my work here, I have not allowed the discussion of the law in Galatians to come up. Several times the question has been asked direct to me in class on that point, and I have told them that I would not undertake to settle it for them at all. I told them that some brethren honestly had one way, while others just as honest held the other, and that I would not attempt to say which is right. I know how it appears to me, but I would not say that that is right, because another view might be just as plain to some of my brethren as this is to me. I have told my class here to avoid the discussion of the question of the law in Galatians, on their own part, and to avoid being drawn into any discussion of it by others. I have told them to look for the gospel of Christ in Galatians, rather than to discuss the law there, and that if others chose to discuss the law and to make prominent the question of which law it is, they could easily avoid danger by looking for the gospel underneath it all. I thought it safe to tell them this, so as to turn their minds from whatever discussion might arise, and from taking sides, and to have Christ and his salvation before them as the one great thing that is beneath and above all. I thought that if they would keep Christ and the gospel before their minds they would be sure to be on the right side whichever way the question of the law should be finally decided. With Christ before them I could not see how they could possibly go astray. I think however that I have told them that I thought they would find both laws there, and the gospel-justification by faith-underlying the whole of it. I think the advice has done them good, for I have seen no disposition to raise any question or discussion, on the part of any. And I am sure the Lord has helped as I have tried to make the gospel plain to them.²⁷

How ironic that such a discussion had been avoided so long in SDA history because it could not occur without animosity. Delaying consideration of the interpretation of Galatians 3 caused the justification by faith discussion to be delayed for years within Adventism and when it was finally discussed, it was done so with so much animosity that the major subject of justification was not looked at closely enough to perceive the varying perspectives within the church.

Varying positions on Justification Summarized. A number of elements combined to prevent the varying understandings of justification from being perceived. Theological disunity and suspicion over the prophetic interpretations of Daniel 2 and 7, the debate over Galatians, sectional rivalry, all combined to prevent justification from receiving the close look that was desperately necessary. Because the pioneers used the term "justification" from time to time, they mistakenly concluded that there was a harmony of views on it. Even though some of the terminology was jointly shared, close examination of the varying positions reveals at least three differing perspectives here briefly summarized²⁸:

PIONEERS AND JUSTIFICATION. Latent within the term "Seventh-day Adventist" can be found the perspective and also the dilemma of the pioneers of the church in 1888. Traditional SDA teaching on the law and prophetic interpretations seemed fully vindicated that crucial year. The United States Senate debated passage of a national Sunday law and SDAs were cruelly imprisoned and persecuted in various states because their neighbors didn't want them hoeing or washing clothes on Sunday. The end of time seemed very near. This was hardly an appropriate time for two second-generation "fledgling" ministers (Jones and Waggoner) to raise more than superficial questions about the relationship of law to gospel and to historical prophetic interpretations.

The pioneers were well schooled in pre-1888 SDA history. Adventism's crucial test immediately following 1844 centered upon the Sabbath of the decalogue. Law came to loom larger and larger in post-1844 SDA history. The stimulating search for the Sabbath truth between 1844 and 1848 defined the evangelistic thrust of the young denomination. Its major point of theological emphasis hinged on obedience to the Sabbath commandment as the final testing truth of the third angel's message.

Uriah Smith, editor of the general church paper, and George Butler, president of the General Conference, and most of the pre-1888 SDA ministry, held that justification involved primarily a means of obtaining forgiveness for "sins of the past." Faith enabled adequate obedience and thus sufficient righteousness to pass the soon-coming final judgment. While sanctification thus overshadowed justification, the latter was perceived as an objective transaction by the pioneers.

JONES-WAGGONER AND JUSTIFICATION. The Jones and Waggoner focus upon the overwhelming dimensions of the law led to their conclusion that personal righteousness was inadequate both for the past and for the future. Only the righteousness of Christ satisfied the requirements of the law and such righteousness came through faith as a gift. In their scheme, however, Christ's righteousness actually replaced the past sins within the individual and became the instrument of obedience for the present and future.

ELLEN WHITE AND JUSTIFICATION. As early as 1884 Ellen White systematically attempted to lead the church to more elevated concepts of the righteousness of Christ as the perspective that would energize the church. Her guidance provided the impetus that would likewise begin reformations concerning the nature of SDA ministry and also modify its organizational concepts as well as its views of the basis for salvation.

Ellen White's view of justification was conditioned by her focus upon the continual need of the mediation of Christ and the inadequacy of the best efforts of the converted Christian to warrant salvation:

Righteousness is obedience to the law. The law demands righteousness, and this the sinner owes to the law; but he is incapable of rendering it. The only way in which he can attain to righteousness is through faith. By faith he can bring to God the merits of Christ, and the Lord places the obedience of His Son to the sinner's account. Christ's righteousness is accepted in place of man's failure, and God receives, pardons, justifies, the repentant, believing soul, treats him as though he were righteous, and loves him as He loves His Son. This is how faith is accounted righteousness.²⁹

Illustrating the Focus: Opportunity in Battle Creek, 1885. Just as Minneapolis offered a new day of opportunity, so did Battle Creek seem to represent the stronghold of the SDA pre-1888 perspective. Among the amazing developments to spring from Minneapolis was the immediate pioneer conclusion that, Ellen White's observation to the contrary, justification was not a central issue. The pioneers claimed that the church had consistently taught justification as a vital doctrine. To a great extent it was because of that claim that many failed to observe what Ellen White clearly observed: there were "many and confused" ideas within the church concerning justification.³⁰ Besides the test of theological analysis that will occur later, the pioneer claim that SDAs strongly held to justification as a vital doctrine also fails the test of history.

Although the Battle Creek church had a membership of slightly more than 1,000 in 1885, its 3,000-capacity tabernacle was filled to capacity night after night as the church unfolded its basic teachings to the citizens of Battle Creek. In 32 lectures extending over five weeks and fully reprinted in the Battle Creek Daily Journal between February 26 and April 1, 1885, traditional Adventism presented its basic "doctrines of this people as presented in new fields for the first time." When the greatly increased supply of the

newspapers was exhausted, the Review and Herald publishing house reprinted the lectures "by request" in a 267-page pamphlet.³¹ Major speakers were George Butler, D M Canright, the outstanding evangelist of the denomination, and Uriah Smith.

Although neither the expression nor the concept of justification by faith was ever mentioned during the 32 lectures involving 267 pages of coverage, it would be unfair to assert that SDAs had no perception of the subject. The subject had appeared from time to time in the pioneer writings. But the pioneer definition of justification made it inevitable that it would be relegated to a position far to the rear of such subjects as the United States in prophecy, signs of the times, the work of the papacy, the change of the Sabbath, etc. Because justification was seen as applying only to the sinner's past and considered solely as the basis for forgiveness, sanctification inevitably swallowed up justification as the pioneers looked toward culminating world events. Indeed, if the lectures on prophecy, the Sabbath and the law were omitted, the only lectures remaining were lectures on Satan and his angels, immortality of the soul, and the Spirit of Prophecy. Even if the citizens of Battle Creek were unable to hear a word spoken during the lectures, the massive law chart used during the lectures would have indicated the central focus.

In presenting the initial lecture, Butler promised to "dwell largely upon the prophetic portions of the Bible," and very publicly committed himself on the names of the 10 kingdoms comprising the great image of Daniel. His partiality toward the Huns and his stress on the importance of prophecy, as well as the wide circulation of the lectures, was already setting the stage for 1888. It says much about pre-1888 SDA history to note that the initial three lectures involved Daniel 2, Daniel 7 and Matthew 24. No one within or without

Adventism would be likely to tamper with traditional interpretations on prophecy or the Sabbath with impunity. Everything centered upon prophecies concerning the time of the end and the last final warning message designed to prepare the world for that end.

Since the final warning centered upon the Sabbath reform, the pioneer system had no room for another reform to follow it. The third angel was the last and to this system the third angel's message centered in the Sabbath. In the pioneer view the first angel's message, centering mainly upon judgment, "was based on the expiration of the prophetic periods, which were shown to expire in 1844, and this position has stood the test of rigid examination from that day to this, and cannot be shaken," affirmed Butler in lecture 16. Smith likewise told the citizens that the Sabbath reform message was the last message and was currently being given.³² The last message involved two aspects, according to Butler: (1) it warned against the worship of the beast; (2) it pointed to the remedy for false worship, namely obedience to the commandments. This was the essence of the gospel to the pioneers: "The message, therefore, is a gospel work,—the faith of Jesus,—and has for its burden the restoration of God's law."³³ Canright told his audience:

The test of character in the Judgment is the law of God. When our lives are examined in the light of that great day, the great rule of life will be laid beside all our actions, and the fourth commandment will read, just as it always has, 'The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God.'³⁴

At the conclusion of the series the Battle Creek Journal editorialized: "The religious views of this denomination, and the Scripture evidence on which they are based, have been very fully set before our readers in the reports of the lectures during the past five weeks."³⁵ Pioneer Adventism had been on very public display in 1885.

Failure to Perceive Justification as the Central Issue. Even while

denominational history and the frequent observations of Ellen White were revealing the failure of the pre-1888 ministry and message, those pioneers caught up in that era were loudly proclaiming that the church always believed in justification by faith. As late as 1894, W H Littlejohn, long-time minister and writer for the Review, wrote an article entitled "Justification by Faith Not a New Doctrine" and told the denomination that "Some of our good brethren have erred in supposing that the doctrine of justification by faith was not understood and advocated by any of our denomination until within a very brief space of time." He wrote that he had spoken with several who held to that mistaken premise and intended to correct those misgivings in his article.³⁶

Littlejohn went on to contrast works versus faith as the basis of salvation and thus concluded that SDAs always believed in justification by faith since "he who has committed a single sin in the course of his life, can only be saved through the perfect obedience of Christ to the law of God." The premise that SDAs believed in justification by faith because they recognized the need of forgiveness for past sins enabled Littlejohn to quote Uriah Smith, the staunchest opponent of Jones and Waggoner, as believing in justification by faith. Twenty-eight years ago, observed Littlejohn, Uriah Smith had written that God's people "have rested their hope of life on the merits of the shed blood of their divine Redeemer, making him their source of righteousness."³⁷

Littlejohn was sensitive on the issue of justification by faith's being a relatively new perspective within Adventism. Indeed, the premise that SDAs needed instruction concerning justification was not flattering given the assumption held by many of the pioneers that the church had never been forced to admit an exegetical error. Littlejohn apparently could not agree with Mrs White's evaluation that less than one in one hundred SDAs understood the basics of the plan of salvation. Notice his reasoning:

The importance of having our people correctly represented in the matter of the relation which they have heretofore sustained to the doctrine of justification by faith, can hardly be exaggerated. Admit that this doctrine is new to them, and that it has but recently found a place in their creed, and you have impeached them before the world. The principle of justification by faith is a fundamental doctrine in the great plan of salvation through Christ. Without an intelligent acceptance of it, no man can be saved. If, as a people, therefore, we had never rightly comprehended and appropriated that doctrine until three or four years ago, all who died in the message up to that time are lost. There is no avoiding that conclusion, since there is no salvation out of Christ, and since he saves only by securing the imputation of his righteousness to the repentant sinner. Rom 3:21-26. Furthermore, if the doctrine in question has not heretofore occupied a prominent place in the faith of Seventh-day Adventists, it is impossible that they have ever as yet given the third angel's message. This is so, because the people who give that message are to keep the 'faith of Jesus' (Rev 14:9-12), the corner-stone of which is faith in the doctrine of justification by faith. Again, the idea that a people who have carried on their work forty-seven years, without understanding the most fundamental doctrine of the Christian religion, should assume to apply the epithet 'Babylon' to other churches who have always firmly believed in that doctrine, is so preposterous that one blushes at the thought. . . . To say, however, that any considerable portion of our people have never been indoctrinated upon the question of the imputation of Christ's righteousness, is to misrepresent the facts, and place in a wrong light those who have occupied the most responsible positions in our work.³⁸

Littlejohn was not alone in his consideration that justification had always been prominent in SDA teaching. Pioneer R F Cottrell wrote that the issues were "simply a war of words." He told the Review readers that he saw "no new departure" in any current teachings for "as a people, we have always held that 'a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law.'"³⁹ Smith, who obviously never closely analyzed the views of Jones and Waggoner on justification, could write to Ellen White that he found nothing wrong with E J Waggoner's views on justification, claiming that "we have always believed" similarly. He told the ministers assembled at the 1890 Bible School for Ministers: "In regard to the subject of justification by faith and righteousness in Christ, I am glad there is harmony on the subject. I am not aware that there has ever been, or is, or ever can be, any difference of

opinion among Seventh-day Adventists on this point."⁴⁰

The observations of Secretary of the General Conference, Dan T Jones, are quite relevant. Jones was in the forefront of those who opposed the Jones-Waggoner positions on Galatians, covenants and horns. Perhaps without realizing the dimensions of his admission, the GC secretary wrote the following to J H Morrison, who had staunchly opposed Waggoner's presentations on Galatians at Minneapolis:

I believe in the doctrine of justification by faith, and am also willing to concede that it has not been given the prominence in the past that its importance demands. And if I should go out in the field again to labor, I would make more of preaching the gospel, showing the life of Christ and the power of his salvation [as] the means of our acceptance with God, than I have done in the past.⁴¹

It seems apparent, even at this point of admission, that Jones is not realizing the stupendous relevance of having been involved in a past ministry that had no real gospel perspective. He is treating the absence of the centrality of justification by faith in his past ministry as though it was a minor oversight. If the perspective then sounding within Adventism, especially as it was enunciated by Ellen White was taken seriously, Dan Jones would have seen the relevance of his admission.

In a letter he wrote the next day, he again gives evidence of the minor importance he and SDAs in general attached to justification. He wrote to Willie White that he considered that the "doctrine of justification by faith, with which I have agreed theoretically, and with which all our leading brethren have agreed, was only a rider, so to speak, to carry through these other things that were more subject to criticism." He revealingly continued: "By connecting the two together,--one with which no one found objection, that rather than reject those that were unobjectionable, our people would be led to accept that which they could not fully endorse."⁴²

Dan Jones here admits to considering the emphasis of A T Jones and E J

Waggoner upon justification as a side issue, a minor point that was well accepted by the denomination as a whole. While he looked upon it as a kind of political rider, Ellen White considered it the loud cry of the third angel. While the GC secretary admitted that his interpretation had been incorrect, he clearly did not perceive how justification could ever be so important that it would "swallow up" every other issue.

After Mrs White suggested that Dan Jones had cast a wrong mold upon the work at the General Conference level, he was placed in charge of denominational work in District No 6, comprising the areas of California, Oregon, Washington Territory, Idaho, Montana, Utah, Nevada, Arizona and New Mexico. He continued to reveal the relative importance he placed upon the one issue that Ellen White affirmed must "swallow" up every other. He was afraid that the workers in his area, and indeed throughout the denomination, would become too wholly absorbed upon that "one line of thought." Dan Jones was looking for the "symmetrical, the well balanced minister," not one who would center merely upon the theme of justification. He affirmed that "one single doctrine or line of thought is not more important than another," and seemed to fear that too strong a focus upon justification by faith would cause SDAs to rely too much upon Jones and Waggoner.⁴³

Another pioneer minister who illustrated the continuing justification by faith dilemma within Adventism was J F Ballenger. His series of four articles and one article of explanation in late 1891 and published in the Review provides clear evidence that several contrasting concepts of justification by faith were clearly in confrontation within the denomination. Ballenger himself, after he modified his positions observed that the Review editors would not have published his articles except that it reflected their own theology and such articles "would not have been printed in the Review if those in charge of

the paper had been in the light."⁴⁴

The articles were baldly entitled "Justification by Works," and clearly represented the core pre-1888 theology that predominated within the denomination. It is exceedingly significant that they could be published some three years after the Minneapolis meetings and illustrate the continuing divergence of opinion on justification. The core of Ballenger's argument involved the traditional interpretation of Romans 3:25 concerning "sins that are past." His thrust was that "no amount of present or future obedience can make satisfaction for past sins" and thus "nothing but the death of Christ can ever satisfy the demands of the law for past transgressions, and all the righteousness that we can have for the past is declared or imputed unto us so that the justification that comes through faith alone is for the sins of the past."⁴⁵ It is important to again notice that pioneer theology maintained an objective or forensic view of forgiveness that we will see lacking in the theological system of Jones and Waggoner.

Ballenger's discussion of justification by faith as applying to forgiveness solely for past transgressions, however, was only incidental to his central purpose: "All depends on how we walk, and it is left wholly to our own choice. . . . Just as soon as I yielded, and said, 'I will obey,' then the blood was applied, and the change came." Ballenger's focus was the typical pre-1888 focus. There is no look toward the cross, the sacrifice of Christ, but instead the focus is upon the performance of the individual. His article is thus accurately entitled "Justification by Works." Notice also that it was the reaction of the believer in Ballenger's theological system and the believer's decision that brought him the power to acceptably obey after his past sins had been forgiven: "The individual by his obedience or disobedience has it in his own power to bring upon him the conditions of justification or condemnation,

righteousness or unrighteousness, life or death," he wrote. Since Abel did well and was blessed while Cain was condemned "is it not evident that their doing well was the condition upon which their justification depended?"⁴⁶

Ballenger's next article illustrates why Galatians and covenant theology would be the point of contention between the old and new messages, between the pioneers and the second generation of Adventism:

Could Abraham be counted just till he obeyed the command?—No. Did not his faith lack this one work to make it perfect? James says it did. Then was not obeying the command a condition of justification and perfection? No one can say that it was not.⁴⁷

Pioneer theology clearly saw merit in God's commands of obedience and believed that forgiveness for past sins and faith in Christ brought power to acceptably work out the righteousness that would enable one's perfection necessary to pass the final test. As will later be seen, the central questions surrounding the law in Galatians and covenants questions involved the issue of the results of obedience to laws both moral and ceremonial. "If faith alone is the condition, and not obedience, as some tell us, why does the Lord himself, in every instance, use the words 'keep,' 'observe,' 'do,' and 'obey' instead of the word 'faith,' stressed Ballenger.⁴⁸

Ballenger reiterated his point in his concluding article and again exhibits the theological rationale of the pioneer system as it was approaching Adventism's time of eschatological destiny. Typical of the system was the denial of what was actually occurring:

Let me say again, reader, do not get the idea that I am trying to lessen your obligation to believe in Christ. Let me define my position once more. To make satisfaction for past sins, faith is everything. Precious indeed is that blood that blots out all our sins, and makes a clean record of the past. Faith only can make the promises of God our own. But present duty is ours to perform. When God says, "Today if ye hear his voice, harden not your heart," all depends upon how we hear. Justification or condemnation is ours to choose. Obey the voice of God and live, or disobey and die.⁴⁹

When W A Colcord, then secretary of the General Conference, wrote to

Ballenger and challenged his theological suppositions, Ballenger published the following "explanation" in the Review:

God spoke to Abraham and commanded him to do a certain act. That act, coupled with his faith, secured his justification. And what was true in his case is also true in ours. God speaks to us through His law and the testimony of Jesus, and when we obey, that act coupled with our faith, secures our justification. It seems to me to be so plain that even the way-faring man could not fail to see it.⁵⁰

Ballenger thus called for a faith that relied upon Christ for forgiveness and strength "that laughs at impossibilities, and cries, 'It must be done.'" "Such a faith as this," he affirmed, "we believe God's people will have under the pouring out of the latter rain, drops of which seem to be already falling."⁵¹

While Ballenger's articles were appearing in the Review, he attended the lectures of A T Jones at the 1891 Battle Creek ministers' institute and acknowledged to Jones at the conclusion of the institute his erroneous positions and said that he would write no such articles in the future.⁵²

Ellen White Warnings of Consequences of Treating Central Testing Truth of Justification Lightly. At Rome, New York, Mrs White told those assembled for the 1889 campmeeting that "the enemy of man and God" was not willing that the truth of justification by faith "should be clearly presented." While it was vital that "Christ should be preached as the only hope of salvation," treating the vital testing truth of justification with "indifference" would result not in increased understanding of it, but rather it "will become darkness." The history of theological aberrations that plagued the SDA church throughout the 1890s and beyond illustrates the truth of Mrs White's warning. She placed a large measure of responsibility upon Uriah Smith because of the spirit of animosity he fostered and wrote him: "The many and confused ideas in regard to Christ's righteousness and justification by faith are the result of the

position you have taken toward the men and the message sent of God."⁵³

Even at the Minneapolis session Mrs White had warned the delegates that it was a "terrible thing" to resist light God was presenting. She warned the individuals there assembled as well as the church: "God will withdraw His Spirit unless His truth is accepted."⁵⁴ Indeed, as Ellen White reflected upon the spirit exhibited at Minneapolis she "knew God would not illuminate the minds thus inflamed," and hoped that "God [would] forbid [that] anything should ever take place again like that which transpired at Minneapolis." Perceptions of the centrality of justification thus were sidetracked at Minneapolis.

Mrs White also warned, however, "The Lord will no more excuse the rejection of light in any one of those who claim to believe in the truth in our day than He excused the Jews for their rejecting light that came from the Lord's appointed agencies. In this our day the refusal to walk in the light leaves men in darkness always."⁵⁵

Clearly anticipating the dangers that would thus confront Adventism in the future, Ellen White wrote an unedited letter of warning to the General Conference president, O A Olsen, in August of 1890. Her writing and spelling is preserved in this highly significant document. Only sentence punctuation has been added:

The spirit of resistance that has been exhibited, in presenting the righteousness of Christ as our only hope has grieved the Spirit of God. . . . It has caused me great sadness of heart to see those who ought to be giving from the walls of Zion the trumpet a certain sound wholly in accordance with the work to be done for this time to prepare a people to stand in the day of the Lord, are in darkness, and have stood as sentinals to bar the way that the confusion they would create would bring confusion misunderstanding and Satan sees it is his time to make a strike and fanaticism and errors will prevail, and as the men who ought to have stood in the light--their voices heard on the right side of the question was exercised on the wrong side to oppose that which was of God and resist that message which the Lord sends, their position is seen to be wrong by very many and their crying danger fanaticism when there was no herisy and fanaticism when these evils really appear and they see the peril and try to avoid it they cannot do it. . . .

Satan fixed up the matter according to his own devices. Because the message of Sister White in testimonies given did not harmonize with their ideas the testimonies were made of no account—except it vindicated their ideas. Persistently have they followed their own ways in this matter that should reproof be given to the evils [which] will have arisen and will still arise the ones reproved will say, Sister Whites testimonies are no more reliable. . . .

Now the churches have a stumblock placed before their feet not easily removed, and if the ones who have been engaged in this do not see and realize where they have grieved the Spirit of God and make confession of their wrongs darkness will as surely gather more densely about their souls that they will be blinded and call light darkness and darkness light truth error, and they will not discern the light when it shall come, and will fight against it. . . .

I send you the enclosed. It may have effect on some honest in heart that they may be warned and correct their errors and reform. You can take a led pencil and errase that which is personal and read this to the camp meeting if you see fit.⁵⁶

Several months later Mrs White warned "brethren in responsible positions" that "those who are laborers together with God must work with pen and voice to meet the wrong tendencies, to correct the errors, that have been coming in among us" and extended the warning by observing: "I have been warned that henceforth we shall have a constant contest." She continued:

There will be those who are unable to perceive the most wonderful and important truths for this time, truths that are essential for their own safety and salvation, while matters that are in comparison as the merest atoms, matters in which there is scarcely a grain of truth, are dwelt upon and are magnified by the power of Satan so that they appear as of the utmost importance. The moral sight of these men is diseased; they do not feel the need of the heavenly anointing, that they may discern spiritual things. They think themselves too wise to err. Men who have not a daily experience in the things of God will not move wisely in dealing with sacred responsibilities. They will mistake light for error, and specious errors they will pronounce light, mistaking phantoms for realities, and realities for phantoms, calling a world an atom and an atom a world.

They will fall into deception and delusions, that Satan has prepared as concealed nets to entangle the feet of those who think they can walk in their human wisdom without the special grace of Christ. . . . There is only one remedy for the sinful soul, and unless this is received, men will accept one delusion after another, until their senses are perverted. . . . We [should] have a continual sense of our weakness and frailty and [should] look to Jesus in earnest prayer for his wisdom and efficiency. There will be times of despondency as we realize our unlikeness to Christ. . . . False views of God, and hence of Christ, are largely entertained today.⁵⁷

The church of the 1890s could not blame Ellen White for the frequency of its bouts with theological aberration, but it could claim one extenuating circumstance: everything pointed to the culmination of Adventism and it hardly seemed the appropriate time to modify past doctrines.

NOTES

1. Ellen White, "Camp-Meeting at Rome, New York," RH, Sept 3, 1889.
2. Ellen White, "Be Zealous and Repent," RH Extra, Dec 23, 1890.
3. Ellen White, "Counsels to Ministers #2: The Need of a True Concept of Righteousness by Faith," Sept 13, 1889, Ms 27-89
4. Ellen White to 1889 General Conference, B24-89.
5. Ellen White, "Looking Back at Minneapolis," c Dec, 1888, Ms 24-88.
6. Ellen White to Stephen Haskell, June 1, 1894, H27-94.
7. Emmett K Vande Vere, "Rugged Heart: The Story of George I Butler," p 29.
8. George Butler to Ellen White, Dec 24, 1886, GIB 1886 and Butler to Ellen White, Oct 1, 1888, GIB 1888, WE.
9. George Butler, "A Circular Letter to All State Conference Committees and Our brethren in the Ministry," RG 9, Documents 4, GCA.
10. L E Froom, Movement of Destiny, pp 157-58.
11. The author is indebted to an unpublished manuscript by Tom Norris for some of the material contained in the biographical sketches of Jones and Waggoner.
12. "Abridged biography and obituary of Dr Ellet Joseph Waggoner," PC 48 GCA; RH, March 5, 1908 (obituary of Mariette Waggoner); E J Waggoner to W C White, Aug 27, 1875, Waggoner 1875 WE.
13. E J Waggoner to W C White, July 27, 1880. Waggoner 1880 WE.
14. J H Waggoner, "California Campmeeting," ST, Oct 26, 1882; "California Conference," Ibid.
15. E J Waggoner, Everlasting Covenant (1900), preface; Waggoner, "The 'Confession of Faith' of Dr E J Waggoner" (1916), p 4.
16. Ibid; E J Waggoner to O A Olsen, Aug 21, 1890; RG 11, 1890W GCA.
17. Alonzo T Jones file, Regular Army Enlistment Papers, RG 94, Records of the Adjutant General's Office, National Archives, Washington, DC; Van Horn, "Walla Walla, WT," RH, June 2 and Aug 25, 1874, RH; "Funeral Services of A T Jones," American Sentinel, July, 1923.
18. RH, Aug 26, 1875.
19. ST, Oct 2, 1884.
20. Siegfried H Horn, SDA Bible Dictionary (1960), art "Justification," pp 616-17. See also SDA Encyclopedia (1966), art "Justification," pp 640-42.
21. "Last Sickness and Death of James White" (1881), p 54.
22. James White, "Eastern Tour," RH, Feb 8, 1881 and D M Canright, "My Remembrance of Eld White," RH, Aug 30, 1881.
23. Ellen White to W C White, Sept 12, 1881. W17-1881, MR 781.
24. Ellen White, Remarks at General Conference Bible School, Feb 3, 1890. Mss 9-1890. [Emphasis supplied.]
25. Minneapolis Tribune, Oct 23, 1888.
26. George Butler, "The Law in the Book of Galatians," p 3.
27. A T Jones to E G White, March 13, 1887; WCW bk A-2, pp 189-90.
28. Each of the views will be displayed in separate chapters.
29. Ellen White, RH, Nov 4, 1890 in 6BC 1073.
30. Ellen White to Uriah Smith, Sept 19, 1892, S24-92.
31. Review and Herald, "The Tabernacle Lecture Course Comprising a Series of Discourses Setting Forth the Doctrines of Seventh-day Adventists," p iii.
32. Ibid, p 122, 200.
33. George Butler, Lecture 17, *ibid*, pp 132-33, 136.
34. D M Canright, Lecture 18, *ibid*, p 143.
35. *Ibid*, p 259.
36. W H Littlejohn, "Justification by Faith Not a New Doctrine," RH, Jan 16, 1894.

37. Ibid, quoting Smith, Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation, 1865, p 589.
38. Ibid.
39. R F Cottrell, "Where Is the 'New Departure'?" RH, April 22, 1890.
40. Uriah Smith to Ellen White, Feb 17, 1890, WCW bk I; Smith, "Remarks of Eld Uriah Smith, Bible School," RG 11, Documents, Mss and Typescripts fld.
41. D T Jones to J H Morrison, March 17, 1890, RG 21, bk 2.
42. Dan T Jones to Willie White, March 18, 1890, RG 21, bk 2.
43. D T Jones to O A Olsen, Dec 17, 1891, RG 11, 1891J.
44. W A Colcord to W C White, Dec 23, 1891, RG 21, bk 7, reporting conversation Colcord had with Ballenger.
45. J F Ballenger, "Justification by Works," RH, Sept 29, 1891.
46. Ibid, Oct 6, 1891.
47. Ibid, Oct 13, 1891.
48. Ibid, Oct 13, 1891.
49. Ibid, Nov 24, 1891.
50. J F Ballenger, "An Explanation," RH, Nov 24, 1891, emphasis supplied.
51. Ibid.
52. W A Colcord to W C White, Dec 23, 1891, RG 21, bk 7.
53. Ellen White to Uriah Smith, Sept 19, 1892, S24-92.
54. Ellen White, "Advancing in Christian Experience," Sabbath Sermon, Oct 20, 1888, Ms 8-1888.
55. Ellen White to Brother Fargo, May 2, 1889, F59-89; Ellen White to Children of the Household, May 12, 1889, C14-89.
56. Ellen White to O A Olsen, Aug 27, 1890, original in GCA, emphasis supplied.
57. Ellen White, "Our Constant Need of Divine Enlightenment," Oct 1, 1890, emphasis supplied.

Chapter 2

The World of the Pioneers

Pioneers and Justification by Faith. The pioneer view of justification had been formalized at the General Conference session of 1882. The nature of its definition made it almost inevitable that its evangelistic thrust in Battle Creek in 1885 assume the focus it did. It is necessary to observe, however, that the pioneer position regarding justification maintained one perspective that the church desperately needed. That perspective would become all the more apparent when it is perceived that Jones and Waggoner lacked that very focus in their understanding of justification by faith.

In the 1882 study J H Waggoner, father of E J Waggoner, quoted the 19th century Protestant theologian Hooker to the affect that the justification spoken of by Paul in Romans, is "the treating of sinful man as though he were righteous" and was "without us, which we have by imputation." Waggoner emphasized that righteousness of faith was "what some one does for us," and was not the result of personal obedience.¹

While that objective view concerning justification is totally in harmony with the SDA Bible Dictionary statement, J H Waggoner, as did the rest of the pioneers, perceived of justification as applying solely to forgiveness. He emphasized, "Justification by faith is not a final procedure; it looks to something beyond itself to be accomplished in the future." To him, justification was not sufficient for salvation, but merely the means of making the individual "passively just" before God, "as Adam was just before God at his creation." Placed in that position, the individual's final salvation rested with his own performance, although the power to acceptably obey was considered to come from Christ. That perspective was considered the means of harmonizing the statements of James with that of Paul concerning justification. Waggoner affirmed: "James (chap 2) is not speaking of the past---of that over which our

actions have no control. He is speaking of the formation of character by our own actions. This is all accomplished after we are justified by faith."²

We can see that while the pioneers were strong on substitutionary, objective concepts of justification for the past, their position of rendering it solely to the past caused them to rely primarily upon sanctification as the basis of their hope of final salvation. It was the pioneer system as outlined in 1882 that would be confronted at Minneapolis in 1888. It seems apparent that the focus of that system was upon the performance of the individual and not upon the Christ that justified the world at the Cross. J H Waggoner illustrated the dilemma:

It will be seen that it is necessary, not only to do a work for man but, also, in him, in order to his complete justification. While the act of laying the penalty upon a substitute vindicates the majesty of the law, a change of heart or of disposition, a thorough amendment of life, can only give that guarantee which is demanded for the future. And this is called conversion. Justification by faith embraces all this. With anything less than this we cannot imagine that any one would stand justified before God.³

It is also apparent that the pioneers, especially George Butler and Uriah Smith, who were the foremost opposers of the "new" message of 1888, taught that justification and sanctification were inseparable in their view of salvation. Indeed, as in the previous statement, they often confounded or merged them and consequently confused the perfect work of Christ with sanctification. That observation is relevant in that it points out that something else was the element that was to provide Adventism its time of opportunity in 1888.

Uriah Smith defined his concept of salvation in the same terms as those outlined in 1882: "The plan of salvation, [is] designed to place every individual of the human family on his own responsibility in reference to his future destiny." Smith defined his belief in adequate righteousness through obedience by maintaining that Christ died to provide the means of forgiveness and release us from the "Adamic sin," but then "each one then stands upon his own merits."⁴

Adventism seemed plagued by the King James translation of Romans 3:24-5:

Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God.

The King James version gives the impression that God, because of the sacrifice of Christ, is willing to provide Christ's righteousness only to enable "remission" of past sins. The implication is that justification does not involve the present or deal with the fact that all "continue" to come short of the glory of God and constantly require Christ's imputed righteousness. The SDA Bible Commentary observes that "Paul is not speaking primarily of the sins of individuals before conversion, but of the sins of the world before the atoning death of Christ,"⁵ and the more recent Bible translations of the passage reflect that idea.

Nineteenth century Adventism, however, made other assumptions concerning that text. The pioneers interpreted it to mean that God forgave past sins and provided power to acceptably obey for the necessary righteousness of the future. As we will see, Jones and Waggoner interpreted it to mean that God gave his righteousness to take the place of the past sins and that perfect righteousness within the believer became the means of his overcoming in the future.⁶ The varying schools of theology would be brought into conflict over interpretations concerning the book of Galatians.

George Butler Presses for Confrontation Over Galatians. It was in June of 1886 that Butler reflected on his visit to Healdsburg and Oakland several months earlier and directly broached the controversy over the law Galatians to Ellen White. Some who had attended Healdsburg College met with Butler and apparently complained to him about "strenuous efforts" on the part of both Jones and E J Waggoner "to impress upon the minds of the theological students that the 'added law' of Galatians 3 and the law which is 'our schoolmaster' to bring us to Christ is the moral law of the commandments." It was not unusual

for ministers who had been active in denominational service for years to pursue theological study at either Healdsburg or Battle Creek College and it might be that some in that category had complained to Butler. The GC president observed that the "same arguments" were being published "more or less occasionally" in the Signs.⁷

Butler informed Mrs White that he was "positive" that the overwhelming majority of SDAs believed that the "added law" was the ceremonial law and that the ceremonial law was the central point of discussion by Paul in Galatians. He reminded her that although J H Waggoner, and now the "young brethren" in the office, held the other position, her husband, Uriah Smith, D M Canright, George Butler and "many others" held to the ceremonial law position. In fact, said Butler, those holding to the majority position had kept "rather quiet" on the law question in Galatians out of deference to those few who held to the other position, since "there was not unanimity of opinion on it by all our leading brethren." But, said Butler, "when we learn that the opposite view held by the minority is being vigorously pushed in one of our colleges among our Bible students and published to the world in the Signs, I confess it does not please me very well." Butler had lodged complaints to the manager of the Pacific Press, C H Jones, and the principle of Healdsburg College, Syndey Brownsberger, he informed Mrs White.⁸

Butler asked Ellen White to intervene for he had heard that some time in the past, Ellen White "had light"⁹ relative to the nature of the added law, "to the effect that it related to the remedial system rather than the moral law." Butler wanted the question "set at rest" and told Mrs White that "it would be a most bitter pill" to the "leading brethren" if the position publicized by Jones and Waggoner should prevail.

Butler ended his letter with a significant revelation of his theological premises. He considered that transgression of the moral law had "required

another law to be added," and that added law, which to him was the ceremonial law, was indeed "a remedy for sin." Butler clearly believed that there was meritorious virtue attached to obedience even in obedience to the "law of ordinances," and hence it was thus the believer's obedience, rather than faith in Christ's merits, that became the "remedy for sin."¹⁰

Since Butler had not heard from Ellen White concerning the Galatians controversy, he wrote her again in two months. This time he added the complaint that the issue had been raised in the Sabbath School lessons and he was now receiving complaints from "various localities," and the position taken by Waggoner was "causing great debate, and stirring up a spirit of discussion and controversy and making trouble." While Butler disliked referring this matter to Ellen White again, he expressed vehement opposition to "making of our colleges, Sabbath School lessons and pioneer papers [Signs], the vehicle for presenting theological views not believed by two-thirds or three-fourths of the denomination."¹¹

It is interesting to note that, although Ellen White had not directly answered Butler in the manner one would normally expect, analysis of the Ellen White writings reveals that even months prior to Butler's first Galatians letter, Ellen White had addressed the relational and theological issues that would surround the Galatians controversy:

In dealing with our brethren, we must remember that they are children of God, and that he will teach one of his faithful workers as readily as he will teach another. There is no respect of persons with him. He would not have any man receive the idea that God will teach him only, and that all must come to his light. . . .

The Bible, and the Bible alone [i.e., not Butler's view of past interpretations of Galatians], is to be our creed, the sole bond of union; all who bow to this holy word will be in harmony. Our own views and ideas must not control our efforts. Man is fallible, but God's word is infallible. Instead of wrangling with one another, let men exalt the Lord.¹²

Butler's view of inspiration, however, militated against resolving a current issue by such use of Ellen White, especially when the principles quoted

contained no evidence that they were received through vision.¹³ Additionally, Butler's view of the presidency, and his entire theological system, as well as the eschatological setting, militated against any patience with a theology that on the surface seemed to weaken traditional SDA defenses of the Sabbath.

It is apparent that Ellen White had received Butler's initial Galatians letter, for W C White wrote to E J Waggoner of his awareness of Butler's irritation on the point and that White wished "our brethren might give this matter a thorough, candid examination, and agree on some common ground." W C White also wrote to C H Jones about the misfortune that the church was "so unsettled on this law question." While it was unfortunate to have the nontraditional position taught at Healdsburg, White hoped that a "candid comparison of ideas" would lessen the points of conflict. White affirmed that he had "tried to avoid taking any responsibility in the matter because I realized that I did not understand it," but had not advised E J Waggoner about publishing the controversial articles that were then "going through the Signs." Already W C White was receiving some blame for the controversy and the blame he would receive would intensify.¹⁴

White made additional observations about the Galatians issue and reported that while his mother had received some "light," in the past concerning the "added" law of Galatians 3, that matter had "passed from her mind." While there appeared to be something in Eld J H Waggoner's position that was "incorrect" W C White observed, "Our brethren may have used this fact to condemn much more than it [Ellen White's light] really referred to." He reported that his mother had sent "for her old manuscript in the hope of finding, or recalling what she has seen on this subject, but I do not know how the matter will come out."¹⁵ W C White urged that Ellet be named a delegate to the 1886 GC to discuss the Galatians issue and that he would "act with all modesty and discretion in maintaining and presenting his views." White

observed that the "unfortunate position" of Ellet's father "will make it very easy for prejudice to arise and interfere with a candid hearing." White, however, had a portent of doom for while he believed Ellet was essentially correct in his Galatians position, he could see "that he is getting into a tight spot."¹⁶

In Butler's second appeal to Mrs White on the Galatians question, he reminded her of its past history of controversy within the denomination and of the fact that he himself had refrained from writing on Galatians because "some persons of high standing in the church" had maintained a variant position. Initially, the position currently held by J H Waggoner had been the dominant position, but Stephen Pierce of Vermont had traveled to Battle Creek "under a great burden" to present the ceremonial law position "to the leading brethren. James White and Uriah Smith became convinced of the Pierce position and Butler believed "the time has come for this question to be settled." Butler felt "impressed to write a brief comment¹⁷ on the Epistle to the Galatians with reference to the question." He made it plain, however, that he would only publish his thoughts for "all our leading brethren."¹⁸

It was clear, as Butler continued his letter to Mrs White, that he was preparing for a confrontation regarding the Galatians issue and intended not to let Ellet Waggoner's publishing on the issue pass without response. Since the Signs had "brought it out in the most public manner possible," Butler saw no alternative to a discussion. While Butler pleaded to "hear from [Ellen White]" on this question, he affirmed "it would be quite a shock to me, after studying the question so long and having it seem so clear to me, if it should be shown to you the position I hold was wrong." If that should happen, Butler said, he would be silent on the issue even though he could "not clearly understand it." He saw this as the "only proper position to take, while we acknowledge the gifts of the Spirit."¹⁹

If Ellen White wanted to resolve the Galatians question to the satisfaction of George Butler and prevent a severe confrontation between Butler and Jones and Waggoner, she could do so only by having a vision or claiming to have a vision on the subject. As we will later discover, Ellen White pursued quite a different course.

1886 GC: "That Terrible Conference." Both Ellen White and George Butler agreed that the 1886 General Conference session held in Battle Creek was indeed a "terrible conference." While Adventists were now being tested from without by increasing religious persecution on a worldwide scale, it was the issues that sprang from within that caused that negative evaluation of the session. Major issues of disunity were friction between J H Kellogg (leading light of the medical fraternity) and administrative leadership, theology of the book of Galatians and moral lapses within the SDA ministry. One additional issue receiving its share of attention concerned church organization. That issue had been before GC sessions for the last several years and was assuming increasing importance.

George Butler and Church Leadership. As early as the 1882 GC, J H Waggoner introduced a resolution that would disseminate the decision-making authority of the General Conference Committee by increasing its membership from three to five members. Since that committee was not resident in any particular location, it clearly would have had the additional effect of increasing localized authority. Although the majority of the delegates favored the action in 1882 (24 yeas and 18 nays), it lost because of the three-fourths majority needed to amend the GC Constitution. While the delegates at the 1883 session voted unanimously to increase the Committee to five, a move to increase it to seven lost. An additional thrust against centralization occurred at the 1884 session when an amazing resolution was approved that actually requested church members who were either not involved in missionary work at Battle Creek or who

could accomplish more in destitute fields to move from Battle Creek to accomplish that service. The 1886 session, by three-fourths vote, enlarged the General Conference Committee to seven members.²⁰

It was Ellen White, however, who observed that merely increasing the size of the General Conference Committee did not prevent it from being dominated by the GC president. By late 1888 she considered that "a sick man's mind has had a controlling power over the General Conference Committee and the ministers have been the shadow and echo of Elder Butler about as long as it is healthy and for the good of the cause." She believed that the 54-year-old Butler had held that office "three years too long and now all humility and lowliness of mind have departed from him."²¹ It is thus clear that Butler's views of the presidency created the major organizational issue of the period and those views greatly influenced how he would relate to any theological innovations.

George Butler was first elected to the presidency of the GC in 1871. By 1873 the denomination was suffering from disunity within its leadership structure and Butler sought to alleviate the tension between James White and other church leaders. At the 1873 GC session Butler presented an essay on church leadership that he considered would help rectify the situation. His focus was clear from his initial sentence: "There never was any great movement in this world without a leader." Butler went on to distinguish between a "true leader" and a tyrant, the former being a kind of benevolent potentate, with the good of those he represented uppermost in his objectives while the latter sought power for selfish gratification. Butler looked at the Biblical giants and observed: "There is not a single important movement spoken of in Scripture but that some person was chosen in it, to lead out."²²

While Butler was willing to concede that Jesus was the true head of the church, still "some men are placed higher in authority in the church than others," and during periods of special emergencies such leaders were given even

greater insight. The implications were obvious as Butler concluded by focusing upon the SDA church: "We believe we have the truth of God for the last days--a special message of warning to the world, containing the most fearful threatening in the Bible, and the principles upon which a grand reform is based, preparatory to Christ's coming." Thinking he was paving the way for the return of James White to leadership, Butler rhetorically asked, "Has no person or persons any special responsibilities laid upon them in such a time as this?" God had consistently laid such responsibilities upon His chosen leaders for 6,000 years and would He do otherwise "when we reach the closing message of probation, the greatest of all movements?"²³

Although the 1873 GC session endorsed the Butler position and "hereby express[ed] . . . full purpose of heart faithfully to regard these principles," and invited all the brethren to unite in that action, James White soon had to second thoughts and in a series of four articles in the Signs which he edited, argued against that GC resolution. He forcefully maintained that "Christ is the only authorized leader of his people," and that at no time during Christ's ministry did He "intimate that any one of his disciples should be designated as their leader." White rejoiced that "the Christian church has no use for the pope," and that church leadership was not ordained to "order, or to command the church, and 'to lord it over God's heritage.'" Differences settled by such concepts of church authority "are seldom really settled at all." White clearly analyzed the differing perspectives between himself and Butler in suggesting that the purpose of church organization was "to secure unity of action" within the church by protecting it from outside intrusion and such organization was not to be used as a means "to compel obedience." He continued:

Human creeds cannot produce unity. Church force cannot press the church into one body. This has been tried, and has proved a failure. Christ never designed that human minds should be moulded for Heaven by the influence merely of other human minds.²⁴

It was a strong indication to the fervency to which James White held to his concept of church organization that he would publish his views despite the fact that they clearly contradicted a resolution passed at a GC session. White wanted that point clear for he told the 1875 GC session that "almost immediately" after the 1873 session he prepared those articles "before he knew that any objection was raised against" the approved position. At that same 1875 session, Butler submitted a resolution that rescinded the previous action approving his position on leadership.

James White still had the subject on his mind in 1878 when he editorialized in the Review that most of the readers of that paper were aware that some five years ago "a mistaken view" was accepted on the question of leadership, "insomuch that the position was taken that one man was to be recognized as the visible leader of SDAs, as Moses was the visible leader of the Hebrews." White affirmed that he was especially pained over the situation because he himself was considered that visible leader. James enunciated important principles that could have prevented the forthcoming explosion at the 1886 GC:

Our long experience in the general, successful management of matters pertaining to the cause gave our people confidence in us, and has had a tendency to lead them to look to us and lean upon our judgment too much. This experience we gained by anxious study and earnest prayer. Our brethren can obtain it in the same way. They should have looked to God more and gained individual experience. For the wrong, God has in wisdom removed us from them for a time, and we fear that the removal will be final unless they learn to look to God for themselves. We do not object to counseling with our brethren, if it can be taken as simply the opinion of one who is frail and liable to err, but when it comes to this that brethren demand of us our opinion, and add that they shall do just what we say, we shall withhold our opinion.²⁵

It becomes apparent that, although Butler's views had modified to some extent, he still maintained a view of the GC presidency that was more exalted than that enunciated by James White. In early 1886 Butler had noted to Ellen White his striving "to overcome on that hardest of all points" to himself, the

feeling of depression that came "with such power" as he had when things went contrary to his will. Indeed, Butler considered that the cause of his prolonged illness during the months preceding the 1886 GC was due to the agitation on the Galatians question. As custodian of traditional SDA theology Butler attributed his 1886 illness to the fact that his "mind was filled with perplexity and anxiety" over the course pursued by Jones and Waggoner. After several months of illness in 1886 he rallied and "was finally able to go through that terrible conference."²⁶

Butler informed Ellen White that he never before had seen "a more barefaced and defiant course" taken on a "controverted question" and that even though he "held the position of president of the General Conference," he had not published on the Galatians issue. He revealingly displayed his concept of his prerogatives as GC president: "One might naturally suppose that one holding the highest position that our people could impose, that I should have some little right to say something in regard to such questions." Waggoner should not have published, but as a minimum "at least the president of the General Conference should have a little intimation that something of this kind was in the wind" prior to its publication. Even Ellen White received some admonition from Butler: "If you are prepared, my dear Sister White, to treat the highest officer in this body thus, and that is the policy you wish to introduce and sustain, I wish you to tell me so." Although Butler had "too much confidence" in Ellen White to believe she would sustain that position "for one moment," he did not believe "that that is the proper way for the president of the General Conference to be used, and in behalf of the office made honorable before our people I shall contend in its behalf, and protest against such manner of doing."²⁷

Ellen White and 1886 Organizational Issues. In a letter written to Butler

in late 1885 and perhaps interlineated as issues intensified, Ellen White clearly perceived the central issue:

God does not require you to take such a course that the workers in New York or anywhere else shall not feel at liberty to make advance movements unless they can consult you, and ask what your judgment of the matter is before they advance. I cannot sanction the idea that you must have a personal oversight of all the details of the work. If I did the result would be that no worker would dare to exercise his own judgment in anything. The workers would have to rely upon one man's brain and one man's judgment, and the result would be that men would be left in inefficiency because of their inactivity.²⁸

Mrs White went on to make the inspired observation that unless workers individually perceived their duty, "they will not recognize the work of God when the loud cry of the third angel shall be heard." She warned Butler of what would become his own personal danger: "When the light goes forth to lighten the earth, instead of coming up to the help of the Lord, they will want to bind about his work to meet their narrow ideas." She continued:

Let me tell you that the Lord will work in this last work in a manner very much out of the common order of things, and in a way that will be contrary to any human planning. There will be those among us who will always want to control the work of God, to dictate even what movements shall be made when the work goes forward under the direction of the angel who joins the third angel in the message to be given to the world. God will use ways and means by which it will be seen that he is taking the reins in his own hands. The workers will be surprised by the simple means that he will use to bring about and perfect his work of righteousness.²⁹

About this same time Mrs White wrote jointly to Butler and S N Haskell with similar warnings: "God has not given to special ones all the brain power there is in the world," she observed. "Take your hands off the work, and do not hold it fast in your grasp," she counseled and warned of the danger to the church: "May God pity the cause when one man's mind and one man's plan is followed without question." She alluded to a concept that was to assume ever-increasing prominence in her writings that related to the "mingling" of various "elements of mind and character" in the church. That mingling allowed a "view [of] matters from an entirely different" perspective and thus as a means of

more fully perceiving truth. In this communication Mrs White mentioned the failures of J N Andrews and J N Loughborough to perceive that necessity and the result was retardation of SDA work in Europe, England and California.³⁰

At the time of the 1888 GC session, Mrs White would make an amazing revelation to Butler about the importance of this issue and specifically relate it to the 1886 GC session. Her revelation was presented to Butler in such a way that it should have been accepted even given his restricted view of the inspiration of Ellen White, for it came as a consequence of a vision. The vision provides a remarkable analysis of the period we have been examining and a synopsis of SDA history up to and beyond 1888.

Ellen White agreed with Butler's evaluation of the 1886 session as "that terrible conference" and told of how she, although in Europe at the time, "was a spectator [to] the scenes that transpired at that meeting." Her "guide" led Mrs White to see the "attitude of some of the ministers, yourself in particular, at that meeting, and I can say with you, my brother, it was a terrible conference." What the church lacked, according to Mrs White's guide, was "the energy of Christ," and he admonished that SDAs should look carefully to the Bible for it alone contained the proper knowledge of the will of God. Mrs White reported that "a time of trial" was before the church and "great evils would be the result of the Pharisaism which has in a large degree taken possession of those who occupy important position in the work of God." No doubt referring to the new message sounding within Adventism, Mrs White reported that the guide said "that the work of Christ upon the earth was to undo the heavy burdens and let the oppressed go free; to break every yoke, and the work of his people must correspond with the work of Christ."

With overwhelming significance Mrs White observed that the guide "stretched out his arms toward Dr Waggoner and to you, Elder Butler, and said in substance as follows:--'Neither have all the light upon the law, neither

position is perfect.'" Was that heavenly gesture toward both Ellet Waggoner and George Butler a dramatic call for the necessity of a unified approach to the new message that would combine the best of the new with the old? Certainly, SDA history would continue to reveal that the two groups needed each other.³¹

While the observation concerning Pharisaism directly challenged the traditional theology of sufficient righteousness accruing from obedience to the law, it could also have had relevance to the bankruptcy of such theology to be exposed at the 1886 session by the widespread examples of immorality within the ministry. Concepts of leadership were also exposed as being inadequate, and all of this was happening within a framework of eschatology that proclaimed that the return of Jesus was imminent. There was a new message focusing upon the righteousness of Christ as the only safeguard for those last days, but even those who were most forward in sounding that new message maintained erroneous elements in their theological system. Could there have been a more effective revelation than one that sought to bring Waggoner and Butler together and suggested the Bible, not past church positions, as the only test of truth?

Galatians Discussion, 1886. There was no hesitancy regarding Butler's determination to confront E J Waggoner over the Galatians question at the session. Two days prior to the beginning of the session, Butler wrote Mrs White that "we expect to call our good Signs brethren to an account for the way they have done in reference to some of the disputed points of our faith, the law in Galatians." He objected that the articles appearing in the Signs were being set forth "as the opinion of this denomination." Butler prepared an 85-page pamphlet, "The Law in the Book of Galatians: Is It the Moral Law or Does It Refer to That System of Laws Peculiarly Jewish," dated it November 18, 1886, the date of the opening of the session and made it available to the delegates.³²

The appointment of a theological committee to examine such questions had become standard procedure by the 1886 session and at the fourth meeting a motion for the chairman to appoint a committee of nine prevailed. While Butler had authority to load such a committee with those of his own perspective, he chose not to appoint the committee himself and Stephen Haskell was asked to chair and appoint the committee with the understanding that both Haskell and Butler would be on that committee. Butler, Haskell, Canright, E J Waggoner, J H Morrison, Uriah Smith, M C Wilcox, B L Whitney and William Covert were named as the 1886 Theological Committee.

As an appropriate preliminary to the consideration of the issues surrounding the law in Galatians (when the New Testament church wrestled with the issue of circumcision and salvation), the committee rendered a report that observed "with regret that in some places certain persons have urged the subject of rebaptism as necessary to salvation" and observed that while most people who join the SDA church from other church bodies eventually choose to be rebaptized, "it should not be urged upon any one as necessary to salvation."³³

While Butler believed himself justified in providing the delegates and "leading ministers" in the denomination a copy of his pamphlet, he seemed chafed when E R Jones wrote him that E J Waggoner had come "loaded for the conflict." Butler became even more irate, however, when both B L Whitney and S N Haskell, who were living with Butler as his guests during the session, seemed to support Ellet. In fact Butler alleged that "Elder E J Waggoner came to the General Conference expressly to fight this battle under the patronage of Elder S N Haskell." That situation brought Butler into a most "trying and unpleasant position." Butler chafed:

Brother Haskell comes on and comes into my private family, enjoying my hospitality throughout the meeting, with Brother B L Whitney also, both filled with this spirit of opposition. They knew well my feelings. They knew well what perplexity and trouble of mind I had over these things and yet their influence sustained Dr Waggoner every way they knew how during the whole meeting. Their great effort

was to keep Dr Waggoner from being censured and help all they could. Eld Whitney, at least, took occasion to go out and collect little knots of brethren of those whom they supposed were not so well posted on the subject and spent hours of time in having Dr Waggoner indoctrinate them in their view of this subject. This I knew was going on. Some of my friend happened to catch them at it several times, how many I have never known.³⁴

Butler was also incensed that the committee thwarted his plans for centuring both Jones and Waggoner and the Signs for publishing on the controverted questions of the 10 kingdoms and Galatians. One thing that hindered the Butler plan was Ellet's statement before the committee that he had consulted with W C White prior to publication and had his endorsement and even thought his position was endorsed by Ellen White. The assertion seemed to confirm Butler's suspicions of W C White for he knew "E J Waggoner was not a fool, and would not go on in this bold and unprecedented manner on his own responsibility." He would later write Ellen White that "your son W C White" was more responsible for the controversy "than any other man," and he even went so far as to imply that Ellen White herself had her "influence" in "some way lugged in" though he did not believe she had intended it to be. "Such a course was taken that no censure could be placed where it really belonged," complained Butler, as he decried the course taken by Haskell and Whitney who were "eating at my own table," but who prevented the censure.³⁵

The committee itself seems to have focused very little on the actual theological issues involved, but centered primarily upon the administrative questions concerning teaching the Galatians theology and publishing it. This was perhaps because after "an argument of several hours" the committee became deadlocked over the theological issue with Haskell, Whitney, M C Wilcox and Waggoner opposed by Smith, Canright, Covert, Morrison and Butler. The committee then unanimously approved the following resolution drawn up by Butler:

WHEREAS, Both the Holy Scriptures and the Testimonies of the Spirit represent that unity in the work of God is of paramount

importance, setting forth at the same time the grand truth that this message is designed to lead to the unity of the faith; and--

WHEREAS, If this object is to be attained, it is necessary that it be kept constantly in view in our educational institutions and in our periodicals, and that we avoid as far as possible the agitation, in a public manner, of those questions concerning which there may be from any cause a difference of opinion among ourselves, and also avoid the introduction of points of doctrine contrary to the established faith of the body, before they are carefully considered by our leading brethren; therefore--

RESOLVED, That this Conference earnestly recommend that the official boards of our schools, our Sabbath-school authorities, and the editors of our papers exercise great care not to permit doctrinal views not held by a fair majority of our people to be made a part of the public instruction of said schools, or to be published in our denominational papers, as if they were the established doctrines of this people, before they are examined and approved by the leading brethren of experience.³⁶

Ellet felt somewhat frustrated as had Jones when he sought counsel from "leading brother" Smith on the make-up of the 10 kingdoms of Daniel's visions. He "very much regretted that every moment of time was so occupied" that he could have no personal conversations concerning Galatians with Butler at the 1886 session and that there was insufficient time to consider the points of theology. The issue had been discussed "to a very limited extent in the meetings of the Theological Committee," but was hardly satisfactory "to any party concerned."³⁷ Waggoner shortly resorted to the solution Butler had undertaken, and prepared a pamphlet.

It should also be noted that the principle of consulting with the leading brethren originated during a period when the organizational structure assumed that denominational work would be guided by a central headquarters, and prior to any ministerial training program. Ellen White would later write, "When we first met in Conference [i.e., 1863] it was thought that the General Conference should extend over the whole world. But this is not in God's order."³⁸ This organizational concept was in transition during the 1880s. At the 1888 GC session Ellen White would further elaborate upon this principle when some considered that Galatians should not be discussed at that session because of

the absence of the leading spokesman for the ceremonial position, George Butler.

The Theological Committee had considered the possibility of bringing the Galatians question before the entire session, but Butler opposed since he feared "a big public fight over it." Although he had circulated his own pamphlet to all the delegates, he believed that consideration by the full conference "would be most unhappy and result only in heat and debate." Butler expressed frustration over the defeat of his resolution to the effect that "we could not see in the course pursued by the Signs a harmony with the principles set forth in the [approved] preambles and resolution . . . in regard to the Law in Galatians and in regard to the Ten Kingdoms." When Butler asked the committee members if they considered that the Signs had pursued a proper course in publishing on Galatians and the kingdoms, "only E J Waggoner could be found to justify it." Butler clearly became more embittered by his experiences on this Theological Committee:

Every one on the Committee had to admit that Elder Jones' course in publicly attacking the position that the Huns were one of the Ten Kingdoms, the position held by all of our writers for forty years, published in all our books treating on the subject before it was laid before our leading brethren, was inconsistent. But of course it must not be said before our brethren. The course could be taken and spread before the world which they had to admit was wrong, but it must not be even hinted at in public. . . .

I feel when I see some of my brethren like Brother Haskell and other prominent brethren for what seems to me policy, to sustain what they happen to be connected whether right or wrong, a sadness I cannot express. Some of these things have pretty near taken the heart all out of me and made me feel that the holding of office and bearing such heavy responsibilities is more than I can endure. . . .

I think ere long . . . the old hands like me will stand aside and let our young irrepressible brethren take the field. . . . The young men are evidently coming to the front, and the old ones better give place.³⁹

It was after the explosive 1886 GC that Butler again appealed to Ellen White concerning the Galatians controversy and noted that he had written her previously on that subject "to which you have never made reply." He again decried the airing of the question at Healdsburg and through the Signs. He

then made remarkably revealing statement concerning his concept of Ellen White's role: "We have been waiting for years to hear from you on the subject, knowing that its agitation would end only in debate." Rather than risk the controversy involved in a scriptural analysis of the varying positions, Butler had anticipated that at some point the Lord would give Ellen White a vision and the issue would thereby be resolved. Butler was willing to allow that both he and the others had the prerogative of changing their interpretations of Galatians, "till God shall speak," and then if the president found his views "condemned," he would at least "close [his] mouth."⁴⁰

Yet once more in 1886 would Butler allude to the Galatians controversy to Ellen White. He told Mrs White that he believed that was "twice as much sectional feeling" with the Pacific Coast brethren as there was in Battle Creek. He felt so strongly on that issue that "nothing short of a testimony from heaven would change" his opinion. It was because of the position taken by the Signs in "publishing things that were opposed to the principles of our faith," that had done more than anything to injure the influence of the Signs with many and, while Butler regretted the situation, did not see how the spirit of disunion could be placed on his shoulders. While Butler recognized that Ellen White maintained no sectional feelings, he could not "say the same of all who have acted a leading part in the work" without violating his true convictions. Ellen White's son, W C White, was uppermost in Butler's mind as he wrote those words and that conviction would continue until Butler's retirement in 1888.⁴¹

The Gospel Sickle and the Voice of Traditional Adventism. In response to the increasing agitation over the Sunday question, the 1883 GC had voted to publish a paper "whose mission shall be to oppose this Sunday law enforcement."⁴² Thus was born the Sabbath Sentinel, published by the Review. Although the 1884 GC session voted to continue the publication of the paper, it

did so with the proviso that a committee be appointed "to determine the method of its further publication and management, a change of its name, etc."⁴³ The appointed committee of five: J H Waggoner, S N Haskell, W C White, Uriah Smith and A R Henry, could not come to an agreement and thus recommended to discontinue the Sabbath Sentinel. Criticisms of the paper, primarily from J H Waggoner, created a confrontational situation where the Review offered the paper to the Signs to publish, but the Signs management was unsure that they could financially manage the enterprise. The major criticism concerned the prominence given the Sabbath question in the Sentinel with the thought that such was limiting the circulation possibilities of the paper to non-SDAs.

In 1885, the Signs office moved toward publishing the American Sentinel, and the 1885 GC session "Resolved, That we recommend the publication, at the office of the Review and Herald, of a journal . . . to be used in ship and city missions, in distributors, and wherever a small paper will best serve the wants of the cause," and hence was born the Gospel Sickle. The Sickle purported to be a new "pioneer paper, full of the stirring truths of the last message of warning to the world." It affirmed that it would "speak in no uncertain terms," was "designed for sharp work," and to "bristle all over with the pointed truths of the last message," and would "cover a wider range than the Sabbath Sentinel did, presenting a more extensive view of the present truth."⁴⁴

If the "new message" sounding within Adventism could be summarized in the word "gift" and by a central text, Romans 10:4, the message of traditional Adventism as evidenced in the "Gospel" Sickle could be summarized by the word "obedience" and its central text could be found in Revelation 22:14: "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life."

In its initial issue, Uriah Smith pointed his readers to the "chief difference" between SDAs and other religious bodies by looking to the Sabbath

and "the interpretation of certain prophecies" that indicated the "second advent of Christ is now near at hand."⁴⁵ The pioneers considered themselves besieged by others within the ranks in the very areas they considered most vital to Adventism. The Sickle became the organ of the traditional defenses of the Sabbath, the traditional exposition of the prophecies, complete with all the nondescript, but artistically reproduced beasts of prophecy. It was not long before the Huns, Galatians, covenants, and righteousness questions were prominently discussed.

Disunity was apparent within the denomination over various sectional and special interests, but the most intense conflict was beginning over the traditional versus the new message. Each perspective had its publications, spokesmen, and focus. This brief section will look solely at the Sickle view of justification by faith.

In the second month of its existence the Sickle published its interpretation of Romans 10:4: "For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to everyone that believeth." As we will discover the perspective concerning this text was quite the opposite from the Jones-Waggoner usage. After making the point that "end" meant "object," and not termination of the law, the editors affirmed:

In Rom 10:4, Christ is the object or purpose of the law to all who believe in him. The object of the law was that man might develop a holy character by obedience, and stand at last righteous before God. This no man can now do by the law, because all have sinned, that is, have transgressed the law. But Christ does this for us by providing pardon for all our sins, and giving us a nature to delight in and keep the law ever after, and thus present us at last as perfect before God as if we had always kept the law.⁴⁶

Notice the absence of consideration of the fact that Christ was the object of the law for righteousness. The pioneers considered that through the strength provided by Christ, the full righteousness that the law required was demanded of the believer. The development of a "holy character" through adequate obedience was the demand of the pioneer system. Because of sin, the

analysis continues, it was not initially possible to develop the necessary character solely through obedience, but Christ's death again makes this possible, since forgiveness and a changed nature bring one back to where, in effect, he can develop a holy character by obedience. The absence of a concept that extended justification beyond the forgiveness of sins "that are past" was devastating to pioneer theology. We must again observe that the Jones-Waggoner analysis of the same text stressed the "for righteousness" element and also stressed that the righteousness subjectively given for forgiveness was also given for acceptable obedience. Christ's righteousness was constantly seen as the only acceptable righteousness, and that righteousness was consistently perceived by them as a gift.

In May of 1886, the Sickle, published its concept of righteousness by obedience in all its starkness in publishing a two-part series written by a H Wren, apparently an Adventist layman. The fact that the article was reprinted from the Review, lends added authority to its content. The author contended that the law would actually "secure immortality to all who are loyal to it." This was so because the law had no condemnation to those who were in harmony with it. Hence that law "will not destroy such itself, neither will it permit any other power to do so." The author affirmed that since the law required eternal obedience, "the immortality of the obedient is a necessary conclusion." The author seemed to take his concept of acceptable righteousness through obedience to its logical conclusion:

The law demands the resurrection of the just, the creation of the new heavens and the new earth, and the setting up of the everlasting kingdom of Christ. How can this all be? As follows: Those who have died in the Lord have died loyal to his law. And we have seen that the law can neither destroy, nor permit any other power to destroy, its supporters; to permit such a thing would be to abandon its sovereign character, just as to destroy them itself would be to abandon its righteous character. Hence it is evident that the law of God must call for the resurrection of its dead loyal subjects; for without such resurrection their destruction is permitted.⁴⁷

Mrs White observed that "a pain comes to my heart every time I see the Sickle. She did not believe the paper provided a useful function and created unnecessary dissension and was "not as God would have it."⁴⁸ While the Sickle ceased publication in 1888, its message of acceptable righteousness through obedience was evidenced throughout Adventism. We will look at two specific examples.

NOTES

1. [J H Waggoner], "Justification by Faith," p 2 [pamphlet].
2. Ibid, pp 8-10, emphasis in original.
3. Ibid, pp 16-17.
4. Uriah Smith, "The Penalty of Adam's Sin," Gospel Sickle, Sept 15, 1888.
5. SDA Bible Commentary, Vol 6, p 507.
6. Both the pioneer and Jones and Waggoner concepts of justification will be more carefully analyzed in separate chapters.
7. G I Butler to Ellen White, June 20, 1886; GIB 1886 WE.
8. Ibid.
9. Probably meaning to Butler that Mrs White had received a vision on this subject and that would have resolved the issue for him.
10. Ibid.
11. G I Butler to Ellen White, Aug 23, 1886; GIB 1886 WE.
12. Ellen White, "A Missionary Appeal," RH, Dec 15, 1885.
13. Butler's views on inspiration and on leadership will be analyzed in later chapters.
14. W C White to E J Waggoner, WCW bk A-1, p 267; W C White to C H Jones, WCW bk A-1, pp 288-90.
15. The relevant manuscript has apparently never been identified.
16. W C White to C H Jones, *ibid*.
17. His pamphlet, completed Nov 18, 1886, contained 85 pages.
18. G I Butler to Ellen White, Aug 23, 1886; GIB 1886 WE.
19. Ibid.
20. Records of 1882, 1883, 1884, 1886 General Conference Sessions, GCA.
21. Ellen White to Mary White, Nov 4, 1888, W82-1888, MR 248.
22. George Butler, "Leadership," RH, Nov 18, 1873.
23. Ibid.
24. records of 1873 GC Session, GCA; James White, "Leadership," ST, June 4, 11, 25 and July 9, 1874.
25. Records of 1875 GC Session, GCA; James White, "Leadership," RH, May 23, 1878.
26. George Butler to Ellen White, Oct 1, 1888; GIB 1888 WE.
27. Ibid.
28. Ellen White to George Butler, [Nov 1, 1885], B5-1885, portion printed in TM 297-300.
29. Ibid, emphasis supplied. Also found in RG11, Special Testimonies, 1850-96 volume, GCA.
30. Ellen White to George Butler and Stephen Haskell, Oct 28, 1885, B12-1885. Portions printed in TM, 301-04.
31. Ellen White to George Butler, Oct 14, 1888, B21-1888.
32. George Butler to Ellen White, Nov 16, 1886; GIB 1886 WE.
33. Records of 1886 GC Session, 4th meeting and meetings of Nov 21 and Dec 6, 1886, GCA.
34. George Butler to Ellen White, Dec 16, 1886, GIB 1886 WE and Butler to Ellen White, Oct 1, 1888, GIB 1888 WE.
35. George Butler to Ellen White, Oct 1, 1888; GIB 1888 WE.
36. Records of 1886 GC, Dec 6, 1886, GCA.
37. E J Waggoner, "The Gospel in the Book of Galatians," Feb 10, 1887, pp 3-4.
38. Ellen White, 1901 General Conference Bulletin, pp 68-9.
39. George Butler to Ellen White, Dec 16, 1886; GIB 1886 WE.
40. G I Butler to Ellen White, Dec 16, 1886; GIB 1886 WE.
41. G I Butler to Ellen White, Dec 28, 1886; GIB 1886 WE.
42. Actions of 1883 GC Session, Res 28, GCA.
43. Action of 1884 GC, Nov 19, 1884, GCA.

44. G I Butler to W C White, Sept 4, 1885, GIB 1885 WE; Butler, "Why This Paper Is Published," Gospel Sickle, Feb 1, 1886.
45. Uriah Smith, "Seventh-day Adventists: Who Are They?", Gospel Sickle, Feb 1, 1886.
46. "Texts Explained," Gospel Sickle, March 15, 1886.
47. H Wren, "Wonders of the Law," Gospel Sickle, May 1 and 15, 1886.
48. Ellen White to E J Waggoner and A T Jones, Feb 18, 1887, B37-1887.

Chapter 2a

The Pioneer World on Exhibit

E P Daniels and Adventism's Pre-1888 Message in Action. Even before Ellen White left her home church in Healdsburg, California, for her European mission in 1885, the seeds were present that would bloom into "strange teachings" while she was absent. Before leaving, Mrs White had criticized that church for its lukewarmness and lack of response to the frequent counsels she had given to them. Because of their concept of self-sufficiency, she determined to leave them to their own devices. Shortly after Ellen White left for Europe, E P Daniels moved to fill that gap.¹

Daniels² had earlier served as a minister in Michigan and then as a stenographer for W C White and a reporter of the campmeeting sermons of Ellen White. In addition he had taught voice training and shorthand at Healdsburg. The Whites hoped that Daniels would become a "first class reporter and writer."³ Daniels became the spark for a spontaneous revival that began when he was asked to speak for a Sabbath service. Reaction to his initial sermon was such that church meetings were called for Sabbath evening and then two more meetings the next day. Thus began a remarkable series of meetings that extended for over five weeks and that offers deep insight into the theology of the times, even in the home church of Ellen White.

The focus of the meetings was neither justification, righteousness through Christ, nor even signs of the times, although the meetings certainly were colored by the conviction of the Healdsburg membership that final events were transpiring. Personal morality and preparation for the judgment was the all-consuming theme of Daniells. Typical of the theological premise of the meetings was a statement by one of the members, who pointed out the "fallen condition" of the Healdsburg church and her conviction that if Christ had returned prior to the commencement of the meetings, "ninety out of a hundred"

of the Healdsburg membership would have been lost, "your humble servant with the rest." She rejoiced that she was now "on higher ground" and thus was "accepted of my Father."⁴

A Christian's means of acceptance was said to be the cleansing of the individual by confession and renouncing of past sins. Thus began a spate of public confessions. Confessions of "lying, cheating, stealing, slandering, adulteries, keeping back tithes and every sin you can think of has been confessed here," wrote one of the members to Ellen White. Such revelations, she wrote Mrs White, certainly illustrated the truth of what Mrs White had told the church prior to leaving for Europe, "although your words to us at the time seemed to have no effect."⁵ Daniels access to Ellen White writings not available to other church members,⁶ his appeal to the last days setting, and his own personal convictions provided an overwhelming impetus to draw forward "all that felt they must make a start that day or be lost."⁷ It was Daniels hard-hitting sermons, his use of the "gospel hammer striking the same hard hearts" that drove the church membership into the confession mood.⁸ Reports were being circulated that Daniels was able to convert the Healdsburg church in a way that Ellen White herself had been unable to do.⁹

Among those who prominently supported the Daniels' meetings was the sister of George Butler and her husband, Aurora and Ranson Lockwood, who had been living with Mrs White and were then caretaking her home in her absence in Europe. Ranson's experience led him to take seriously an observation by one of the members that he was "so happy" that he seemed in a state ready for translation. When he took the lead in one of the meetings that proposed to raise funds for Daniels to enable him to pay off his personal debts and enter ministry full time, Ransom wrote Ellen White "it seemed [my] word was inspired," and "I guess my face shown some." He believed the church was experiencing "a few drops" of the latter rain. Ransom, as well as many other

church members, had taken to loudly shouting the word "amen" to things they agreed with at the church meetings. This, too, seemed to be an exaggerated response to what Ellen White had told them before her departure, when she noticed that church's lack of response to her own ministry.¹⁰

The practice of public confession in the Healdsburg setting led to the establishment of what became exclusive meetings, called variously "experience meetings," 6 o'clock meeting, "meetings for those only who were free," or "meetings for those in the light," "out in the light-holiness." Aurora wrote Mrs White that "if you could be dropped down into our 6 o'clock meetings where none are permitted to come but those who are free [from sin], you would rejoice."¹¹ Among those barred at the door by Daniels was 23-year-old John Burden, who, while highly regarded by most for his spirituality, objected to proclaiming himself "in the light."¹²

One of the issues that Daniels believed needed to be rectified to cleanse the church was the practice of making contributions during Sabbath School time. He believed the system was "inaugurated by unconsecrated men, and it was a violation of the Sabbath."¹³ Another involved the plans for constructing a new church building. Church leaders had insisted that no money was to be accepted from anyone who was unconverted and that only converted church members should have part in the construction of the building. Additionally, work at the building site must begin with prayer each day. Healdsburg president, Sydney Brownsberger, observed that the revival meetings had become a cloak for "exclusiveness, Pharisaism, self-confidence, and a puffed up kind of religion."¹⁴ The Healdsburg Dress Association was reestablished in the aftermath of the meetings and such subjects as under garments, shoes, garters, skirts came to the notice of the association. Votes were taken against the wearing of clothing the Association did not approve.¹⁵

The California Conference became involved following Daniels' visit to the Oakland office after the meetings had been held for two weeks and he informed the leaders that most in Healdsburg would not be attending the forthcoming campmeeting because of the intensity of the revival meetings and because of his belief that campmeetings among SDAs "had done more harm than good." He informed C H Jones, Pacific Press manager and leader of the Sabbath School work in California, that most SDAs were "in the dark," and required complete conversion. He decried the behaviour of SDA youth and the general spiritual condition of the church. Daniels made similar statements to both J H Waggoner and his son Ellet. Although Daniels had second thoughts about some of his sweeping accusations, his tirade of that day led conference leadership to question the nature of the meetings being held in Healdsburg. The conference recommended suspending the meetings after the next scheduled meeting and the members of Healdsburg should be encouraged to attend the campmeeting at Stockton. When Daniels carried that report back to Healdsburg, the local church became established in a confrontational situation with the conference.¹⁶

Conflict continued at the Stockton campmeeting when executive committee members J N Loughborough and J H Waggoner took the lead in calling together the Healdsburg members present at the campmeeting and strongly intimating that the meetings at Healdsburg were tainted with fanaticism.¹⁷ Since Daniels was not connected with the conference in a ministerial capacity, he was not granted credentials at the campmeeting.

Following the campmeeting a number of conference officials regularly visited the Healdsburg church and attempted to rectify the situation. It is interesting to see the young A T Jones and E J Waggoner in this pastoral situation. Because of his position as Bible teacher at Healdsburg for the fall term, A T Jones actually became the local pastor at Healdsburg. In his initial sermon Jones preached a general sermon without directly dealing with the

Healdsburg situation and he seemed to believe he had created a favorable climate, but in the testimony meeting following, one member got up and directly addressed the Healdsburg situation and accused conference leadership of sinning against the Holy Spirit by speaking disparagingly of the Healdsburg revival.

Since this was Alonzo's first time in the Healdsburg church, he did not then directly address the situation.¹⁸ The next week he confronted the question of the propriety of taking up Sabbath school offerings in a sermon on proper Sabbath observance. He relied upon Psalms 96:8 ["Give unto the Lord the glory due unto His name, bring an offering, and come into his courts"], upon previous GC session resolutions concerning such offerings and upon Ellen White statements. Little opposition came from the congregation in the testimony meeting following the sermon, although Daniels then spoke against "paying our dues," on Sabbath, meaning that the church should not talk about paying for Sabbath school supplies, etc, on Sabbath.¹⁹

From personal conversations that E J Waggoner held with Daniels, Waggoner considered that Daniels "bordered very closely on to modern sanctificationism, and the meetings finally assumed a good deal of the 'holiness phase.'" Ellet confided to W C White that "we shall be heartily glad to see you all back once more." He observed that many at Healdsburg seemed to believe that Ellen White would endorse the Daniels revival over the decision of the conference.²⁰ By the next month, Syndey Brownsberger wrote W C White, "I thank the Lord for the letters received from yourself and mother. Were it not for them I do not know where we should have landed." Indeed, it was the Ellen White letters to Daniels that turned the tide in the affair, for it was Daniels' own removal of himself from the conflict that broke the back of the opposition.²¹

Pastor Jones also performed an important part, however. He was handed a golden opportunity when Syndey Brownsberger received "the silliest piece of fanaticism that ever Satan stirred anybody up to write." Dating from about the

time conference officials began pointing to the fanatical tendencies of the meetings, a member put together claims of visions, strange counsels on dress and explicit directions on who and how the new church should be built. Perhaps utilizing some of his old evangelistic techniques, Jones read the 6-page piece and then asked the church members to rise if they considered that it represented fanaticism and almost everyone in the congregation rose. Whether or not the tactic was fair to Daniels, things began to become more quiet at the Healdsburg church from this point onward.²²

Unfortunately, the faulty theological base to the movement was not carefully analyzed, although Ellen White would provide such a basis, and hence the issue would reemerge again and again during the period. A close parallel to the 1885 experience with Daniels would re-emerge in Oakland in 1888 and Fresno during 1889 and 1890. The issue would illustrate that when a church focuses upon a concept of progressive righteousness wrought through obedience, it becomes exclusive and ever more rigid in its application of the law. A church and individuals focusing upon Christ's righteousness as their only hope has other alternatives as Ellen White would regularly point out.

It was in April of 1886 that Butler spent several weeks in California. Among the issues clouding the horizon as Butler arrived in there was the case of J H Waggoner, whose personal moral behaviour made objective analysis of the points of theological conflict more difficult, especially since J H was derisively considered by Butler as "our great law expositor" and the father of the moral law interpretation of Galatians within the denomination.

After conversing with J H Waggoner for several hours, Butler concluded that Waggoner's "hard, legal, critical and far from humble spirit" had had its influence on both E J Waggoner and A T Jones and thus given a "wrong cast" to their work on the Pacific Coast.²³ Butler then interjected himself into the E P Daniels matter, still a controversial issue at Healdsburg, and pointed out

to Mrs White that it was J H Waggoner who had been largely instrumental in stopping the Daniels' meetings and thereby brought about a "revulsion of feeling" against the California Conference.

Obviously influenced by the opinions of his sister and brother-in-law, Butler clearly sided with Daniels: "I have not heard of a work for years that seemed to bear more evidences of God's work than this does in many respects. The more I have investigated the subject the stronger have been my convictions that this is the case." Butler maintained that much of the animosity against Daniels was because he himself "had got so near to God" while "most of the laborers on the Pacific Coast at the time were anything but spiritual." Referring to Jones and Waggoner, Butler maintained that "there is a spiritual experience that they must gain," and that they thusly "could not appreciate" Daniels' work and "tried very hard to stop it." Butler maintained that the nature of the work he was trying to do at Healdsburg, according to his sister, was very similar to that done by Daniels and "there is an excellent feeling between Eld Daniels and myself." He wondered out loud whether Ellen White would think "that Eld Butler needs a real reproof for thus criticising your Pacific laborers," and, in fact, suggested to Mrs White that "the first thing you better do is to look around to get some one to put in my place next General Conference."²⁴

In mid-1886 Ellen White wrote to the Healdsburg church from Christiania, Norway, and clearly labeled the Daniels movement as a mingling of "fanaticism" with "God's work." She told the members that Daniels did not realize he was "moving blind-folded under a deception," and quoted the warning of Jeremiah 7:4, "Trust ye not in lying words, saying, . . . The temple of the Lord are we," when instead the church was exalting its own "earthliness," "glorifying" itself, rather than Christ while Satan was "close by [their] side to make [them] vain and conceited." Such a Pharisaic attitude was inadequate, stressed

Ellen White, for "the crisis is just before us." "I solemnly inquire of the Healdsburg church," stated Ellen White as she pointed to the only solution to the times: "as drowning men, have you clung to Jesus? Has your refuge been in Christ?"²⁵

She reiterated that point the next month in a personal testimony to Daniels and his wife: "Let anyone glory in his wisdom or his talents, or in anything but Christ and him crucified, and he will learn that the Lord alone is to be exalted." She predicted that the church was then in a kind of warfare that would continue "to the end," and urged a unified approach within the church as a solution.²⁶ This would be a consistent observation of Ellen White as a solution to aberrant theology warring against the church. The danger faced by Daniels would likewise apply to those young ministers who initially were sent to refute the Daniels movement at Healdsburg as Mrs White warned "you serve yourself, and attract the people to yourself."²⁷ Mrs White continued as she applied the lessons of E P Daniels to SDAs generally:

I am pained beyond measure to see the little discernment existing among our people who have had so great light. They listen to a sermon that stirs their emotions and the language of their hearts is, "Evermore give us the ministry of this man; he moves our hearts, he makes us feel." They forget God, and praise and exalt the man, to his injury, and the injury of their own souls.²⁸

She drew one further lesson from the Daniels experience as she pointed to the alternative to Pharaisic righteousness: "You have earnest work to do if through Christ's righteousness you win the crown of life." In a personal testimony Ellen White preached the gospel to E P Daniels:

Your sins are reckoned to Jesus, his righteousness is imputed to you. For God "hath made him to be sin for us who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." Thus your prayers are accepted, becoming unto God a sweet-smelling savor in the beloved. Thus you enter into his rights, and become an heir with God and joint heir with Jesus Christ. You will enter into his victories, and the reward of eternal life will be given you. . . .

Oh, when will every child of God learn to unite with Jesus, and not depend upon frail, erring men, and expect to be towed along to heaven by their faith and zeal? Genuine conversion united the soul in clinging faith to the one helper, Jesus Christ.²⁹

When George Butler, in January of 1902, wrote the obituary of his sister, Aurora Butler Lockwood, who died at 73 years of age, he recalled her last moments and it became apparent that she, too, had profited from the Ellen White counsel in the Daniels experience. When Aurora's voice was so weak that she could barely whisper she told her brother, "My life record has been imperfect, but the blood of Christ--the blood of Christ!"³⁰ Between 1886 and the time Butler wrote that obituary, however, there would be battles that the "defender-of-the faith" felt he had to fight.

1887: Year of the "Shaking" of the Old. As 1887 approached and the Adventist church came closer to its eschatological destiny, the word "inadequacy" depicts its readiness. The "Pharisaism" term used by Ellen White to describe its state could be seen in the nature of its concept of ministry and even the moral state of its ministry seemed to exhibit inadequacy. The views of its major church leaders on leadership and inspiration were inadequate to the needs of the times and the theological views actually militated against an understanding of the plan of salvation. Two years hence, Mrs White would actually publish in the Review that fewer than one percent of SDAs understood the gospel.³¹ The picture of the "inadequacy" of the pre-1888 SDA church is further delineated by the example of one whom James White once called its foremost minister, Dudley M Canright.³²

The "Shaking" of Dudley Canright. As the Seventh-day Adventists in Michigan prepared to gather for their annual campmeeting at Grand Rapids in September, 1887, George Butler looked toward that event as vindication of the positions SDAs had taken and considered that the meeting would no doubt bring together "the largest number of Sabbath-keepers ever assembled for a thousand years."³³ As the believers assembled, however, one of the preliminaries to the last days in their reckoning seemed to be fulfilling before their eyes.

Opponents of SDAs appeared on the campground and circulated articles and broadsides written against Adventism by one of the SDAs more colorful and experienced former ministers. Since its earliest days Adventists believed that prior to the return of Jesus, many Adventists, including some of its "brightest lights" would, for various reasons, leave the church. Given the setting in 1887, it seemed that the decision of Dudley Canright in February of that year to do so was further indication of the signs of the times. While Uriah Smith considered that "we may be even now entering upon this time of shaking,"³⁴ George Butler, in one of his articles in response to the Canright defection, observed that one of the results of the "shaking times" that was "just before us," would be the theological and moral purification of the church. Butler also observed, however, that the publicity given the Canright defection had represented an attack upon the denomination never given to a past defector. The widespread use of Canright's apostasy by the religious press transcended national barriers and attracted attention in most countries where there were Adventists.³⁵

As a SDA minister for 22 years and a church member for 28, Canright had brought over 1000 individuals into the SDA church, successfully represented the church in 14 debates against representatives of other religious bodies, written over a score of books and pamphlets on SDA doctrines and trained scores of ministers. In all of this, Canright represented the old Adventism at its best, but that aspect of Adventism was in process of transition. It should also be observed that the positions held by Canright on SDA ministry and inspiration closely resembled those held by Butler and Smith. When Canright fully gave up his confidence in Ellen White and in the "two laws" defense he usually applied to Galatians, however, he relinquished all of Adventism.

Canaright and Inadequacy of Adventism's Past Ministry. In its report of the defection of Canright, the Kalamazoo, Michigan, Daily Telegraph, in

addition to listing Canright's contributions to the growth of the SDA church, considered that he "was decidedly the ablest debater in the denomination, having held fourteen set debates with able ministers, from Maine to California."³⁶ As in other areas, Adventism's concept of the nature of ministry was undergoing transition. Its initial perspective was born of the midwestern evangelistic fervor of the 1850s and 60s and was able to successfully compete with the westerners' concepts of excitement. Adventist success in debating the Sabbath issue became heady stuff and already by late 1855 Ellen White noticed that it was causing the spirit of the Lord to die in the church. The ministers, she warned, "trusted too much to the strength of argument," and didn't rely properly upon God. The results of the debating methodology led to "self-exaltation" and were costing the church dearly.³⁷

The Review actively participated in the debates and published the contending positions, even offering \$500 rewards to those non-SDA combatants who could discover biblical proof for the change of the seventh day to the first day of the week "as a day of devotional or religious rest." The Review editors committed their successors to that liability since the time granted for the discovery of such a text was "a temporal millennium."³⁸ Prior to the beginning of tent meetings in many locations, the evangelists would place advertisements in the local newspapers challenging the ministers of other denominations to debate the Sabbath question with them in their "portable meeting house," a 50 by 80 foot tent which flew a banner asking "What is truth?"

The eagerness with which many of the early SDA evangelists cherished a good debate is illustrated when the president of the Iowa Conference expressed consternation at the apparent lack of expertise of his opponent after Snook had made the SDA tent available to the Campbellite debater. "Never before did I hear such thunder with so little lightning," moaned Snook.³⁹ Uriah Smith

obviously relished the thoughts of personally involving himself in debates that his editorial responsibilities prevented him doing. In his analysis of H E Carver's criticism of the denominational position interpreting the two-horned beast of Revelation 13, Smith penned this deflating statement:

"From the dust and noise which some kind of a beast has apparently made while tearing over the prairies of Iowa, we supposed we should find in it an antagonist, which would be in no small degree formidable, a beast with as many at least as two horns, and those perhaps not altogether as harmless as a lamb's. We confess therefore to some degree of disappointment to find, on approaching to reconnoiter, that it is a creature merely of imagination, appearing formidable only at a distance, but vanishing even to hide and hair on closer inspection."⁴⁰

As illustrated in the case of Canright, an amazing percentage of the SDA debaters eventually left the Adventist church. Seeing such results and sensing the need for a more pastorally-oriented ministry, James White had written:

We want more small preachers, like Bro. Sanborn, to go through the ranks and set things in order. We have always had too many large ministers, smart debaters, and the like. They lead the people astray. They attract the admiration of the people to them, so that they very much lose sight of Christ, and the humble path of truth and holiness. This is one reason why the cause prospers no better where our smart ministers labor. . . . Let them understand that to deliver sermons that they have preached over and over, in an able manner, is a work of small importance compared with building up churches and feeding the flock of Christ. . . . The cause wants small men. It must have laborers. . . . We have been wanting smart men, looking and longing for smart men. Now let us pray God to raise up laborers.⁴¹

The situation had not improved much over the next several decades and in 1882 Ellen White observed that few ministers were truly "prepared to labor for God." While the ministry was full of those "who can say sharp, crank things, going out of their way to whip other churches and ridicule their faith," there were few who were pastors in the true sense. "These sharp, self-important speakers, profess to have truth in advance of every other people," she affirmed, "but their manner of labor and their religious zeal in no way correspond with their profession of faith." According to Ellen White, SDA ministers lacked true "humility of soul" and a deep "love for souls" that they

must possess. Her next words, published in the general church paper, should have devastated the ministry and pointed it toward a new message and ministry:

When the love of God is burning on the altar of their hearts, they will not preach to exhibit their own smartness, but to present Christ who taketh away the sins of the world. . . .

There are many flippant talkers of Bible truth, whose souls are as barren of the Spirit of God as were the hills of Gilboa of dew and rain. But what we need is men who are thoroughly converted themselves, and can teach others how to give their hearts to God. The power of Godliness has almost ceased to be in our churches. And why is this? . . . It is faith that is lacking. . . . We do not exalt Jesus and rely wholly upon His merits.⁴²

Among the "small" workers whom James White hoped would lead the denomination into a more pastorally-oriented ministry was a family named Shireman who managed the SDA mission in Kansas City, Missouri, in 1887. Brother Shireman and his wife were burdened over the length of time it took for SDA workers to present Adventism to others and prayed for guidance to discover some way that would shorten the presentations. While the husband-wife ministerial team was preparing to give a Bible study to a non-SDA one Sunday morning, they received a remarkable experience, one that most readily is explained by assuming that they were guided by heavenly sources.

While preparing to go to the Bible study the Shiremans were asked by a stranger to present the essence of their message to him and since he had only a short time to spend in the city, asked them to explain their message as he walked with them to the study. He asked them to "make it short," for he would understand them. The stranger especially hurried their presentations regarding "the prophetic times and dates in the lines of prophetic prophecy." He made his statements to both Brother and Sister Shireman, "as the case might be for Sister Shireman was along and answered often." Within an hour the Shiremans had "carried him through all the points of our faith into the new earth and everlasting kingdom of God." During this period a series of remarkable experiences led the Shiremans to conclude that "this must have been a good angel of God" who gave them the admonition "Go tell the people of this city,

the Lord is coming, the Lord is coming, the quickest way you can." The paper on which the Shiremans assumed the stranger had been taking notes from their presentations was given to them and contained the words taken from First Timothy 2:4: "God will have all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth," and signed it "Christ's expositor."⁴³

Canright and Adventism's Theological Structure. Although Canright himself had clearly recognized the necessity for a transition away from the earlier evangelistic-debating style ministry that brought with it the law charts, beasts, and intense focus upon the prophecies, to a more personalized, pastoral ministry, it was during his preparation for a debate with a Disciples of Christ minister that he began to see his system of theology come tumbling down around him. Early in 1886 Canright had preached at the Des Moines, Iowa, campmeeting and made a strong impact with the townspeople. The Disciples, having both a univeristy and a church there "were quite stirred over the preaching" and subsequently proposed a debate with the Adventists. Canright was even offered free room and board as an inducement. Arrangements called for a ten-night debate and Canright was scheduled to meet Professor Dungan, president of Drake University. Although technical difficulties, including the inability of the Disciples to provide the meeting place, caused the cancelation of the debate, Canright had done considerable study on what he anticipated would be the vital points to defend, paying particular attention to the Sabbath, the law and the covenants. Despite the fact that the debate was cancelled, Canright believed the Lord had blessed him in his study and he promised to publish the results of his study soon "that others may have the benefit of them."⁴⁴

It would appear that much of the defense that Canright had prepared for Dungan was met by Waggoner during the meetings of the Theological Committee at the 1886 GC. While Canright had voted with the 5-4 majority in favor of the traditional position on Galatians and had considered that the Old Testament

patriarchs had a very limited knowledge of Christ's work of salvation,⁴⁵ it is apparent that the discussions before that committee greatly impacted upon him. In the aftermath Canright decided that "it was time" to now examine for himself the denomination's doctrines and not be "intimidated by men who could not agree among themselves."⁴⁶

Butler evaluated the situation somewhat differently and he wrote Ellen White that Canright had become "very much disgusted" and the "way that some of our brethren (no doubt meaning E J Waggoner and the "minority") acted" during the theological discussions. Those discussions, according to Butler, "set him to thinking so he said he went to studying this law question and came to the conclusions that he has."⁴⁷ Butler's implications to Ellen White were apparent. If the position held by Jones and Waggoner on Galatians prevailed, logic demanded the giving up of the Sabbath, and all of the essentials of Adventism just as Canright had done. Ellen White's analysis would differ.

Canright's initial move out of the denomination had been accomplished somewhat quietly. In early 1887 he met with the "leading brethren" in Battle Creek and told them of his decision to leave Adventism and then appeared before his home church in Otsego, explained his disbelief in the SDA theological structure and requested his membership to be dropped. His own brief explanation was published verbatim in the Review. Canright explained that he had "so far changed" his views on "some of the vital points of our faith and practice" that he could not continued "labor with our people." While he had been troubled for years on some points, "so much so that I quit preaching more than once,"⁴⁸ his "attachment" to SDAs and submission to the "judgment of my brethren" continually brought him back. Referring to the 1886 GC theological meetings, he observed, "This winter a question came up which affected our position upon the law, and of course that ended the matter." While the question of the Spirit of Prophecy was also very prominent in Canright's

decision (and not mentioned in this published statement), it seems apparent that his study of the law question after the session, caused him to conclude that the entire system collapsed by abolished his own "two laws" system. While he maintained his belief in the Bible and Christian religion, he affirmed that he could not maintain "one part of the message" and reject others since "it must all stand or fall together." Canright concluded his parting statement to SDAs by proclaiming his intention to unite with "some evangelical church" where he could focus upon "practical religion."⁴⁹

Canright is a clear illustration of the results of magnification of points of theological difference and of the wisdom of Ellen White in strenuously downplaying disputed points. While it is apparent that a "silent" revolution was occurring within Adventism, Canright's assumption that the SDA system could not be modified without completely discarding the past seemed to offer him no perspective other than to leave the denomination when he believed the scriptural evidence overthrew his past position on the law. While Butler and Smith would react somewhat similarly, although not leave the church, it is apparent that their theological structure likewise would not survive the "shaking," for the "sifting," while centering around justification, also involved ministry, organization, eschatology, indeed the very essence of Adventism. It was Ellen White that showed that Adventism's ability to adapt to the new did not require the extreme measures taken by Canright.

To some extent Butler agreed with a number of the points made by Canright. He clearly believed Canright's premise that "every point in the system of faith held by Seventh-day Adventists was mutually dependent on other points, all being mutually connected in one system, so that not one point could be removed without destroying the whole." Butler, however, firmly maintained his confidence in the traditional ceremonial law position and believed that "Elder Canright will never be able to answer the arguments" that he had "a thousand

times" presented as defense in the past. Butler was most astonished that "the very position" Canright had "triumphantly refuted in many debates" he now accepted. He believed the weakness not to be in the traditional position, but in Canright.⁵⁰ It is apparent that the pioneers who held to the traditional position on the law had never agreed or implemented the decision of the joint meeting of the boards of the Pacific Press and Review of 1885 that concluded to withdraw Canright's "Two Laws" from circulation. Despite the agreement that the work contained erroneous theological points, its circulation was continued by the Review well into 1888.⁵¹ Indeed, in their Review Extra in "Reply to Eld Canright's Attacks on S D Adventists," both Butler and Smith recommended Canright's 120-page pamphlet, "The Two Laws," to the SDA membership.⁵²

While Butler noted that Adventists had never before sustained such an attack as Canright had mounted "which has been so extensively circulated before the public . . . through the religious papers of the popular denominations, to distant portions of the earth," he considered that the shaking "does not alarm us" for "we should be better off if quite a number of half-hearted believers," which he believed had entered the church, "were purged out." Indeed, he urged such, "If you cannot be converted, it would be better for you to withdraw." While the basic theological premises upon which Butler operated would itself be completely "shaken" during the forthcoming year, his observation about the stability of Adventism was remarkably perceptive. "We have . . . learned by much experience," said Butler, that this work is hard to kill." He compared the Adventist church to a "wall four feet high and six feet thick." When such a wall was turned over, "it is higher than ever."⁵³ The coming year was the year Adventism would most thoroughly be turned over.

Canright and Ellen White. One of the major points of contention in Canright's entire denominational affiliation⁵⁴ was his failure to develop a harmonious view of the nature of Ellen White's inspiration. As he became more

embittered against the denomination, Canright's attacks against both Ellen and James White became increasingly virulent. The materials he wrote to be circulated at the Grand Rapids campmeeting in late 1887 especially attacked Mrs White, even though he knew she would be personally present at that campmeeting. Using his own debating skills, Butler considered that it was the SDA denomination that had been responsible for the degree of success enjoyed by Canright and considered it an ungracious act for Canright to now so violently attack that church and those friends who had nurtured him:

It took him when but a poor, beardless boy, with few friends, and needy of much counsel and training every way, and made a man of him; gave him influence and position, many friends, and generous remuneration, till he came to think he was a great man in the world. . . . Yet now, like the ungrateful youth who strikes his own mother, he can turn upon his old friends and the cause which fostered him, ridicule us through the papers and in the pulpit, make the umost of our unpopularity, join with our bitterest enemies in opposition to our work . . . and do his best to make it appear that we are a narrow, bigoted set of dupes, led blindly by a fanatical woman, we know not where.⁵⁵

The defenses offered by both Smith and Butler against Canright's attacks on Mrs White serve as harbingers to their own forthcoming difficulties of interpretation because of their distinction between visionary and nonvisionary aspects of Ellen White's messages. Smith, as had Butler, made such distinctions and we thus have the two major "defenders" of Ellen White with that perspective. Several years earlier Smith had written Canright his view that he had come to the conclusion that it was necessary to "discriminate between 'testimony' and 'vision,'" in his acceptance of the Ellen White messages,⁵⁶ and, noting that "considerable handle" was being used over Smith's past "trouble over the question of the visions, had been unsound on that question, and at one time came very near giving them up," he argued that "came very near giving them up" was very different from "giving them up." He had studied the question "as thoroughly as any one of no more ability than myself could go," and "the weight of evidence has never in my mind balanced on the

side of surrender." Smith argued that he had never come to a point when he could deny that the "visions" of Ellen White "were not the operation of the Spirit of God."⁵⁷ Pre-1888 views of the nature of the inspiration of Ellen White was another area where the word "inadequacy" would apply and she would later observe: "I tell you the work God has given me to do has not suffered and is not likely to suffer half as much from open opposers as from my apparent friends, those who appear to be defenders of the Testimonies, but are their real assailants."⁵⁸

It would be Ellen White herself that would most fully and accurately perceive the lessons from the Canright experience. In early 1887 Mrs White wrote Butler of her "impressive dream" that led her to believe Butler himself was "not altogether in the light." She dreamed that Canright was "presenting his ideas upon the law" and "such a mixed up concern I never heard." Neither Butler nor Canright seemed to realize the implications of Canright's positions. "You seemed to be sitting in a boat in a shadow," she wrote Butler, and while Butler sat in Canright's shadow, Canright "was turning the light down lower and lower." Then someone (perhaps an allusion to Jones or Waggoner) said, "We have had enough of this. All this is as the shadow of night, it is the work of Satan." Following this Canright "started up uneasy, groaning and seemed to be like a man paralyzed and declared he would leave the boat." When Canright noticed a boat nearby that seemed to be "sailing faster" and its occupants were happy and singing, he determined to join that company, believing the boat he was in would "go to pieces." Although the "Captain" assured Canright that the ship he was in would "outride every storm" and the other would not "endure the tempest," Canright determined to leave and join the other boat though he "perish with it." Canright would not accept the "Captain's" assurance despite the fact that he knew "every piece of timber in the ship."⁵⁹

It seems apparent that this "impressive dream" given Ellen White maintains an eschatological significance that transcends Canright. It clearly points to something new that was designed to guide an old ship through a final storm. While Canright believed that the "new" concepts, clearly relating to the "law," demanded the leaving of the boat he was on, the "Captain," who well understood the construction of the ship, gave assurance of security despite the fears that it would "go to pieces." Security depended upon the guidance of the "Captain." If the Lord had chosen to reveal only this one insight to Ellen White in the period 1884 to 1889 and the church had pondered its implications and sought enlightenment from it, this alone would testify to the inspiration of the one whom the Lord had chosen to give guidance to His work.

Ellen White drew additional lessons from the Canright experience that she relayed to Butler and Smith in the same letter when she described the dream. She had "been shown" that Canright was a "loose writer, that he was ever seeking to be original, and that he gave assertion for proof," but yet had been selected to teach at Battle Creek College and "pour" his matter through the Review, "as though he was bishop of the Methodist Church." She had "advised his books to be suppressed, especially the one on the law, the very subject he was conversing with you in regard to," she told Butler and Smith. Concerning the Canright book on the "Two Laws" she observed: "If that work is what I believe it to be I would burn every copy in the fire before one should be given out to our people." Ellen White seemed clearly ready to look toward a new analysis of the purpose of the law and its relation to the gospel and that which had been considered adequate since 1876, when "The Two Laws" was initially published, was no longer suitable to the church and must be discarded. Surely a new message was sounding within Adventism. Mrs White wanted the Galatians issue to be "met fairly and squarely in open discussion" for "we want Bible evidence for every point we advance." To Ellen White,

Canright's course was "contemptable" and an evidence that the church needed "far more of the Spirit of God in order to escape the perils of these last days."60

NOTES

1. E J Waggoner to W C White, Nov 20, 1885; EJW 1884-85 WE.
2. E P Daniels should not to be confused with A G Daniells, who would serve as GC president from 1901 and 1922.
3. W C White to G I Butler, April 2, 1885; WCW bk A, pp 150-51.
4. Sister I L Decker to Sister Ramsie, Sept 7, 1885; Misc 1885 WE.
5. Lizzie Grainger to Ellen White, Sept 17, 1885; W C Grainger 1884-85 WE.
6. He had transcriptions of "7 or 8" Ellen White sermons delivered at Healdsburg during the spring of 1885. Ellen White herself had no copies of these as late as Nov, 1885. E P Daniels to Ellen White, Nov 11, 1885; EPD 1884-85 WE.
7. I L Decker to Sister Ramsie; Misc 1885 WE.
8. Lizzie Grainger to Ellen White, Oct 9, 1885; Grainger 1884-85 WE.
9. C H Jones to W C White, Oct 12, 1885, CHJ 1884-85 WE and G I Butler to W C White, Dec 1, 1885, GIB 1885 WE.
10. R G Lockwood to Ellen White, Sept 22, 1885; Lockwood 1884-85 WE.
11. A B Lockwood to Ellen White, Sept, 1885; Lockwood 1884-85 WE.
12. A T Jones to W C White, Dec 4, 1885; JATJ 1884-85 WE. Despite this setback Burden would go on to manage the St Helena Sanitarium, strengthen medical work in Australia and eventually found Loma Linda Medical Center.
13. C H Jones to W C White, Oct 16, 1885; CHJ 1884-85 WE.
14. E J Waggoner to W C White, Nov 20, 1885; EJW 1884-85 WE and Sydney Brownsberger to W C White, Dec 4, 1885; Brownsberger 1884-85 WE.
15. Mrs W C Grainger to Ellen White, Feb 2, 1886; Grainger 1886-87 WE.
16. C H Jones to W C White, Oct 12, 1885; CHJ 1884-85 WE.
17. Lizzie Grainger to Ellen White, Oct 9, 1885; Grainger, 1884-85 WE.
18. A T Jones to W C White, Dec 4, 1885; ATJ 1884-85 WE.
19. Ibid; C H Jones to W C White, Oct 16, 1885, 1884-85 CHW WE; Aurora Lockwood to Ellen White, Lockwood 1884-85 WE.
20. E J Waggoner to W C White, Nov 20, 1885; EJW 1884-85 WE.
21. Syndey Brownsberger to W C White, Dec 4, 1885; Brownsberger 1884-85 WE.
22. A T Jones to W C White, Dec 4, 1885, ATJ 1884-85 WE; W C Grainger to Ellen White, nd, Grainger 1884-85 WE.
23. It should be observed that the theological systems embraced by J H Waggoner and his son were as different as the that between E J Waggoner and Butler. J H Waggoner, despite his Galatian position, was actually closer to Butler than to Ellet. Ellet would later point out that even on Galatians, his position was not the same as his father's.
24. G I Butler to Ellen White, April 13 and April 19 [concluded April 21], 1886; GIB 1886 WE.
25. Ellen White to Brn and Sisters in Healdsburg, July 9, 1886, B21-1886.
26. Ellen White to Br and Sr Daniels, Aug 6, 1886, published by J N Loughborough, Feb 16, 1890 in "Testimonies on the Case of Elder E P Daniels," pp 3, 7.
27. Ellen White to E P Daniels, Nov 5, 1889, in ibid, p 74.
28. Ibid, pp 77-8.
29. Ibid, pp 78-9.
30. George I Butler, "Aurora Butler Lockwood," RH, Jan 28, 1902.

31. Get source
32. Get source.
33. George Butler, "The Michigan Campmeeting," RH, Aug 23, 1887.
34. Uriah Smith, "Fulfillment," RH, Aug 9, 1887.
35. George Butler, "Conclusion: Nature and Progress of Our Work," RH Supplement, "Reply to Eld Canright's Attacks on S D Adventists," Dec, 1887.
36. Kalamazoo Daily telegraph, May 20, 1887, cited in George Butler, Brief History of Eld Canright's Connection With This People," RH Supplement, Dec, 1887.
37. Ellen White, 1T, p 113 (1855).
38. RH, Oct 20, 1859.
39. B F Snook, RH, Aug 7, 1860.
40. Uriah Smith, RH, Oct 9, 1866.
41. James White, Oct 27, 1863.
42. Ellen White, "Preparation for the Campmeeting," RH, Aug 15, 1882.
43. R M Kilgore to Kilgore family, corrected by "Bro and Sr Shireman," Oct 22, 1890; RG 11, 1890K, GCA.
44. D M Canright, "The Debate at Des Moines Given Up," RH, Oct 19, 1886.
45. E J Waggoner, "The Gospel in the Book of Galatians," pp 64-6.
46. D M Canright, Seventh-day Adventism Renounced (1889), pp 50-1.
47. George Butler to Ellen White, Feb 17, 1887; GIB 1887 WE.
48. Actually this was Canright's fifth withdrawal from organized work.
49. D M Canright Statement in George Butler, "Eld Canright's Change of Faith," RH, March 1, 1887.
50. George Butler, "Eld Canright's Change of Faith," RH, March 1, 1887.
51. W C White to C H Jones, Feb 19, 1886, WCW bk A-1, pp 22-3; W C White to F E Belden, July 3, 1888, WCW bk B, pp 325-27; W C White to Members of SDA Book Committee, July 3, 1888, WCW bk B, p 344.
52. George Butler, "Canright Vs Canright on the Law and Sabbath," and Uriah Smith, "The Two Laws and the Sabbath," RH Extra, Dec, 1887.
53. George Butler, "Conclusion: Nature and Progress of Our Work," RH Extra, Dec, 1887.
54. He had converted from Methodism to Adventism in 1857.
55. George Butler, "Brief History of Eld Canright's Connection With This People," RH Extra, Dec, 1887.
56. Uriah Smith to D M Canright, Aug 7, 1883; RG 17, M L Andreasen Reference Files, Midnight Cry folder, GCA.
57. Uriah Smith, "Personal," Ibid.
58. Ellen White to George Butler, Dec 11, 1888, B18-1888.
59. Ellen White to George Butler and Uriah Smith, April 5, 1887, B13-1887.
60. Ibid.

Chapter 3

Jones-Waggoner and Adventism's Emerging World

The theology of the pioneers was transcended by Alonzo Jones and Ellet Waggoner because they centered upon the "gospel" and not the law and came to see that not "our righteousness" but rather the righteousness of Christ was the basis for evaluation in the final judgment. This righteousness, just as the righteousness that allowed the forgiveness of sins, was received as a gift of faith, and not wrought through personal obedience, as the pioneers taught. Jones would explicitly identify what "new" to the message he and Waggoner were preaching when he stated the following at the Ottawa, Kansas, campmeeting in May, 1889: "We have always claimed eternal life to be a gift, but we have not claimed the same for righteousness as being a gift through Jesus Christ."¹

While it is vital to understand the contributions the young ministers were making to SDA theology, it is just as vital to perceive their theological limitations. In examining their teachings concerning justification by faith, it is absolutely necessary to realize that neither maintained a concept of an objective, legal righteousness set to the sinner's account in heaven to justify him. Their concept of righteousness involved its subjective "imputation"² to the Christian when he sought forgiveness for his sins. Both ministers lacked an objective focus before and after the Minneapolis session and throughout their ministry. Because of the implications of such an evaluation and because both Jones and Waggoner at times used the terminology of objective justification, this chapter concentrates heavily on analyzing their understanding of justification.

Jones and Waggoner on Forgiveness. The concept of legal imputation of righteousness placed to the sinner's account in heaven was so alien to Jones and Waggoner that they taught that sins were forgiven in a literal transaction

within the individual. In other words, Christ's righteousness was literally brought within the sinner to replace his sin. Notice Waggoner's expression: "When God remits--sends away--sin, He does it by putting righteousness in its place. Where once was sin, now appears perfect righteousness."³

Although that transaction was often confusingly stated in objective-sounding terminology, examination of the full theological system of Jones and Waggoner, both before and after 1888 and indeed throughout their entire careers, illustrates that they thought of the transaction occurring subjectively, not outside the believer. Notice this example from an 1889 article by Waggoner:

The righteousness of God is declared for the remission of the sins of all who believe in Jesus. He cures the disease by putting health in its place. The righteousness which is brought to the believing sinner through the gospel, is the same thing exactly as the righteousness of the law, for it is witnessed by the law.⁴

In the emphasized portion of the previously-quoted statement by Waggoner in 1889, we notice the use of the word "declared" as though the transaction was objective, or taking place outside the believer, but, in reality the next sentence makes it clear that Waggoner considered that a literal transaction is occurring within the believer. It should again be emphasized that while Waggoner may have lacked an objective view of justification, he was still making a contribution to SDA theology in that he was affirming that obedience to the law was inadequate both for forgiveness for the past and for obtaining sufficient righteousness to pass the final judgment. The gospel, not the law, was man's only hope and the righteousness necessary to obtain both forgiveness and to pass the judgment was the perfect righteousness wrought out by Christ, offered as a gift and accepted by faith.

The integration of the objective focus of the pioneers with the Christocentric perspective of Jones and Waggoner could have given nineteenth-

century Adventists the fullest message and avoided the multiplicity of theological aberrations it suffered over the next decade and beyond. We will see that a complete message of justification by faith was held within Adventism only by Ellen White, and she desperately sought to maintain the harmony between the pioneers and the messengers of the new perspective.

Beginnings of Galatians Focus--Nonoriginality of SDA Views of Justification. It is important to recognize that neither Jones nor Waggoner were blazing new theological pathways in the theological world when they made their contribution to the SDA understanding of justification. Indeed, their theological dependence upon evangelical Christianity for their essential concepts is easily demonstrable from an analysis of some of the articles that they reprinted in the Signs of the Times from 1884 to 1888. That is not to say that SDA theology had nothing potentially to contribute toward an enhanced understanding of the vital message of justification, but, as we will see, the disunity within the denomination effectively inhibited any such contribution. Ideally, Adventism could have prospered and contributed to theological growth in the world by combining its eschatological perspective with the last-day implications of justification, but confusion over justification itself prevented any such contribution.

Although SDA leadership was becoming increasingly concerned over the frequency of theological questions that came up for resolution at General Conference sessions, it was in mid-1884 that the Signs of the Times began a series of articles on the law that was to lead the denomination into great turmoil.

Before E J Waggoner embarked upon a series of 10 articles on the law, the Signs reprinted an article by Rev Philip S Moxom from the New York Independent, a Presbyterian newspaper and considered by Ellet as "the most influential

popular religious journal in the country."⁵ The article is significant because it contains the essential textual and theological concepts that would remain with both Jones and Waggoner throughout their careers. Whether or not the young ministers were profoundly influenced by that article or whether it merely reflected views they already held, it is clear that their theological perspective was not original. The central text used by Moxom, Rom 10:4, would be the springboard by which Jones and Waggoner introduced a new path into Adventism: "Christ is the end of the law for righteousness."

While traditional Adventism had considered that forgiveness was a gift made possible solely because of the cross and nothing that anyone could do would enhance that gift, it did not consider that righteousness was also a gift. No doubt both Jones and Waggoner considered that Moxom was describing Adventism when he decried the "Pharisaic idea of righteousness" that stressed a righteousness that came from obedience and that was considered to have merit toward salvation. In contrast, Moxom noted that "in Christ the obligation of righteousness is met and fulfilled" and was available to the believer solely through faith. Moxom also hinted at what was to become a major denominational confrontation over the law in Galatians when he stressed the "second" purpose of the law: "Its enactments are regulative and tuitionary." When we see our inadequacy and need, we go to Christ, not the law, for the solution. Only when the soul is free, affirmed Moxom, can real righteousness become possible.⁶

Another aspect of Moxom's theology, however, obviously impacted upon the system of Jones and Waggoner⁷. Moxom failed to distinguish between the perfect righteousness of Christ imputed to the believer through faith and sanctification and by blurring the two actually merged them. Moxom had no room for "any fiction of imputed righteousness" relating to the present. Like many 19th century theologians, he relied upon the King James translation of Romans

3:25 and relegated justification solely to the past. Here was a pathway that eventually brought both Jones and Waggoner to the brink of pantheism. If Moxom, in the following quotation was speaking of sanctification, his perspective would be orthodox, but he is actually speaking of justification and thus perfect righteousness:

Christ, in whom righteousness and law are embodied and suffused with the beauty of gracious love, lays hold of our hearts, touches the springs of desire and volition, wakens us to righteous impulses, and through our faith, becomes in us the fulfillment of the law unto righteousness. . . . If [the believer] is ever to be saved--that is, if he is ever to be righteous--the law must pass within him, and become a free, internal impulse.⁸

Waggoner published his series of 10 law articles in the Signs between June 19 and September 18, 1884. In his third article, "Condemned and Justified," Waggoner gave evidence of some of the theology that would cause such disastrous results to him later. This article provides evidence that, while Waggoner would use the terms of objective righteousness, he clearly used such terms to mean "gift" rather than in a legal sense. Waggoner consistently thought subjectively when he considered justification.

When he referred to Isaiah 53:5 (Christ "bruised for our iniquities"), he considered that a literal transaction occurred. The believer literally received Christ's righteousness in exchange for his sins because Christ had "done more than his duty--more than was required of him" and hence had "merit to impart to others." Notice that it is an "impartation" of righteousness that literally was exchanged for sins, according to Waggoner. The subjectivity of the transaction is even more apparent if one reflects upon the consideration that Christ had "done more than his duty" and thereby had accrued merit which actually left Him when it was imparted to others. This was not a transaction set to the believers "account" in heaven by Waggoner's reasoning, but very literally occurred within the believer.

We must also notice how Waggoner used the term "accounted." In the transaction Waggoner was describing, "Christ will take our load of sins upon himself" (literally) and "we will be accounted as though we had never committed them." While using the objective term "accounted," Waggoner was really referring to an actual transaction within the believer and he termed that process "justified by faith in Christ."⁹

In his next article Waggoner set the stage for his forthcoming discussion of Romans 10:4 by first discussing 2 Corinthians 5:21: "For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." Here we have another example of Waggoner using objective terms concerning justification, but applying the passage in a completely subjective sense. We have affirmed that throughout his ministry Waggoner considered that the forgiven Christian was subjectively given the righteousness of God in place of his sin, and hence truly "made" righteous. That was possible, according to Waggoner because of another very literal occurrence: "God made Christ (the sinless one) to be sin for us. . . . He bore sin just as we do."

We must again notice Waggoner's use of the objective terms "counted" and "as though," in a manner to describe an experience he clearly means to be taken in a subjective sense: "Although the sins that he bore were ours, they were counted as his own, and so caused his death." Indeed, "He bore the sins of the world as though they were his own. If it were not so, he would not have died; for 'the wages of sin is death.'" Waggoner seems to define such objective terms as "impute," "reckoned," "declared," etc, as having a substitutionary, but literal meaning. In other words, we are "declared" righteous because we are made righteous through a literal transaction we were undeserving of. The gift part of the transaction appears to be what Waggoner meant when he used such terms as "impute" or "declare."

Waggoner would again affirm, "none can die except those in whom sin is found; our sins were laid on Christ, and accounted as his; and so, although personally 'he knew no sin,' he was made to suffer the penalty of the law as a transgressor." Just as the believer was literally "made righteous" so was Christ literally "made a sinner," according to Waggoner.¹⁰ It was the premise that perfect righteousness prevented death that, when tied to a completely subjective perception of justification, created the aberrant theology that plagued Adventism throughout the 1890s. Here Waggoner was using the idea in its converse sense: only because Christ literally took sin within Himself could He die. Waggoner did not vary in his literal, subjective application of 2 Corinthians 5:21 and because of the importance of the issue, we will notice some of his later uses.

Elaborating upon that text in his Galatians pamphlet in 1887, Waggoner contended that the baptism of Jesus was necessary beyond the issue of example because "as in his death, so in his life, our sins were counted as his." According to Waggoner, Christ was baptized to literally deal with our sins that were "counted" as his, even while He lived. Waggoner continued, "Thus it is that he could be all his life, even from his birth, under the condemnation of the law. It was not on his own account, but on ours."¹¹

In 1889, Waggoner used that text to argue against the concept that Christ served as a sin-offering rather than as a continual sin-bearer. His position here is revealing concerning his understanding of Christ's heavenly ministry as he pictures Christ literally bearing our sins in heaven in order to dispense His righteousness to us on earth. Here Waggoner again reveals an absence of an understanding of legal satisfaction through the substitutionary death of Christ:

[Christ] bears our judgment--the iniquity of his priesthood--before the throne. As a priest he has continually taken sins, except

from those who choose to retain them. . . . All these centuries he has been receiving the sins of penitents.¹²

In his analysis of that text in 1900, Waggoner made this literal application:

It was no superficial work that he undertook. The sins were not merely figuratively laid on him, but they were actually in him. . . . No sin was ever manifested in His life, although He took all sin upon Himself. He received it and swallowed it up by the power of the endless life in which He swallows up death. He can bear sin, and yet be untainted by it. It is by this marvelous life that He redeems us. He gives us His life, so that we may be freed from every taint of the sin that is in our flesh.¹³

Because he maintained no view of a perfect righteousness set to the sinner's account and secure in heaven, all of Waggoner's later views were incipient in his earlier analysis and our examination of his 1884 articles on the law continues by noticing that in his July 24 article on Romans 10:4, he mounted a strong argument against antinomian misuse of that text, but revealed the denominational dilemma in applying Romans 3:25 solely to the past. While both the pioneers and Jones and Waggoner made such application of that text, the pioneers relied upon Christ's strength to provide acceptable obedience thereafter while Jones and Waggoner focused upon the internalized gift of Christ's righteousness to enable that adequate obedience. Here was a clear divergence that would become increasingly prominent. It can be seen that theological growth was breaking upon the church, but it was not the fullest truth concerning justification by faith. Both perspectives ultimately depended upon the performance of the believer, although Jones and Waggoner would stress that it was Christ's obedience and not the believers that enabled that made obedience perfect.

Despite his continuing contribution, Waggoner, in this article, again revealed concepts of theology that would later lead him into pantheism. He argued that those who received Christ who was the purpose of the law "for

righteousness" were able to fulfill the highest demands of the law, because it was the literal obedience of Christ that "made" the believer righteous when that righteousness came to him. The corollary would be that since righteousness and endless life were interrelated in Waggoner's analysis, the fully righteous individual could not die. We shall see that A T Jones also developed that premise by mid-1889. And that theology would be regularly replayed in SDA history during this period.¹⁴

Waggoner concluded his 1884 law series with four articles discussing Romans 6:14, "For ye are not under the law, but under grace." Here was another area where the interpretations of Waggoner and Jones were of very questionable validity, but interpretations that would become increasingly important as 1888 approached. Waggoner defined the expression "under the law" to mean solely to be condemned by the law and thus to be under the dominion of sin. Since he defined keeping the law as involving "fulfill[ing] the righteousness of the law," in its minutest requirement, he thereby placed a heavy burden upon any who failed to fulfill fully the demands of the law. "We learn that to be under the law one has only to violate it" and that a "righteous man is one who keeps the law--fulfills its requirements--and therefore the law has no controversy with him." Waggoner thus was forced to the conclusion that a Christian who in any way failed to reflect constantly the highest demands of the law moved thereby into a position of condemnation. He observed "that all men are under the law until they have faith in Christ; from that moment they are out from under the law, unless they again bring themselves into condemnation by again yielding themselves to sin."¹⁵

From that point, Ellet moved somewhat nonchalantly into an area that he certainly knew would bring controversy, the law in Galatians. Noting that the expression "under the law" occurred several times in Galatians, Waggoner

broached the key text, Galatians 3:24: "Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith." It was in the setting of condemnation "when sinners want liberty, and begin to struggle for it" that brought Waggoner to his conclusion that was to advance Adventism far beyond where it had been in the past. Here he came to the conclusion that this use of the law allowed the sinner "no avenue of escape except Christ, who is the 'end of the law.'" Galatians 3:24 and Romans 10:4 were placed together in Adventist history and would become foundational to the new message that would continue sounding to and beyond Minneapolis.¹⁶ Ellen White would accurately observe, however, that Waggoner's theology was not without flaws, even at Minneapolis.

A T Jones and Justification, 1884. Waggoner was not alone in noticing the implications of Romans 10:4 to Adventism's past focus. While Ellet was writing his law articles, Jones was preaching similarly. He tied most of the same elements together in a sermon delivered in Oakland, Sabbath, July 5, 1884. This sermon contains the major elements found in what he would later term his first of a series of six sermons on justification. Stressing that Christ was the purpose or end of the law for righteousness, Jones quoted Psalms 119:172 to the effect that righteousness was in the law of God, but fallen man, because of clouded perceptions and the results of sin could not obtain that righteousness from the law. That necessary righteousness, he affirmed, could be obtained only by the gospel. "Christ steps in; through him we obtain righteousness, and he thus becomes the purpose of the law for righteousness, he told the congregation." Jones, as did Waggoner, considered that the righteousness thereby obtained was a very real infusion of Christ's perfection into the believer and "making [the believer] spiritual and thus in harmony with the law, the purpose of the law can be met."¹⁷

By 1884 pictured himself as a reformer within the denomination. While he never seemed reluctant to make prophetic pronouncements, one that he made in that year, would become fulfilled in his own case after he became a major voice in Adventism:

The reformer is always a heretic. He is always counted an enthusiast, and very often a fanatic. Such is the heritage, in his day, of every reformer, and such he must expect to be counted, if he will do the work of a reformer. . . .

Nevertheless, knowing all this, and expecting it all, and knowing also the truth and the virtue of the principle which he advocates, the reformer as he really is, but heretic as he is held, out of pure love of the principle, urges it always, everywhere, and against all opposition, until finally he achieves its success, and compels its recognition. Just then the reform encounters its greatest danger.¹⁸

Pioneer, J N Andrews, issued a similar warning to the church. He warned the church in 1854:

If the Advent body itself were to furnish the fathers and the saints for the future church, Heaven pity the people that should live hereafter! Reader we entreat you to prize your Bible. It contains all the will of God, and will make you wise unto salvation through faith in Christ Jesus.¹⁹

More on Justification, 1886. In 1886, both Jones and Waggoner published many law articles in the Signs and in their understanding of justification consistently used objective terminology to refer to a system they were applying completely subjectively. They revealed again and again their absence of objective views of justification. Waggoner himself published approximately 30 articles on the law that year. Only his two-article study of justification and sanctification are here analyzed, because those articles illustrate the dilemma faced by one studying this period of SDA history. They also reveal, as will be seen when we analyze Ellen White's views of justification, that it is vital to broadly survey the writings of an individual before making firm conclusions based on specific statements. Notice the dilemma that the following Waggoner statement poses to this author's previous analysis of Waggoner's views of

justification:

In our best efforts there is so much imperfection, that but for the continual imputation of Christ's righteousness to make up for our deficiencies, we should be lost.²⁰

From that statement, it certainly appears that Waggoner maintained an objective view of justification. How could words be any more clear? He is recognizing the need for the "imputation of Christ's righteousness to make up for our deficiencies." He seems to be entirely orthodox concerning a recognition that God accepts perfect righteousness and that righteousness is accounted ours solely through faith in Christ. But that is emphatically not what Waggoner is saying. Let us look closely at Waggoner's two articles, and come back to this issue. It is worthwhile to do so for the articles reveal the consistency of Waggoner's theological thought over the next three decades.

In his article, "Justified by Faith," Waggoner using Webster's definition considered justification to be "a showing to be just, or conformable to law." Here is his description of his understanding of the process that took place:

Christ's righteousness is declared for the remission--taking away--of those sins. As Christ's life is worth infinitely more than the lives of all the world, so through his death his righteousness may be made to take the place of the disobedience of all those who will have faith in him. We may say that an exchange is made: Christ takes upon himself the sins of all our past life, and in return lets his righteousness be counted as ours. When this is done for a man, the law can do no other than justify him. It demands perfect obedience in the life, and that is what it finds. It matters not to the law that the obedience which it finds in the man's life is not really his own; it is counted as his own; and since the obedience is perfect, the law cannot condemn.²¹

In the passage, Waggoner has used the terminology of objective justification: "declared" and "counted." But he has used those concepts of justification to really refer to sanctification and by mixing the two processes has confounded both. We see that Waggoner thinks of the process in very literal terms because he again, as we have noticed in the past, focuses upon the accrued merit of Christ's life and makes the point that since "Christ's

life" was of such value, He had a vast supply of "righteousness" to dispense to literally "take the place of the disobedience" of all who claimed it. When the "exchange is made," according to Waggoner, Christ literally "takes upon himself" or "swallowed up" as we have previously noted, those sins and dispenses "his righteousness" to be "counted" as ours. The law then looks down from heaven upon the justified individual and can see perfect lawkeeping "in the life, and that is what it finds." We can see that Waggoner's totally subjective application of justification would inevitably lead to aberration.

Waggoner made another revealing point when he emphasized that "it must not be forgotten that we are now speaking only of the sins that are past." He elaborated more upon that point in his next article by considering that the righteousness that literally replaced sin in the past life was also the perfect righteousness that enabled flawless lawkeeping as long as the believer maintained faith. "Since justification has reference to the law of God," affirmed Waggoner, "it is evident that the works that make perfect the faith that secures justification, must be the works which the law requires." Notice Waggoner's point:

Since a man, after he has been justified by faith, would fall into condemnation if he should refuse to do any duty that was presented to him, and can only retain his state of justification by continuing in obedience to the law, it may be said that sanctification is but continued justification.²²

We will notice a profound difference between the theological systems of Jones and Waggoner and that of Ellen White concerning this matter. To Ellen White, saving righteousness was mediated in heaven because "all must be laid upon the fire of Christ's righteousness to cleanse it from its earthly odor" to be made acceptable.²³ In the above passage, we see that Waggoner has so internalized his perception of justification that he essentially equates the two, considering "sanctification is but continued justification." His dilemma

was further compounded by his internalization of Romans 3:21 ["But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets."]. Because of his exclusively subjective perspective, Waggoner applied the completed, historical act that Paul described, to the ongoing experience of the believer:

Paul says, "The righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law." The law stands by and witnesses to the righteousness that is thus manifested in our past life. Whereas it before condemned us, now it justifies us, for in the righteousness that is imputed to us it can detect no flaw.²⁴

It was in that setting that Waggoner made the statement which began this section. Notice the more extended passage from which we originally quoted:

"Faith without works is dead;" and on the other hand, obedience without faith is impossible, as is shown by our Saviour's words in John 15:4,5; also by the words of Paul. "They that are in the flesh cannot please God." Rom 8:8. The man who is destitute of faith in Christ cannot keep the law, or do any act that is really good. In our best efforts there is so much imperfection, that but for the continual imputation of Christ's righteousness to make up for our deficiencies, we should be lost. The best that we alone can do is bad.²⁵

We can now see that far from revealing an objective view of justification, Waggoner's premise that "in our best efforts there is so much imperfection, that but for the continual imputation of Christ's righteousness to make up for our deficiencies" means something altogether different. To Waggoner, "in our best efforts" means not the Christian exercising faith, but the individual "in the flesh." The Christian who exercised faith, according to Waggoner, received the "continual imputation of Christ's righteousness" within and thus his works were entirely acceptable and in full harmony with the severest requirements of the law. If the Christian exhibited any imperfection in his obedience, it was an indication that he was "under the law" and thus condemned by that law. Waggoner would take this premise to amazing conclusions in the 1890s and clearly reveal the results of the lack of considering his righteousness secure

in his heavenly account.

A T Jones, and Last-Generation Justification. Jones wrote the following as illustrative of his theological system in late 1887:

Being transgressors, the only way in which [the sinner] can ever attain to harmony with the righteous law of God is through the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ. Rom 3:20, 21. The righteousness embodied in the Third Angel's Message, therefore, is the very supremacy of righteousness itself, and to receive the love of the truth of this message is to receive the love of the highest manifestation of righteousness that is known to the universe of God.²⁶

Jones, as well as Waggoner, continued to consider perfect, justifying righteousness as something to be "attained" and "manifested" within the believer and by 1893 included physical as well as spiritual elements in his assumptions of what the last generation must attain. In a talk on health reform presented at the Lansing campmeeting, Jones informed the believer that the Lord "intends to have, and he is going to have his people to be the fairest, healthiest, best-looking people on the earth." While others were succumbing to the afflictions of the last days and "dying by the thousands, when other people are carried away by disease, and are suffering all kinds of evils in this respect," Jones affirmed that God's people would be "in perfect health, and not troubled at all." Clearly reflecting suppositions that were beginning to permeate the denomination by this time and anticipating the major premises of the movement of the later 1890s that would become known as the "holy flesh" movement, Jones again evidenced the results of his lack of an objective perspective concerning justification:

Health reform, as such, is to be practiced by faith in Christ. And when our people get to that place where they will live health reform by faith in Christ, then they will live righteousness by faith in Christ. Any one who does not live righteousness by faith in Christ, cannot live health reform as God has given it. One is just as really a matter of faith as the other. . . .

[God] has given this [health reform message] that we may be prepared by his direction to pass safely through the time of the plagues which are about to fall, when the very air itself will be

sick; it is to prepare us to pass through that, and to be translated.

“ . . . If a man will apply the principles of health reform as God has given them, can he be sickly?—No, sir; I say he cannot be sickly. As I said awhile ago, it is a disgrace for a Seventh-day Adventist to be sickly.”²⁷

Jones reiterated his eschatological and internalized assumptions in an additional talk on health at that campmeeting: “Health reform, then, is just as certainly—I do not say as much but as certainly—a part of God's plan of salvation as righteousness by faith.” According to Jones, the believer's faith not only caused righteousness to be infused into him, but also caused him to have good health. The converse was also true to Jones: “If a man slights what the word of God says he shall or shall not eat, he does not eat by faith. Because the faith by which we are to eat is of God, to be brought to us, and be created in us, by the word of God, just as the faith by which we receive righteousness and virtue, comes from God by his word.”²⁸

The failure of Jones and Waggoner to distinguish between justifying righteousness secure in heaven for the believer and its sanctifying, yet imperfect results, drove Jones to exhibit the results of his eschatological system and make the following equation:

As the salvation of souls came by the grace of God, the gift of God through faith, and not of ourselves, so health reform came as the gift of God, and by grace through faith, and that not of ourselves.

“ . . . Then our characters are to be just like Christ's; our bodies are to be just like Christ's. In other words, our spirits are to be just like his, and our bodies are to be just like his. And therefore it is not saying too much to say that health reform must be by faith, or else it is not health reform. And without living health reform by faith we will never get the benefit of it, any more than we can be benefited by a righteousness that is not of faith. . . .

The object of the third angel's message is to fit us to meet Christ alive. And the health reform is part of the third angel's message. . . . Then health reform is just as much in its place fitting people to be like Christ and to be translated to immortality when he comes, as the main body of the third angel's message is to make us like Christ in character.”²⁹

Sanctification, and indeed an aberrant view of that subject, effectively

became Jones' view of the third angel's message "in verity." Justification lost its centrality in the scheme of Jones and Waggoner and those they influenced because they lacked an objective perspective. Notice his perspective of the third angel's message as he continues his message to the believers assembled at Lansing in late 1893:

What are the events brought to view by the third angel's message?--The coming of the Lord; and before that, the pouring out of the plagues, and the worship of the beast and his image on the part of the wicked; perfect holiness and the close of probation on the part of the righteous. The image of Christ is to be reflected in us fully; we are to be sealed with the seal of the living God; so that we are like Jesus in character. And then we are to pass through the seven last plagues, and meet him when he comes in the blazing glory of all the universe, that we may be like him in body. Those are the things brought to view in the third angel's message, and health reform is to be preached by us all and set forth as the preparatory work to meet those things which the message tells about. . . . [This] is health by faith, in view of the things that are brought to view by the third angel's message, to meet Jesus Christ, and the things that are coming between us and his coming. And therefore we are to preach the third angel's message, and get people to see what is coming, and then get them to prepare their bodies to meet them, as Jesus Christ [is to] prepare their souls for the close of probation.

In other words, righteousness by faith brings us to the perfection of Jesus Christ in character, and health reform by faith brings us to the perfection of Christ in our bodies. Between the point where we are sealed with the seal of the living God, and the coming of Christ, there are the seven last plagues, and our bodies have got to go through them unscathed, before they become like the glorious body of Jesus. When we preach to the people the coming of the Lord, and the necessity of meeting him, and the motive in keeping the Sabbath, and all that, their bodies are not prepared by that in itself, to meet him. So that the health reform has to come in its place, and fit the people to meet the events brought before them in the preaching of the message; and that is just as much a part of the third angel's message, in its place, as is the other.³⁰

It seems clear that Jones' perspective effectively prevented justification by faith from swallowing up every other issue and, indeed, his fully subjective perspective effectively brought Adventism's core message back to its pre-1888 focus. Note Jones' concept of character preparation for translation:

Faith in Jesus Christ, personal faith in Jesus Christ, and receiving righteousness by faith, and the keeping of the Sabbath, seeing Christ in it, and receiving the seal of God, the perfect image of Jesus Christ, reflected in the character,—this prepared the

character for the close of probation. And the health reform is to prepare our bodies for the close of probation, because, between the close of probation and the Saviour's coming, our bodies are to pass through the plagues before we are ready to meet him, and be like him, seeing him as he is.³¹

Jones had traveled from a centering upon Christ's righteousness to a focus upon his own flesh. And he and Waggoner would lead the SDA church of the 1890s in that path.

Jones, Anna Rice and Justification.³² In the latter part of 1892, SDA fears of final events were startlingly revealed by the manner in which it reacted to the "visions" of a youthful believer, Anna Rice. It is indeed interesting to observe that the presuppositions were so strongly entrenched that it was not considered necessary to consult with Ellen White (who was then ministering in Australia) prior to public circulation of the so-called visions of Anna. The reason A T Jones took such prominent part in endorsing the visions concern us in this section.

Anna's basic theological and eschatological premises indeed harmonized with those of A T Jones. And Jones was further flattered when Anna informed him that the same angel that gave her the visions urged her to share them with Jones. Anna's visions centered around the nearness of the return of Christ and the necessary preparation church members needed to undertake before they could look upon the returning Christ and survive. While the initial focus concerned celibacy, eventually it came to include practically everything:

Nothing of earth can enter heaven, everything pertaining to this life must be given up. . . . Not one thing must be held back or cherished. Unless men and women are willing to give up everything, all of self, every pleasure of self, every known sin for God, they cannot enter heaven. . . . We are just on the borders of eternity and we can carry nothing of this world over. Jesus will change our vile bodies when he comes, like unto his most glorious body. But when he shall descend and look upon us, unless we are pure with everything of earth given up, we shall be consumed. We must be like Jesus, having overcome every temptation, emptied of all self and passion, everything that pertains to self, and be filled with his presence. . . .

As we stand in the house, this mortal house of clay, and see his coming getting nearer, very near, our hope that he is just at the door to take us unto himself, arises, and the thought, I must be pure even as He is pure, comes with it. How pure is he? Has he one thing in him like the world or pertaining to the world? No, not one, and we must be like him. . . . Give [a]ll up for God, and then he can make you pure and ready to meet him.³³

It is obvious that Sister Anna, like Jones and Waggoner, maintained no concept of an out-side-of-you justification and hence did not think of the eschatological implications of such justification. The result was the complete subjectivication of the process and, in effect, bring back the essential theological focus of the pre-1888 SDA church.

Another "vision," however, illustrates the problem of analysis, for the wording used in a limited portion of the vision, seems to be the wording of justification. It is thus apparent that theological systems must be analyzed in their entirety and not by a few paragraphs here and there. The overwhelming focus of all the Rice visions involved frightening illustrations of the shortness of time remaining coupled with the need for the fullest self-sacrifice as preparation for that event. There is essentially no focus upon Christ. Yet, notice these words taken from a February, 1893, "vision": "No one could by any effort of their own or by their own works enter heaven. It must be by the faith and righteousness of Jesus, it must be all in him and through him." This sentiment, indeed, harmonized with the basic Jones-Waggoner theological system that considered that the righteousness that forgives sin remains within the individual and becomes the power that overcomes in the future. Since it is God's righteousness and not the individual's, it was not a righteousness by works, but rather "all in and through" the righteousness of Christ.³⁴ It is indeed interesting that only Ellen White in Adventism saw the grave dangers to the church if the Rice-Jones "testimonies" prevailed.

Initially, the assumptions of Anna Rice did not differ markedly with very

many in Adventism and again serves to illustrate the confusion within the church over the very basic message of justification by faith. A T Jones, S N Haskell and, indeed, the church in general was ripe for such deceptions. In July of 1893 Haskell wrote Anna that he felt "a deep interest in what you have written" and had shared her writings with "other of our leading brethren" and "thus far they have thought them to be of God and that is the general impression as far as I know." Eschatological assumptions were determining theology as Haskell wrote: "We are certainly living in startling times. We are living in the closing work of the gospel on the earth. God is pouring out his holy spirit and he is preparing his people for the last final conflict."³⁵

A T Jones brought great notoriety to the Rice testimonies at the conclusion of the week of prayer meetings in late 1893. He, himself, published a description of the final Sabbath meeting in the Review and noted that an article written by Ellen White was read "with an unpublished testimony on entire consecration, the proper use of our time and means, and the nearness of the end," "and the good impressions of the spirit of God in the forenoon exercises were only deepened and carried forward to a triumphant victory over the power of the enemy in this place." While Jones did not tell the congregation that the "unpublished" testimony was one of the "visions" of Anna Rice, he did observe: "The meeting took a peculiar, though most blessed turn. The unpublished testimony read had insisted on entire separation from the world and worldliness, from pride and outward adorning, and that there should be plainness of dress, and especially a 'tearing off' of gold, etc, instead of wearing it on the body." The atmosphere created resulted in over \$21,000 in cash and items donated and over 75 decisions for baptism, 66 who had made their initial decision as the result of the meeting.³⁶

Ellen White's analysis of the Anna Rice episode differed from that of all

others within the church. Normal reasoning would probably have prevented Ellen White from disparaging the work of Anna Rice. Anything she would say would probably sound like an unwillingness to share the prophetic role with a potential rival. And the results seemed to be positive as reflected in the baptisms and donations in Battle Creek. The praise from prominent denominational leaders that Anna received and the excellent press coverage over the Battle Creek revival all seemed to point toward exoneration, rather than warnings.

Ellen White saw beyond the immediate, however, and history proves her completely correct. She warned Jones that his support of Anna Rice was support of a movement similar to the "spiritualistic," false sanctification fanaticism faced by her in the earliest stages of her mission to the church and she also compared it to the past Garmire episode. She warned him that she had been "made to tremble for some things that have been urged upon me by the Spirit of God in regard to your work." Satan was working "weaving his snares" for the feet of Jones and in "these last days the false will take the field with the true, the spurious with the genuine." She told Jones:

I know what I am talking about, for most solemn messages were given me to correct this evil that was growing to large proportions among those who had so great a burden to set people right in regard to purity. The state of things was terrible. . . . You are giving to the work a mold which it will take precious time and wearing soul labor to correct, to save the cause of God from another spasm of fanaticism.³⁷

A spate of similar movements led by such denominational leaders as E R Jones, A W Stanton, R S Donnell, A F Ballenger, S S Davis, J H Kellogg and others pervaded Adventism in the 1890s. All had the common failure to distinguish or recognize the difference between legal justification at the cross and sanctification. By failing to distinguish between the perfect, legal righteousness set to the sinner's account and sanctification, the two became

merged and theological aberration pervaded the church in the 1890s.

Such did not occur without warnings from Ellen White, however. The day after writing Jones, she addressed the church in general and perhaps, even unknowingly identified a central cause of the confusion: "The Lord has given Brother Jones a message to prepare a people to stand in the day of God; but when the people shall look to Elder Jones instead of God, they will become weak instead of strong. It is no time now to be careless and ignorant of Satan's masterly devices to draw the people into deceptions and delusions."³⁸

The new focus upon the message of justification by faith was indeed the message "to prepare a people to stand in the day of God." It was false assumptions about that message, and the failure to closely analyze it, that provided the opportunity for fanaticism and theological aberration. Indeed, it was an undue focus upon the theology of Jones and Waggoner, rather than scriptural analysis, that moved the church closer to aberration. Although Jones and Waggoner contributed to SDA theology in their focus upon righteousness as a gift, their lack of understanding and failure to distinguish between forensic and subjective righteousness led them and the church into what Ellen White would later call the "strange paths of pantheism." If only Jones had taken the following personal testimony sent to him concerning the Anna Rice experience to heart and pondered the upward focus of the Ellen White counsel:

Measuring weapons with Satan in the wilderness and in the garden of Gethsemane and on the cross, Christ received his death wound, which was the trophy of his victory, and the victory of all who believe in him. . . . Through faith in the righteousness of Christ, rebels against the law of God may lay hold upon the infinite, and become partakers of everlasting life.³⁹

It was the church failure to perceive the differing focus of the Anna Rice visions and actually treat them as though they sprang from a voice similar to that of Ellen White that is the most revealing and was so painful to Ellen White. Ellen White consistently looked upward to a heavenly righteousness when

she defined saving righteousness while just as consistently those who were leading the church into theological aberration were looking within as the source of saving righteousness. While Mrs White felt "very tenderly" toward Anna Rice and the misguidance she received from church leaders, Mrs White was amazed that Jones should have read the writings of Rice "in connection with the communications from Sister White given her of God." She deeply regretted the failure to distinguish the differing focus between Rice and herself: "The great wonder to me is that our brethren should accept these writings because they could see nothing objectionable in them," she wrote to Prescott and Jones. Alluding to the complexity of the issues that called for a careful analysis of differing concepts of the basis for our justification, Mrs White told Jones and Prescott:

You seem to think I should be able to point out just where the particularly objectionable sentiments lie. There is nothing so very apparent in that which has been written. You have been able to discover nothing objectionable, but this is no reason for using these writings as you have done. Your course in this matter is decidedly objectionable. Is it necessary that you should discern at once something that would produce harm to the people of God, to make you cautious?⁴⁰

A consistent reaction of Ellen White in situations similar to the Rice episode was to point to the remedy for such teachings: "The word of God is your counselor; the word of God is your authority. Be very careful how you bring anything weaker to take its place," she warned Prescott and Jones. "Take your Bibles, and dwell upon the truth. Preach the word, and let the Holy Spirit of God impress the hearts of the hearers." Mrs White next gave deep insight into the nature of her mission and her relevance to us today:

The reason why I hang out the danger signal is, that through the enlightenment of the Spirit of God I can see that which my brethren do not discern. It may not be a positive necessity for me to point out all these peculiar phases of deception that they will need to guard against. It is enough for me to tell you, Be on your guard; and as faithful sentinels keep the flock of God from accepting indiscriminately all that professes to be communicated to them from

the Lord. . . . Satan would like nothing better than to call minds away from the word, to look for and expect something outside of the word to make them feel. . . . The word of God is the weapon of our warfare.⁴¹

The reaction of Jones to the Ellen White communications is of surpassing interest and offers evidence that Jones did not profit from the experience sufficiently to question some of the basic theological tenets that made him in harmony with Anna Rice. In November of 1893 Ellen White wrote to the parents who had adopted Anna Rice that they should not have been fostering her work.⁴² Mrs White went further and affirmed that Anna's work of "accusing, of judging, of reproving, of condemning and flattering others" was likewise not indicted by the Lord.⁴³ Jones, one of those "flattered" by the information from Anna that the Lord specifically designed Jones to have Anna's communications, agreed with Anna's interpretation of the Ellen White communication: "On the whole it was not sent to me and I cannot see from it that God has given any special light in regard to my case." Jones did not see any broader counsel in the Ellen White communication than that Elder Rice should not have advanced the writings of Anna before the people. Jones continued in his counsel to Anna:

As for the words that she has had "not the least confidence" in your claims etc, and about your reproving, judging, condemning, etc, the communication as a whole is not clear and decided except in Bro Rice's work, and as the only news she had of you was from the determined enemies, presenting your name and all in the falsest light, it is not to be wondered at that she should have no confidence etc. Therefore on the whole so far as you yourself are concerned in it I think you would do well not to have any further anxiety over the matter. . . .

As for the matter you have sent to me, I cannot possibly see how the Lord could possibly condemn it, as it is only the plainest truth so far as I can see. . . . It does not seem to me possible that the Lord can in any way condemn what you have written so far--at least what you have written to me. For it is just as clear, and draws to Jesus just as much, as anything I have ever read in the writings by Sister White. . . . I have used the one you gave me at [1893] General Conference, twice in public congregations, and the results have been only of the best. I read it last Sabbath in the Tabernacle along with Sister White's and the results you see mentioned in Review of January 2 in my report. . . . I have no fears that the Lord will ever condemn these communications. . . . Trust the Lord the same as

ever. When he gives you anything receive it thankfully, and write it out and send it to me, if he so directs, or rather unless he forbids you, as he has directed you once to do it.⁴⁴

Even after receiving the later Ellen White communications already cited, Jones did not perceive the dimensions of the questions to his theological system raised by his assurance that Anna Rice was receiving visions from the Lord. His own theological premises were so closely allied with hers that he apparently never took the Ellen White counsels seriously enough to do the in-depth analysis that such communications demanded. Instead he wrote the following to Anna after receiving the Ellen White communications:

You can see it [Ellen White testimony] says just what we thought, That those things are not so far wrong in themselves. The wrong and the danger is in what would have come after; for it says plainly "There is nothing so very apparent in that which has been written," and "It is because of the many and varied dangers that would arise, that this warning is given."⁴⁵

Because Ellen White did not advocate the recalling of the widely-disseminated Rice "testimonies," Jones made additional unwarranted assumptions:

Another thing that helps is that though there are many wrongs and dangers that would come if that course were followed further, yet there is not enough that is wrong in these of themselves to pay for any effort to call them in or destroy them, that less harm will be done in letting them alone than in any special attempt to undo them. So we can just be of good cheer and thank the Lord that He has pointed out the dangers while we are safe and while the matter in itself can do no particular harm. This we can be glad of, and take courage and go on our way rejoicing.⁴⁶

Besides the theological implications of the Anna Rice experience, other aspects directly involve 1888 issues. Although Stephen Haskell did not analyze the issue from a theological perspective, he did draw some lessons that were useful. Indeed, Haskell wondered to Mrs White whether she had been in the "Wartburg Castle" long enough and should return from Australia to "Wittenburg" to check some of the growing aberrations within Adventism. Haskell also observed that neither Prescott nor Jones were personally involved with some of the theological aberrations that had sprung up in the early years of the

denomination, "but had they consulted with Uriah Smith and some of those who have been in the background, and are looked upon as being out of date, it would have saved them from making the mistake."⁴⁷

Ellen White drew additional observations in her response to Haskell. She expressed her anxiety concerning A T Jones "who is so ardent in his faith, and does not manifest the caution he should in his statements by pen or voice." Referring to both Jones and Prescott, Mrs White observed that "Some of our brethren have looked to these ministers and have placed them where God should be. They have received every word from their lips, without carefully seeking the counsel of God for themselves." She rejoiced, however, that both had manfully received her counsels and accepted their error in advancing Anna Rice as they had. She contrasted their response with those who had "refuse[d] the correction of God like stubborn children, and wait[ed] long in resistance, as those did who were reprov[ed] at the important meeting at Minneapolis." Again reflecting upon Minneapolis, Mrs White observed that the church had been in danger for years because of overreliance upon men in leadership positions:

Men who have been chosen of God to do a special work have been imperiled because the people have looked to the men in the place of looking to God. When Eld Butler was president of the General Conference, ministers placed Eld Butler and Eld Smith and some others where God alone should be. The brethren made grave mistakes, and the Lord sent messages of truth to correct their errors, and to lead them into safe paths. But in spite of the reproofs that have been given to the people, they still make men their trust, and exalt and glorify the human agent, and this grave error is repeated again and again.⁴⁸

Mrs White analyzed the situation faced by the SDA church as it wrestled with the opportunity of theological advancement because of new insights on justification by faith. "Every inch of the ground had to be fought in presenting the present message," she noticed and also affirmed that "some have not been reconciled with the providence of God in selecting the very men whom he did select to bear this special message." Disunity did indeed cloud the

perceptions of nearly all within the denomination. The pioneers were not selected by the Lord to give the new insight, affirmed Mrs White, because "these men who had had long experience would not do the work in God's way and after God's order." She endorsed the new insights of Jones and Waggoner by affirming: "God has chosen the very men he wanted, and we have reason to thank him that these men have carried forward the work with faithfulness, and have been the mouthpiece for God." Even though those mouthpieces "have not seen all things distinctly, because they were in danger, the Lord sent them a warning, and let every soul who loves God, thank the Lord for his mercies."⁴⁹

In an insight of surpassing importance, Mrs White analyzed the results of the disunity fostered by the animosity of the pioneers:

Let these men who have not received the draught from the wells of Bethlemen that has been presented to them consider how much has been lost in their not finding their place and their lot in doing the very work that God would have them do. Had these men of experience who have failed to do their part stood in the paths of God's choosing, and followed not the counsel of men but the counsel fo God, they would have connected with the men who were chosen to give the message which the people needed in these last days. God would have worked through them, and the work would have advanced much more rapidly and solidly than it has done. . . .

Had they walked in obedience to the light sent them from heaven, their experience in the rise and advancement of the third angel's message would have been of great value in helping to make complete the work for this time; but they refused to fill the position for which they were fitted, and failed to do the work for which God had qualified them, and they stood as criticisers and thought they could discern many flaws in the men whom God was using.⁵⁰

The foregoing inspired observation is vital for it places the new focus upon justification by faith in its eschatological setting, suggests that the pioneers had insights desperately needed by the church, insights so important that without them, the message had been both hindered and not advanced "solidly" as it could have. "God will hold them responsible for the good they might have done," affirmed Mrs White. "New aspects of truth" were yet to sound within the church. As we have previously seen, the pioneers maintained an

objective view of justification that was lacking in both Jones and Waggoner and such a perspective certainly could have emerged within a united church. Mrs White continued her inspired observation:

If the union had existed between these brethren, which Christ in his lessons has enjoined upon his disciples, some mistakes and errors which have occurred would have been avoided. But if the men who should have used their experience in furthering the work, have labored to hinder it, and mistakes have occurred that would not have occurred if they had stood in their allotted place, whom will God hold accountable for these late errors? He will hold the very men accountable who should have been gathering light and united with the faithful watchmen in these days of peril. . . .

The Lord's work needed every jot and tittle of experience that he had given Eld Butler and Eld Smith, but they have taken their own course in some things irrespective of the light God has given.⁵¹

Theological aberration pervaded Adventism in the 1890s and sprang from the "many and varied ideas" concerning justification by faith bred by the disunity of the period.⁵² While Ellen White offered a different interpretation of the preparation for those final events, SDA fears concerning the end were understandable as we shall observe next.

NOTES

1. A T Jones, Initial Sermon on Justification by Faith, May 11, 1889, in Topeka Daily Capital, May 14, 1889. This, and other Jones sermons in the series will be examined in detail in chapter 9.
2. The use by Jones and Waggoner of objective-sounding terminology, but meant to apply subjectively, will be discussed shortly.
3. E J Waggoner, "The Law in the Gospel," ST, March 18, 1889.
4. Ibid, emphasis supplied. It was this lack of an objective concept of forgiveness that led Waggoner to observe that by the early 1890s, he had forsaken traditional SDA sanctuary concepts that emphasized such objective transactions. [See E J Waggoner, "Confession of Faith," p 14] The Jones-Waggoner concept of a Mediator likewise lacked objective, legal categories and to them meant that Christ was a dispenser of His righteousness in a very real transaction to the believer. [See Waggoner, "Everlasting Covenant," 1900.]
5. David P McMahon, Ellet Joseph Waggoner: The Myth and the Man (1979), pp 28-9; E J Waggoner, "Is a State Religion Contemplated?" ST, Oct 2, 1884.
6. Rev Philip S Moxom, "Christ 'the End of the Law,'" ST, June 5, 1884.
7. As will become increasingly clear in future treatment in this work.
8. Ibid.
9. E J Waggoner, "Condemned and Justified," ST, July 3, 1884.
10. E J Waggoner, "A New Creature in Christ," ST, July 17, 1884, and "Under the Law," ST, Sept 18, 1884 (emphasis supplied).
11. E J Waggoner, "The Gospel in the Book of Galatians," 1886-87, p 63.
12. E J Waggoner, "Sabbath-School Lessons on the Letter to the Hebrews," Sept 7, 1889, BSL #28, pp 34-5.
13. E J Waggoner, The Glad Tidings, 1900, pp 117-18 (emphasis added).
14. E J Waggoner, "Christ the End of the Law," ST, July 24 and Aug 7, 1884.
15. E J Waggoner, "Under the Law," ST, Aug 28, Sept 4, Sept 11, 1884.
16. Ibid, Sept 11, 1884.
17. A T Jones, "Charity the Object of the Law," Sermon in Oakland, Cal, July 5, 1884, printed in ST, July 31, 1884.
18. A T Jones, "How to Honor the Reformers," ST, Oct 23, 1884, emphasis supplied.
19. J N Andrews, RH, Jan 31, 1854.
20. E J Waggoner, "Justification and Sanctification," ST, April 1, 1886.
21. E J Waggoner, "Justified by Faith," ST, March 25, 1886, emphasis supplied.
22. E J Waggoner, "Justification and Sanctification," ST, April 1, 1886, emphasis supplied.
23. Ellen White, "Danger of False Ideas on Justification by Faith," 1890, Ms 36-90.
24. Ibid.
25. Ibid.
26. A T Jones, "The Third Angel's Message," ST, Dec 8, 1887, emphasis supplied.
27. A T Jones, "Health Reform by Faith," Home Missionary, Nov, 1893.
28. A T Jones, "Health Reform by Faith," Home Missionary Extra, Nov, 1893.
29. Ibid.
30. Ibid.
31. Ibid.
32. For a masterful treatment of the entire Anna Rice experience, see George Knight, From 1888 to Apostasy: The Case of A T Jones, pp 104-16.
33. Anna Rice to Bro and Sister, Aug 10, 1892, DF363a, WE.
34. Anna Rice to A T Jones with enclosure, Feb 21, 1893, DF363a, WE.

35. Stephen Haskell to Anna Rice, July 28, 1893, DF363a, WE.
36. A T Jones, "Sabbath, December 30, in Battle Creek," RH, Jan 2, 1894.
37. Ellen White to A T Jones, March 15, 1894, J103-94.
38. Ellen White to Brethren and Sisters, March 16, 1894, B6a-94.
39. Ellen White to A T Jones, March 15, 1894, J103-94.
40. Ellen White to W W Prescott and A T Jones, April 16, 1894, P68-94.
41. Ibid.
42. J D Rice was an ordained minister working for the California Conference in Utah.
43. Ellen White to Bro-Sister Rice, Nov 1, 1893, R54-93.
44. A T Jones to Anna Rice, Jan 3, 1894, DF363a, WE, emphasis supplied.
45. A T Jones to Anna Rice, May 24, 1894, DF363a, WE.
46. Ibid, emphasis supplied.
47. Stephen Haskell to Ellen White, March 31 and April 20, 1894, DF363a, WE.
48. Ellen White to Stephen Haskell, June 1, 1894, H27-94.
49. Ibid.
50. Ibid, emphasis supplied..
51. Ibid.
52. Ellen White to Uriah Smith, Sept 19, 1892, S24-92.

Chapter 4

Doomsday Context: the Eschatological Setting

Such last-day concepts as the time of trouble, last warning message, loud cry, image to beast, shaking, etc, were all ideas shared by both the pioneers and Jones-Waggoner. None, except Ellen White, however, seemed to perceive how justification by faith had to condition those eschatological assumptions. The issue that separated the pioneers from Jones-Waggoner in the area of eschatology concerned the question of how the righteousness that would prepare the church for the final events would be obtained. The pre-1888 focus was that it was obtained through obedience to the law; Jones-Waggoner considered that it was received as a gift developed within the individual. Both systems considered that the final generation would be living without sin because those translated would have found the means of fulfilling the most far-reaching demands of the law.

Pioneers and Last-day Perfection. The pioneer perception of last-generation righteousness is illustrated by George Butler's article published by the Review in February of 1889. According to Butler, those who were to be translated would be found without personal "guile" and "the circumstances of their salvation (they being translated without death) are very different" from all who preceded them. He believed that their personal "holiness and purity" would transcend that of all past generations. Since they were to "meet the fearful scenes connected with the closing of human probation" it would be "the highest possible honor to belong to this class." "The preparation and purification are to be wrought in us here in the days of probation. The moral change precedes the translation to heaven," he affirmed.¹

If the 1888 GC offered new possibilities in dealing with the preparation for the final events, the 1887 GC illustrated how the past message dealt with

such preparation. The following was adopted at the 1887 session:

Whereas, The great religio-political crisis in which will be involved the last conflict between truth and error, is even now overshadowing our land; and--

Whereas, In these troublous times the Lord by the prophet (Dan 12:1) has assured protection to those only whose names are written in the book of life, and whose robes are washed in the blood of the Lamb; and--

Whereas, The success of the cause of truth depends not upon human efforts, but solely upon the power of God, which power can be secured only by bringing ourselves into such harmony with his will that we may become partakers of the divine nature; therefore--

Resolved, That we will, by the help of God, strive as never before to heed the injunction of the Scriptures, "Be ye holy; for I am holy," and so separate ourselves from all sin and impurity of heart and life, that the divine counsel may guide, and the divine power attend, all our efforts.²

Personal obedience was the path to acceptance in the pioneer system and James Garmire identified with that premise.

Garmire Episode.³ Any one of the 18,702 Seventh-day Adventists in 1884 could have predicted that the year would be significant to his church. After all, this was the year that equaled the time since 1844 that Moses had spent in the Sinai wilderness. That fact was not lost upon one James M Garmire and he brought his message to Battle Creek, where over 12% of the total membership of the church fellowshipped.

In some ways, Garmire represented a culmination of the law focus that many SDAs had accepted as standard. In recounting his 1884 experience Garmire stressed that "evil must not be countenanced in any form," that "all sin . . . must be put away."⁴ He aroused the fears of many who thought of facing the final judgment and yet not feeling as though they were personally blameless. Garmire's path to personal sinlessness was through doctrinal obedience for "without a perfect doctrine the church cannot be pure, free from mixture with anything that weakens, impairs or pollutes."⁵ Many within the church believed that since perfect sanctification would eventually result from obedience to the truth, then correct doctrine was of surpassing importance.

A former canvasser, Garmire used the correct apocalyptic language, combined with scattered Biblical passages and themes lifted from early Ellen White visions and, based upon a "vision" given his 14-year-old daughter on August 23, 1884, warned all Adventists he was able to reach (from the subscription list of the Review stolen by one of his followers) of the impending close of probation. He even mildly berated Mrs White for tolerating some of the imperfections he observed in the church.⁶

Garmire created sufficient havoc in Battle Creek and within the denomination as a whole to call forth several pamphlets and testimonies. That written jointly by George Butler, the president of the General Conference, and Uriah Smith, editor of the Review, would be but one illustration of why the SDA church of his period had great need of its "pioneers" who had seen such aberrant manifestations in past denominational history. Their approach, however, would also illustrate a problem that would become more and more visible in this period. Rather than closely analyze the theological roots to Garmire's fanaticism, Smith and Butler affirmed, "We frankly confess we are very suspicious of all new devices in God's work. We cling to the old paths."⁷ The pioneers also decried that Garmire had made "strenuous efforts" to gain a following in Battle Creek, "the very headquarters of the work of present truth."⁸ Butler's concept of his position as defender of the denomination's theology and Battle Creek as being the center of denominational truth would again arise.

Another theme that would be reechoed throughout the 1880s and 1890s and onward would be the misuse of the writings of Ellen White to apparently bolster the authority given to perverted teachings. Mrs White berated Garmire for his "expressing so much faith in the testimonies" and using them in such a manner as to "lower the sacredness and exalted character" of her ministry to the

church.⁹

Still another theme of the period would be Mrs White's observation that the "visions" of Anna Garmire were not sustained "by the Word of God" but instead were imbued with a Satanic "cloak of righteousness." Mrs White throughout his period (as well as throughout her entire ministry) would consistently point to the Scriptures as the test of all doctrine and experience.¹⁰

While doing so, however, Mrs White also saw a special relevance to her own ministry. One of her missions was "to unveil this falsehood, and to rebuke it in the name of the Lord. As the end drew near, I was to see more of these manifestations." And as the end approached, Satan would especially work "to make of none effect" her ministry. Her ministry also involved working against the disunity that resulted from false standards that resulted in "questioning, criticizing, denouncing, passing judgment on others." While Mrs White agreed to some extent with Garmire's premise that "time was short," she disagreed with his theological solution and looked for a "great work [that] was to be accomplished to prepare a people to be sealed with the seal of the living God."¹¹ A new message would provide that opportunity. But unfortunately, the 1890s would reveal that eschatological assumptions were guided by the theological premises of Garmire rather than by justification by faith. The involvement and endorsement of Anna Rice by A T Jones and others illustrates the dilemma and illustrates that eschatological assumptions were swallowing up the centrality of justification by faith.

The Sunday Issue and Eschatological Setting. The eschatological focus came at a time when SDAs were sensitive to that issue. Events on the national horizon seemed to bear out what had been predicted since the early 1850s: there would be a day, just prior to the return of Jesus, when the United States would

persecute those who kept the Sabbath.

As early as July of 1878, in an apparently isolated incident, Samuel Mitchel of Quitman, Georgia, was arrested and imprisoned for working on his farm on Sunday and suffered under "loathsome" prison conditions for 30 days. The imprisonment directly contributed to Mitchel's death Feb 4, 1879.¹²

Wholesale arrests, including that of W C White, commenced in California in 1882 when fundamentalist churchgoers began to push for rigid enforcement of the California Sunday law. White, the 28-year-old son of Ellen and one of the directors of the Pacific Press had been arrested for the operation of that institution on Sunday. The California Sunday issue attracted nationwide attention and became the major political item in the state elections held in 1882. The Democrats, who had pushed through the original California Sunday law, changed positions while the Republican Party supported the law. The victorious Democrats repealed the law and SDAs at the 1882 General Conference Session "recognize[d] in this result the hand of God" in allowing additional time to proclaim to the world its "duty to observe the Sabbath of the Lord" and thus "to prepare for the advent of his Son." The session also rejoiced that the mission of the Pacific Press that had been seriously imperiled could continue.¹³

It was the American Civil War that gave impetus to the organization largely responsible for agitating for Sunday legislation. Taking the name National Reform Association, representatives from 11 Protestant denominations met in Xenia, Ohio, in 1863, and sought to prevent the national calamities it saw by direct legislative means.¹⁴

The November, 1883, General Conference session reflected the SDA assessment of the growing National Reform Movement by passing three resolutions concerning the Sunday question. In almost boastfully pointing to its past

anticipation of "the present Sunday movement, and understanding that there is a conflict before us," the delegates reminded Adventists "of their duty to place the great light" on the Sabbath upon others and to do so "before the leaders of this Sunday movement have opportunity to represent the issues of this question in a false light."¹⁵

The delegates approved two resolutions dealing with practical methodology to counteract the Sunday movement and recommended publishing both tracts and a new monthly publication which became the Sabbath Sentinel, published for two years by the Review.¹⁶

The eschatological setting in which the pioneers found themselves raised very serious questions about their preparedness for that event. It seemed as though the church's theological focus was brought into serious question. Stephen Haskell illustrated the dilemma as we compare his official pronouncements as president of the International Tract and Missionary Society with his private, personal fears to Ellen White. Haskell sought to stimulate others with his observations of the eschatological setting:

The signs of the times indicate very clearly that the coming of the Lord draweth nigh, and what is done must be done quickly. The Sunday law agitation in California and the movement that is now being made in many of the states in this country as well as nearly all the nations in Europe shows most clearly that we have been correct in the application of the prophecy relating to this country and these things most clearly indicate that the end of all things is at hand. . . . There are evidences that we are already entering the shaking time that has been spoken of so repeatedly for these many years. Many of our ministers even are dropping out of the work.¹⁷

In this public letter of counsel, Haskell sought to stimulate his readers by drawing upon his understanding of proper preparation for the return of Christ. He warned his readers that if they neglected their witnessing "in the closing scenes of this world's history," that they would be "destitute of that experience which will enable [them] to form such a character as God can accept, that will stand the test of the Judgment." He reiterated his point: "We want a

character that God can approve, and this character is made up of acts, as a brick wall is made up by one brick being placed upon another." The message that the church was relying upon as it prepared for its final stand centered upon a theology that found acceptable righteousness to pass the judgment in the personal obedience of the believer. This test of character was wrought out by Christ's help, of course, and Haskell wanted that point clear: "Our character is formed by a continual succession of acts that call out those qualities of the mind which God has implanted in our being."¹⁸

The frank and personal confessions of inadequacy of this 50-year-old pioneer tell us something about the insufficiency of the "old message" for its eschatological test. Less than two weeks after his previous letter, Haskell told Ellen White of a "crisis" in his religious experience and decried "traits of character which had cropped out here and there" that "ought to be overcome." He had tried to overcome his temptations, Haskell affirmed, yet some of his failures he had "fought during all my Christian experience." He confessed his dilemma to Ellen White that "when I preached to others sufficient grace" to overcome everything, he himself "was ashamed to mention" his personal failures. As Haskell considered this theology of a final testing by character development, he felt inadequate. Haskell pleaded for a "thorough cure for selfishness" and for all his "wicked" ways "or if this cannot be accomplished I see no object in living." He again mentioned the welcoming of death if he could not "be of benefit to the cause of present truth," and, until receiving a letter from Ellen White that encouraged him considered that perhaps he had been deserted by God.¹⁹ A prominent aspect of the ministry of Ellen White during this period was her letters of encouragement to those who were humbled when they looked at the dimensions of the law and the converse to those who considered themselves adequate to stand before Sinai.

Sunday Persecutions in Arkansas and Tennessee. The stakes in the pioneer system became higher in 1885 for it was during that year that SDAs suffered very real religious persecution. Difficulties began in Arkansas when a newly-elected prosecuting attorney in Little Rock began to enforce the previously-unenforced law that prevented saloon-keepers from doing business on Sunday. When a few of the Jewish owners could stay open every day on the basis of the exemption clause that applied to "persons who are members of any religious society who observe as Sabbath any other day of the week than the Christian Sabbath, or Sunday," the legislature on March 3, 1885, quickly repealed the clause. It is ironic that in the aftermath only Seventh-day Adventists suffered the penalty of the law while the saloons continued to operate in violation of the law and remained completely unmolested.²⁰

The immediate background to SDA imprisonments in both Arkansas and Tennessee for violations on Sunday legislation was the establishment of new SDA churches raised up after evangelistic meetings. While Tennessee had no exemption clause for SDAs, its 1803 law was not enforced until a number of citizens of Henry County organized a SDA church in that community. In three arrests in Tennessee in 1885 for minor Sunday labor, SDAs Parker, Stem and Dortch were imprisoned for nine months, two months, and two months respectively when they chose prison over paying fines.²¹

Indictments in Alabama followed on the heels of the repeal of the exemption clause. The first indicted was SDA minister James W Scoles. Scoles, with D A Wellman had established a SDA church at Springdale in the summer of 1884 and in the next year a church building was constructed. After the death of Wellman, Elder J G Wood of Missouri, joined Scoles. Together they organized the Springdale church with 61 members and established another company of 30 to 40 members.²²

The manner in which Scoles was convicted is incredible. During the fall, 1885, session of the Fayetteville, Arkansas, circuit court, James Armstrong, head elder of the Springdale church was summoned to appear before the grand jury. He was sworn in and then asked about his knowledge of Sunday violations. After prodding, Armstrong stated that he knew of railroads operating in that area on Sunday. He further responded that he knew of hotels doing business on Sunday. After going in this vein and mentioning drugstores, barbershops, livery stables, etc, he was finally asked if he knew of any SDAs "who ever work on Sunday?" All five that Armstrong was forced to name were indicted and Scoles was among them. Scoles had painted a portion of the new church on Sunday, April 26, 1885, and was indicted for the crime of "Sabbathbreaking" despite the fact that the church was not visible from any public roads.²³

During the Scoles trial, the church decided to take strong action and set up an evangelistic tent where the trial was to be held. The GC sent E F Farnsworth, according to Butler, "one of our best speakers" to assist in the evangelistic meetings. Farnsworth initially observed that public sentiment was clearly against SDAs, both by the looks and reactions of the people and by the prices they had to pay for any services. Judge Walker, former US Senator, was hired to defend Scoles and two others who had been indicted, but he knew that there was no hope of winning the case in court. Walker portrayed the Arkansas law as unconstitutional in its infringement upon freedom of religion and depriving one of property rights by taking portions of his time and also as violating the scriptural admonition to labor six days and rest one. The judge overruled Walker's entire defense by asserting that the law did not inhibit anyone from worshiping on Saturday if they chose; it merely compelled him to rest on Sunday. The law likewise took no property from one class that it did not take from another, since it was not the law, but the person's religion that

caused him to have to observe two days.²⁴

Adventists clearly saw the "signs of the times" when Scoles himself was given the opportunity of speaking to the jury and to the many spectators. In the 40 minutes granted Scoles, he focused upon the scriptural rationale for Sabbath observance. Farnsworth observed:

The Spirit of God and the surrounding circumstances gave his words solemnity and power. . . . The crowd was held in perfect silence. To see a minister of the gospel on trial in a court of justice, pleading with the Bible in his hand for the authority of God's law and for liberty to keep it, was a sight that has not often been seen in the past, but we believe will be repeated many times in the future.²⁵

Scoles was convicted and on October 30, 1886, his conviction was sustained by the Arkansas Supreme Court and that paved the way for convictions of about 20 additional SDAs that had been indicted and whose trials were held in abeyance awaiting the decision of the Arkansas Supreme Court in the Scoles case. All were SDAs and all were found guilty.

Actions taken at the 1885 GC directly impinged upon the situation in Arkansas and Tennessee. Farnsworth described the situation in Arkansas to the delegates and Elder Fulton of Tennessee described the situation there. Appeals were then pending before the supreme courts of both states. Butler appointed a committee of five to suggest appropriate action concerning the arrests and an "earnest and lengthy discussion" ensued when the committee reported. Because of the widespread interest in the issue, the entire congregation present at the session was given opportunity to vote upon the report and "by a rising vote, heartily sustained the report."²⁶

The committee noted that, as a minimum, the fourth commandment gave permission for all to work six days in seven, and such permission came from higher authority than man. It vigorously denied the rationale that maintained a state's prerogative to require its citizens to keep the first day and allow

any who chose to do so, to keep an additional day. "The Sunday institution was designed as a substitute for the Sabbath of the Lord; and it is impossible to keep aright the Sabbath of the Lord as he has commanded, and to keep a human substitute for it at the same time," emphasized the report. The study submitted evidence showing that the Sunday arrests were intentional religious persecution and once appeals to the state supreme court were exhausted recommended, that those convicted "suffer imprisonment rather than to pay fines" because such imprisonment would focus attention upon the injustice of such a law and "also lead all classes to consider well the motives of those who instigate persecution against quiet and inoffensive Christian citizens." The report concluded:

Everything indicates that the struggle in vindication of the great principles of the Reformation is to be re-enacted in the United States. Our reading of the prophetic word has enabled us to foresee these things; for years we have looked for them. And if we shall be counted worthy to have a part in this work, and to suffer for the sake of the precious truth of God, let us walk after the example of Him who suffered for us, and who will crown his faithful followers with glory and immortality.²⁷

One year to the day after the GC session took its action, George Butler wrote to Ellen White about his fears concerning what those thus imprisoned were facing and might be called upon to face in the future. The Scoles case had been lost in the state supreme court and he wondered whether the case should be submitted to the US Supreme Court. Even if the denomination lost in that instance, the situation in Arkansas could not worsen since bigotry allowed practically complete confiscation of SDA property and person. Each separate offense could be fined from \$25 to \$50 and as many offenses could be indicted as the state pleased. When the believers went to jail rather than pay their fines, they were allowed \$1 per day in jail, but after their release were still charged the fine and also for board at the jail. They could then be reindicted for another offense or their property confiscated for the unpaid fine or board.

While in jail the believer could be hired out on a prison gang for 75 cents per day and could be whipped for refusing to work on Sabbath. Butler feared that believers might be sent to the state prison where, if they refused to work on Sabbath, they could be placed in barrels where water constantly flowed in and unless the prisoner worked the pump he would drown. Conditions in the jails was indescribably filthy and after release the anticipation of returning must have been devastating. After one SDA and his son were released, they were served 8 to 10 additional indictments and returned to jail.²⁸

Adventists in Arkansas were jailed primarily for such farm-related work on Sunday as picking overripe fruit, picking potatoes for dinner, fixing a broken wagon, plowing, pulling weeds, etc. Often those indicted were not even noticeable violators since most of the farms were isolated. They often were charged because of what they told someone, or upon the word of someone who had visited them. In almost every case, those that testified against the Adventist were involved in far more laborious work on Sunday and were not indicted. One SDA was fined for Sunday labor done 17 days before the exemption clause was repealed and some were jailed even after the exemption was reinstated.²⁹

A T Jones was quick to point to the "Arkansas iniquity" as an illustration of what Sunday legislation could do under circumstances of religious prejudice and warned, "If there is anybody in the United States who wants to see in free America anything more like to the Inquisition than is this, just let him work for National Reform." A national Sunday law, such as espoused by the National Reformers would "make possible in all this Nation the enactment of such scenes as these which have been enacted in Arkansas." Jones affirmed that the fact that while some in the leadership positions in the Movement "abhorred" such persecution, their feelings of tenderness helped not one bit since it was their philosophy of civil enactment of religious laws that enabled "bigoted and

fanatical" religionists to persecute. "Religious bigots in Arkansas are no worse than those in any other state," observed Jones. Such a "persecuting, intolerant spirit" will always become manifest "when any class of religionists can control the civil power," he warned, and if the wishes of the National Reformers prevailed, "the history of Arkansas from 1885 to 1887, would be but repeated through the whole extent of the nation."³⁰

While SDA endeavors in publicizing the Arkansas persecutions were effective, it was the grandson of Davy Crockett who turned the tide. Early in 1887, Arkansas state senator Colonel Robert H Crockett introduced and secured passage of a bill in the Arkansas legislature that again allowed exemption from penalties of the Sunday law to Sabbath-keepers. A statewide meeting for all SDAs in Arkansas was called to commence April 14 in Springdale, and Sunday, April 17 was appointed as a day of thanksgiving because of the deliverance. Among the resolutions passed at the meeting was one extended to Crockett thanking him for "his faithful and philanthropic efforts in our behalf." Also thanked was the Arkansas Bar Association, the governor Simon P Hughes, the Little Rock Gazette, for assistance during the SDA crisis. The members also voted to observe February 12, the day that Governor Hughes signed the new bill, as a day in which the SDAs in Arkansas would abstain from normal secular labor and assemble for worship in thankfulness to God for His hand of intervention.³¹

Crockett's speech before the Arkansas legislature was powerful and widely published in newspapers throughout the country. SDAs likewise published and circulated the speech that mentioned specific cases of religious persecution that brought Crockett to "take shame to myself" to have been a member of the 1885 legislature that repealed the exemption clause and thereby brought that persecution. "It was hasty and ill-advised" and "only productive of oppressive persecution upon many of our best citizens, and of shame to the fair fame of

our young and glorious State." Crockett emotionally told of specific case histories both of SDAs and Seventh-day Baptists who suffered in Arkansas and pointed out that there had been in the two years since repeal of the exemption clause more religious persecution in Arkansas than in all states combined since 1787. "Accursed be the day which brought such a foul blot upon our State's fair fame," he proclaimed and urged that "this one foul blot be wiped from the escutcheon of our glorious commonwealth."³²

Early in 1885 Mrs White had warned that Adventists would soon experience the wrath of persecution depicted in Revelation "as the Protestant churches unite with the world and with the papal power against commandment keepers. The same spirit which actuated papists in ages past will lead Protestants to pursue a similar course toward those who will maintain their loyalty to God." Such a persecuting spirit, indicated Ellen White, would give evidence that the United States was "disconnect[ing] herself fully from righteousness." Such a union "when Protestantism shall stretch her hand across the gulf to grasp the hand of the Roman power," would indicate that the end was near. Adventism's eschatological testing had clearly arrived, but its inadequacy was everywhere apparent and only Ellen White seemed to clearly perceive the new "energy" necessary for the church to receive. That "energy" was to be found solely in the new message beginning to sound more and more loudly within the church. Ellen White again pointed to it in her early 1885 testimonies to the church: "While we should realize our sinful condition, we are to rely upon Christ as our righteousness, our sanctification, and our redemption," she urged. Our only hope "is in the mercy of God."³³

1886 GC Session and Eschatological Setting. When he announced the forthcoming GC session, Butler aluded to the last days setting in which the church found itself. Its message was penetrating areas both within the US and

abroad in a way never before achieved, but also "the spirit of persecution is abroad." He told of SDAs jailed "for observing and teaching the law of God" and the church had "in this respect reached a point never before attained in this cause." To Butler it was a "time for serious thought and much prayer" and he urged all SDAs to "pray for the success of the next General Conference."³⁴

The Sunday persecutions remained a constant cloud over the 1886 GC session from its first meeting on November 18 until its last on December 6. Although President Butler in his presidential address was able to report a year of prosperity for the church, "as much so as in any year in the past," he also reported that opposition was arising against SDAs and that some were already suffering from religious persecution. The Sunday imprisonments should not be cause of discouragement, Butler affirmed, "for this is just what we have long been expecting, from the declarations of God's word." At the second meeting of the session, Butler again raised the question of Sunday persecutions "for the consideration of the Conference" and many reports were given concerning the situation in various states. A number of those who had carefully observed the situation in Arkansas, including J A Armstrong who had been imprisoned, reported on the imprisonments in that state. It was moved that Butler appoint and chair a committee of seven to recommend a strategy to the Conference.³⁵

Before Butler's committee reported, the Committee on Resolutions also addressed the spectre of the Sunday persecutions and passed the following resolution:

WHEREAS, The reports from the various mission fields show that the third angel's message is spreading with a rapidity never known before, and the many and urgent calls that are coming in show that the fields are white already to the harvest; and--

WHEREAS, The persecution which we have long expected against those that "keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ" is no longer a matter of theory, but is a stern reality; therefore--

2. RESOLVED, That we recognize all these things as evident tokens that the end is very near, and that our time for work will

soon close; and that while we thank God for the help which he has given us in the past, and for the privilege of laboring for him, we will be admonished by these tokens to redouble our diligence, and to make renewed and complete consecration of ourselves to God and his cause; and further--

3. RESOLVED, That we tender our hearty Christian sympathy to our brethren who are suffering persecution, and that we urge them, and others upon whom the same things may come, to be in nothing terrified by the adversaries, but to remember that to us "it is given in the behalf of Christ, not only to believe on him, but also to suffer for his sake."³⁶

After the Yearbook Committee discussed the question of including reports of the Arkansas persecutions in the forthcoming SDA Yearbook, the Finance Committee considered the issue and recommended the raising of funds to relieve those imprisoned in Arkansas and Tennessee, especially those "suffering from disease contracted in prison, from which recovery seems improbable." Butler's committee then recommended that the case of J W Scoles be appealed to the Supreme Court of the US to test the constitutionality of the Arkansas Sunday law and that the General Conference Committee be given authority to employ legal counsel to try the case and to grant financial assistance to those persecuted. The committee also recommended that the GCC be granted authority to appoint someone to publicize the persecution of SDAs to the general public.³⁷ Butler had in mind the appointment of J H Waggoner to publicize the Sunday persecutions, but Waggoner's personal situation made it questionable whether he would accept that assignment. As the SDA church came up to the very eschatological borders it had so frequently predicted for some 40 years, its lack of adequate preparation became more and more apparent. We have previously seen how both Butler and Stephen Haskell seemed to inwardly sense their personal inadequacy and actually preferred death to the testing that was occurring. J H Kellogg, Sydney Brownsberger, and J H Waggoner, in their personal correspondence in 1886, also expressed such death wishes.³⁸

Morals Question and Eschatological Implications. The 1886 GC session

seemed to illustrate the poverty of Adventism's old message of acceptable righteousness wrought by obedience to the moral law. Seen within the last days setting, it seems significant that never before in the history of Adventism had such outlandish and so many morals issues ever come before such a general church body.

Although the case of J H Waggoner was the most prominent of the half-dozen moral cases prominent at the 1886 GC, his situation had been developing since early 1885 and was becoming widely known throughout and beyond the denomination. It developed when his estranged wife discovered copies of letters Waggoner had indiscreetly written to another married woman. When Mrs Waggoner threatened to make the letters available to a denomination well-known for its attacks against SDAs, denominational leadership feared exposure and the resultant humiliation. Butler was "astonished" that the 65-year-old Signs editor "whose head is whitening for his last change," and "our great Law expositor," "who talks of purity and the soundness of the law of God as he does," could become so compromised. In reminding Ellen White that Waggoner was a "Pacific Coast man," he hoped that she would actively involve herself in the situation. "What are we coming to next? Whom can we trust? And can we trust even ourselves," Butler asked Ellen White.³⁹

At the 5:30 a.m. morning meeting the second day of the session, Butler introduced the subject by discussing the seventh, "and part of the tenth commandments." He spoke very plainly and believed he was "quite pointed and impressive." His treatment brought tears to a "good many," as he dwelt "especially upon the subject of our thoughts, and referred to the practices among us and made the matter come pretty close to some," he thought. While Butler seemed pleased that some "made good confessions relative to their thoughts," still there "was not that breaking up of the fallow ground of the

heart" he would have been pleased to see. "Indeed," he wrote to Mrs White, "the large majority seemed little moved." Butler spoke on the subject again at the next morning meeting and this time read some material from Mrs White. She called for a converted ministry and decried the "spectacle" of those who were standing in such firm vindication of the fourth commandment but who were "charged in the books of heaven with transgressing the seventh."⁴⁰

The elder Waggoner seemed to illustrate the inadequacy of a system that focused upon sufficient personal righteousness wrought through obedience and he wrote Ellen White of his shame as he realized that he "would have condemned the same thing in another" and he was the more ashamed and "astonished" at himself for he did not believe "there is one in all our number who, in all my life and in all my travels [who] was so carefully guarded on this point" as himself. This situation likewise worked against Butler's being of any real assistance to Waggoner because of Butler's recollection of Waggoner's "lofty position as a general sort of a critic of everybody in the ranks."⁴¹

While one conference president made public confession of his lapse, Butler regretted that another did not do so. While he was not convinced that J H Waggoner exhibited sufficient public remorse, he did observe: "Poor man, we all pity him and hope he has broken the terrible spell which has been on him." As he considered this aspect of the 1886 session, Butler reported it as "one of the saddest ones in some respects, I ever attended." As he considered the "sins of an aggravated character" amongst SDAs, "even among our own ministry," he wondered about the perplexing times SDAs had come upon and wondered "who next." Butler observed: "On every side is evil in every form, yet our people are growing harder and more unfeeling." Butler considered that the only plausible resolution of the situation faced by the denomination was "for the judgments of God to fall upon us, and we be brought into the most trying places

and many be lost." Not only did the state of the cause seem to illustrate the inadequacy of the old Adventism, but even Butler seemed to sense a feeling of forboding that illustrated its weakness:

A sort of foreboding of something terrible before us seemed to fasten itself upon me. . . . I never have taken office when I have done it with more dread. Many times death looks rather pleasant than painful. . . . Things go so different in many ways from what I wish to have them and I seem so utterly powerless to prevent it. I DO NOT know, MY DEAR SISTER, HOW to give myself to God any more thoroughly than I have done. . . . To think of carrying the burdens of the cause another year under these circumstances seems like a mountain. . . . Once in awhile I get so I can weep and it is such a relief from the settled sadness that comes over me. I have said very little of all this to any one else.⁴²

Butler continued his mournful analysis of the state of Adventism in his next letter to Ellen White. He did not see hopes of stirring up SDAs very easily: "They seem more unfeeling than they used to," and he observed that "the most painful things I know of in the work are evidences of depravity and backsliding among our people and disagreements among leading laborers." He then analyzed his personal inadequacy: "I am naturally too stiff, too much iron in my nature." He went so far as to affirm that "the school in which I have had to be trained to meet every kind of influence has been very favorable to keep the iron in me and make me stiff." Butler again expressed a death wish when he observed that "the future looks full of hardship and trouble" and he "would be blessed to die in the Lord and be laid away" and "often" felt so. It would not be Butler, however, but Ellen White who would perceive the basis of the inadequacy of the old Adventism and would point the church toward its great need, the "energy" that would follow the gazing upon the righteousness of Christ.⁴³

Continuing Trauma Over Sunday Question. As SDAs considered preparations for the 1888 GC session, a large cloud was appearing on the horizon and it was a cloud that constantly loomed in the thinking of every believer and gave

intense reality to every phase of his theological system. The cloud concerned two separate legislative enactments introduced in the United States Senate by Senator H W Blair of New Hampshire that would effectively promote Sunday as a national day of rest and promote Christian teachings in the nation's public school system.

The future president of the General Conference, O A Olsen, considered the proposed legislation as "a clap of thunder from a clear sky" and it "stirred" his soul thoroughly and he considered the eschatological implications of such legislation. "It is truly remarkable to see how things are ripening off and the day of the Lord is coming at a fast rate," he wrote from Norway. As he looked on the horizon he saw the rest of the SDA eschatological scenario before his eyes. Indeed, as he anticipated final events, Olsen, whose infant son had recently died of rheumatic fever, observed: "When we look at the things that are before us and the events that may soon transpire and the troubles which the living may soon be called to pass through we are thankful that our little one is laid to rest."⁴⁴

The California Conference was the first to take formal action relating to the proposed legislation. Meeting the month before the 1888 GC session, the California Conference took the following action:

WHEREAS, We have for many years been looking for an amendment to the national Constitution to open the way for national religious legislation; and, WHEREAS, In the Blair amendment to the national Constitution, and the accompanying national Sunday bill, there are now pending the very things for which we have so long looked, as that which will surely make the image of the Papacy against whose work the Third Angel's Message pronounces its solemn warning; therefore, . . .

Be It Resolved, That this Conference call the attention of the National Conference of the Seventh-day Adventists to the urgent necessity of sending a delegation to appear before the United State Senatorial Committee on Education and Labor, to use all reasonable efforts to secure the defeat [of the proposed bills] . . .

And Be It Further Resolved, That the Pacific Coast asks the appointment on said delegation of Elder A T Jones, as one whose diligent study of this question has made him fully competent to perform such work.⁴⁵

California Conference president, J N Loughborough, also had reflections on the proposed legislation during this 17th annual session of the California Conference. He told the assembled believers:

When I embraced this message, in the year 1852, it was the confident expectation of this people that the time would come when, in this Government of the United States, there would be a movement to unite Church and State; or, in other words, to make an image to the Papal beast of Rev 13. This we confidently believed, not because we could see the fact fulfilling before our eyes, but because the evidences were so clear that the United States was the power symbolized by the lamb-like beast of Rev 13, and because the prophecy said so emphatically that the two-horned beast should make an image to the first or Papal beast.⁴⁶

He went on to describe his 80-page pamphlet, completed in 1854, that anticipated the very events then transpiring. "The prophecy is being fulfilled before our eyes," he admonished. "Here we have, in this year of grace 1888, sprung upon us at once the very work for which I, with hundreds of other SDAs, have for 35 years been looking to see come in and fulfill this prophecy." In case the believers didn't see the implications, Loughborough proclaimed: "The great crisis of the message, and the closing up of the work, are right upon us."⁴⁷

Another pioneer, S N Haskell, brought the eschatological implications to the church membership. Writing through the Review, Haskell elucidated on "The Present Crisis," to the church members. "Before us at the present time is one of the greatest dangers that our people have ever experienced," he stated. He saw the Blair bills as harbingers of a national religion that would abrogate Sabbath worship for SDAs and end all SDA evangelism. Current events were harbingers of the close of probation and time of trouble and Adventists would soon be bearing testimony in courts and prisons and likely "by instruments of torture." Haskell, as did all SDAs, pointed back to the apparent success of the past SDA eschatological predictions: "For many years we have looked forward

to the enforcement of the observance of the first day of the week," he affirmed and raised the question uppermost in all SDA minds: "Are we prepared as a people to enter upon this trying time?"⁴⁸

When the Blair Bills lapsed without Congressional action in 1888, they were resubmitted during 1889 and again defeated. SDAs eschatological fears, however, were retained as additional actions occurred that kept the Sunday question in the forefront. The Breckenridge Bill, designed to provide Sunday legislation for the District of Columbia, the arrest and imprisonment of R M King in 1891, the Supreme Court decision proclaiming the United States as a Christian nation in 1892, all served to keep SDA eschatological assumptions at a high pitch. Within the church, the issue of the question of the formation of the image to the beast assumed major prominence.

Image to Beast Issue. It is of surpassing relevance to notice that no Adventist, outside of Ellen White, integrated the new focus upon justification by faith with the current eschatological scene. Indeed, with all except Ellen White, it appears that the Sunday question militated against relating the new theological insight with the current actions occurring on the national level. There hardly seemed time to do so given the feverish actions within the denomination to inform the world about the Sunday issue. In addition, such integration was impossible outside of Ellen White because disunity prevented the church integrating both the potential contributions of the pioneers and the aspects added by Jones and Waggoner to allow the church its necessary understanding of justification. It is a marvel, however, to see a vital new insight coming to the church, but no application of that insight during its period of eschatological trauma. The debate on the image to the beast illustrates that paradox.

Although A T Jones and E J Waggoner represented second generation

Adventism and a new perspective concerning justification by faith, their views on the interpretation of Rev 13 and the formation of the image to the beast sprang from more traditional prophetic interpretation. From their earliest published articles, both looked toward the current religious scene and the Sunday agitation as the beginning of the formation of that image and neither integrated their views on justification with the interpretation of the image.

Both considered that SDAs had clearly anticipated the movements then occurring: "For more than 40 years, in public and in private, by speech and by prints, Seventh-day Adventists have constantly taught that there would be the very condition of things which now is and is impending," wrote Jones in 1886. Sunday, not the issue of justification, was the central issue to Jones: "For years we have expected to see the Sunday, and controversy concerning it, become the leading question in this Nation."⁴⁹ While Jones and Waggoner would disagree with the pioneers in the particular events that seemed to cause the immediate formation of the image to the beast, their prophetic interpretation was tied to the same core theology of the pioneers. Both positions demanded absolute perfection in theological system as well as in personal life for the last generation that they believed they represented. It was those assumptions that caused the interpretation of the horns/kingdoms issue of Daniel 2 and 7 to assume such gigantic proportions.

Jones' view of the relationship between the "image" issue and the Sabbath question was outlined by him in 1887 and evidences that, at least at this point, justification by faith was certainly not the question that would "swallow up" all others to Jones:

We have before shown that the image of the beast--the union of Church and State in this Nation--is almost formed. . . . Remember that it is "evangelical" Protestantism that is making the image of the Papacy in the United States, by the proposed establishment of National Christianity, and that it is the Seventh-day Adventists that are opposing it with all their might by giving the Third Angel's

Message. . . . It is evident from the facts in the case as they exist today, as well as from the Scriptures, that the Sabbath question is the pivot upon which turns the Third Angel's Message. . . . We have known all these years, and have told the world so, that the Sabbath question would yet be the greatest question in the world. . . .

What, then, does all this mean? Well, it means this one thing if nothing else, it means that we were telling the truth all these years when we told the world that the Sabbath question would yet be the greatest question in the world. . . . We saw it by the light of the Third Angel's Message, of which it is the pivot. And this further shows that the Third Angel's Message is abroad in the world, and there is no use in denying it.⁵⁰

It appears that it was solely through the influence of Ellen White that justification by faith came to occupy the central position in the message of the third angel and it appears that only she saw the resulting eschatological implications.

Ellen White, Justification and Final Events. In this area of eschatology, as well as in the concept of justification itself, Ellen White portrayed the best of Adventism. And only Ellen White perceived the last day implications of an imputed righteousness secure to the believer because it was above and not within. Her statements that justification by faith was the "third angel's message in verity" and that the "loud cry of the third angel has already begun in the revelation of the righteousness of Christ, the sin-pardoning Redeemer,"⁵¹ should have led to the fullest reformation in Adventism. The church, however, pursued quite a different path as it related to the final events scenario it saw transpiring before its eyes as evidenced by various episodes that erupted within Adventism.

As Mrs White approached Minneapolis in 1888, she seemed to become increasingly impressed with the eschatological setting of the times. In remarks at Kansas City, just prior to her reaching Minneapolis, Mrs White remarked that "things we spoke of 25 years ago are just working up," and she noticed that the heavenly watcher knew whether individuals were prepared to

receive the "righteousness of Christ" and also knew "whether it is imputed to me." She noticed that the judgment had been occurring for some time and that Christ's righteousness, "His purity of character, are mine to accept."⁵²

Ellen White drew a different set of conclusions from her analysis of justification by faith than did the rest of the church, however. Shortly after leaving Minneapolis, she penned the following that appeared in the Review:

The peculiar work of the third angel has not been seen in its importance. God meant that his people should be far in advance of what they are today. . . . The third angel's message comprehends more than many suppose. What interpretation do they give to the passage which says an angel descended from heaven, and the earth was lightened with his glory?⁵³

It was thus very soon after the Minneapolis meetings that Ellen White connected justification by faith, the third angel's message and the loud cry together. She alluded to the eschatological setting in which SDAs found themselves: "A great crisis awaits the people of God," but also observed the unprepared state of the church for its final test. "The church of Christ is the only object on the earth upon which he bestows his supreme regard; yet it has grown feeble and inefficient through selfishness." She also warned, "Every conceivable thing that the enemy can bring against the people of God, to hinder them in their work, will be employed."⁵⁴

As early as 1880 Ellen White had asked the basic question that enabled her above all others to perceive the eschatological significance of the message of justification by faith:

In a vision given in 1880, I asked, Where is the security for the people of God in these last days of peril? The answer was, "Jesus maketh intercession for His people."⁵⁵

Because of that perception of a secure righteousness in heaven where Christ was interceding for His people, Ellen White consistently pointed the church away from its preconceptions regarding the time of trouble and final events. In 1885, she urged, "Do not become anxious and distressed about the

time of trouble, and thus have a time of trouble before hand. Do not keep thinking, 'I am afraid I shall not stand in the great testing day.'"56

In her initial Sabbath message at Minneapolis, despite her awareness of the eschatological setting, Mrs White urged the believers "We want to act like individuals who are redeemed by the blood of Christ; we are to rejoice in the blood of Christ and in the forgiveness of sins." She urged them to keep their minds "off the dark pictures" and not to "make a time of trouble before it comes." Indeed, she observed as she noticed the delegates seated before her: "I look over this congregation and you look like discouraged men."57 She alluded to the security in the new message when she told New Yorkers the next year: "God has opened to us our strength, and we need to know something about it and be prepared for the time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation. But here is our strength, Christ our righteousness."58

In the revival that took place at Battle Creek immediately following Minneapolis, Ellen White again placed justification by faith in its eschatological setting and clearly identified the core of the new message:

The principal topic dwelt upon was justification by faith, and this truth came as meat in due season to the people of God. The living oracles of God were presented in new and precious light. The Holy Spirit, working through human agencies, revealed the deep significance of long-known truths relating to the new and startling movements in the development of the Religious Amendment to the Constitution.⁵⁹

Ellen White's next remarks assume surpassing importance within that eschatological setting. She observed that "There were many whose minds had been clouded with doubt, but the light received from the explanation of Scripture encouraged their faith, while the truth was revealed to their minds and hearts in a light in which they had never before seen it. They also had clearer views of the mercy, goodness, and love of God." Mrs White contrasted that new focus with Adventism's past: "It was manifest that a renovation had

taken place; for they expressed their determination of soul to work earnestly to counteract the evil influence they had exerted in the past."⁶⁰

As she ministered to the dying brother of O A Olsen, Mrs White again alluded to the eschatological implications of the new message. She wrote to O A Olsen of the experience:

We called on your brother. . . . I tried to lay out before him clearly the strength he might obtain by simply trusting in God, and not go back to hunt up his mistakes and defections of the past. This you know is natural to do when the soul is letting loose his grasp of this life and looking into the eternal world. If anyone ever has a distinct view of his own imperfections it is at this point in his experience. The Lord blessed the words spoken. He said he could now better understand that his business was to look and live, to take the robe woven by Christ himself in the heavenly loom, and rejoice in the worthiness and righteousness of Christ.⁶¹

It was clearly within eschatological connotations when Mrs White urged the church in general to cause justification by faith to swallow up every other issue. "The end is near," she told the church in 1890. "We have not a moment to lose! Light is to shine forth from God's people in clear, distinct rays, bringing Jesus before the churches and before the world." Because of the superiority of that message, she observed "Wherever the laborers go, they will triumph." "One interest will prevail, one subject will swallow up every other,--Christ our righteousness."⁶² Several days later, she wrote one of the main spokesmen of the pre-1888 focus: "Again and again have I seen that blindness was upon you to an alarming degree." She asked Uriah Smith: "Where is your preparation to be obtained that you may stand in the day of the Lord?" and answered as she effectively demolished Smith's theological premises, "Nowhere but low at the foot of the cross." She told him "When God helps you you will be helped to see your own weakness and the inefficiency and the glory and majesty of Christ."⁶³

Indeed, the experience of Uriah Smith represents on a personal level all the drama of the issues of 1888 fought out within the church as a whole.

Indications are that Smith's past theological presuppositions prevented his looking upon the doctrine of justification sufficiently to grasp the new understanding. Ellen White aptly considered the pioneer system closely akin to that of the Pharisees for that system relied upon a perfected lawkeeping to bring about their deliverance in the last day. While Jones and Waggoner relied upon an internalized righteousness resulting from the faith of the believer as their eschatological hope, Ellen White looked not within but above and found security in Christ's already completed works. The difference within those three systems was profound.

Ellen White and Loud Cry. Adventists, since the earliest phase of their history, have believed that they were raised to proclaim a last warning message to the world that would immediately precede the return of Jesus. Identifying themselves with the work of the angel of Revelation 18 who came "down from heaven, having great power," and who unites his voice with that of the third angel of Revelation 14, SDAs have considered that the final message they will give to the world will indeed constitute a "loud cry." Past assumptions had focused solely upon the Sabbath reform as the constituent element of that loud cry, and in this area as in others Ellen White again led Adventism to new horizons.

In 1886 Ellen White saw the danger that the loud cry could be hindered by a centralized authoritarianism that would stifle perception of that final message. She clearly anticipated the issues that would emerge more fully in 1888 and warned the GC president that she could not sanction the concept embraced by Butler and other pioneer administrators that they "must have a personal oversight of all the details of the work." Such a premise, she affirmed, would hinder the loud cry: "When the light goes forth to lighten the earth, instead of coming up to the help of the Lord, they will want to bind

about his work to meet their narrow ideas." The church should be on its guard for "There will be those among us who will always want to control the work of God, to dictate even what movements shall be made when the work goes forward under the direction of the angel who joins the third angel in the message to be given to the world." Again recognizing a new direction for the church, Ellen White wrote the president: "God will use ways and means by which it will be seen that he is taking the reins in his own hands." Pointing to a direction other than the basic direction of the old message, Ellen White looked to heaven and God's righteousness as the source of strength and told Butler, "The workers will be surprised by the simple means that he will use to bring about and perfect His work of righteousness." Sensing the danger to the church, she warned, "May God pity the cause when one man's mind and one man's plan is followed without question."⁶⁴

While throughout the 1880s Mrs White had given Adventists their time of opportunity to refocus its core message throughout the 1880s and also shown its eschatological implications from time to time, it was in 1892 that she most clearly presented the last day implications of that message. In an article appropriately entitled "The Perils and Privileges of the Last Days," Mrs White informed the church:

The time of test is just upon us, for the loud cry of the third angel has already begun in the revelation of the righteousness of Christ, the sin-pardoning Redeemer. This is the beginning of the light of the angel whose glory shall fill the whole earth. For it is the work of every one to whom the message of warning has come, to lift up Jesus, to present him to the world. . . .⁶⁵

It seems clear that in Ellen White's mind, the "beginning" of the loud cry involved a new insight into the righteousness of Christ and it was the continuing duty of every church member to continue that focus and bring it before the world. While Ellen White's eschatological perspective looked upward, however, Adventists, in their fears of the last days looked

increasingly within. They did so, however, despite the counsels of Ellen White. She pointed the church toward its security for those last days:

If you would stand through the time of trouble, you must know Christ, and appropriate the gift of his righteousness, which he imputes to the repentant sinner. Human wisdom will not avail to devise a plan of salvation. . . . No glory is to redound to man; all human help and glory lies in the dust; for the truth as it is in Jesus is the only available agent by which man may be saved.⁶⁶

In those brief sentences, Ellen White again transcended the theological presuppositions of every other SDA. Looking for her security in heaven and not within, Ellen White alone saw her path through the time of trouble: the perfect righteousness that the struggling soul longed for was indeed secure there. Here, indeed, was Adventism's message for the world:

The theme that attracts the heart of the sinner is Christ, and him crucified. On the cross of Calvary, Jesus stands revealed to the world in unparalleled love. Present him thus to the hungering multitudes, and the light of his love will win men from darkness to light, from transgression to obedience and true holiness. Beholding Jesus upon the cross of Calvary arouses the conscience to the heinous character of sin as nothing else can do. It was sin that caused the death of God's dear Son, and sin is the transgression of the law. On him was laid the iniquities of us all. The sinner then consents unto the law that it is good; for he realizes that it condemns his evil deeds, while he magnifies the matchless love of God in providing for him salvation through the imputed righteousness of Him who knew no sin, in whose mouth there was found no guile.⁶⁷

If Adventism had truly perceived the centrality of justification by faith as the new message sounding within Adventism, it could have developed an unanswerable Sabbath defense that transcended its past defense by light years, for that new defense would have centered completely upon the merits of Christ and reliance upon the imputation of His merits. Since Christ observed the Sabbath of the fourth commandment and not Sunday, He had no imputed merits to credit for Sunday observance. In proportion to its centering upon justification as its guiding perspective, so would the SDA defense of the commandments become strengthened.

NOTES

1. George Butler, "In Their Mouth Was Found No Guile," RH, Feb 26, 1889.
2. "Proceedings of the General Conference," Gospel Sickle, Dec 15, 1887.
3. This analysis of the Garmire episode is based upon the following sources: J M Garmire to Ellen White, July 24 [1884], DF 504 WE; George Butler and Uriah Smith, "An Exposure of Fanaticism and Wickedness," 1885, containing Ellen White to Garmire, Aug 7, 1885; Ellen White to Garmire, Ltrs 11 and 12, 1890, and Ellen White to Bro M, Ltr 16, 1893, in 2SM 64-9, 72-84; J M Garmire, "The Gospel Review," nd and "Reply to Elder J N Loughborough's Reply to Open Letter No 2," nd; and J O Corliss, "A Note of Warning," nd.
4. J M Garmire, "The Gospel Review," p 6.
5. Ibid, p 11.
6. J M Garmire to E G White, July 24, [1884], DF 504 WE.
7. George Butler and Uriah Smith, "An Exposure of Fanaticism and Wickedness, p 7 in DF 504 WE.
8. Ibid, p 2.
9. Ellen White to J M Garmire, Let 12, 1890 in 2SM 74.
10. Ibid.
11. Ibid, pp 76,78,79; Ellen White to Garmire, Aug 7, 1885 in Butler, Smith, "An Exposure of Fanaticism and Wickedness," p 10.
12. William Blakely, ed, American State Papers on Freedom in Religion, 3d ed (1943), p 553.
13. E J Waggoner, "Why the California Sunday Law Was Repealed," American Sentinel, Feb 6, 1889; R W Schwarz, Light Bearers to the Remnant (1979), p 251.
14. Blakely, op cit, p 235.
15. Records of 1883 GC Session, Res 26, GCA.
16. Ibid, Res 27-8.
17. Stephen Haskell to Brn and Sisters assembled at Bunker Hill, Indiana, Jan 14, 1883. SNH 1883 WE.
18. Ibid.
19. Stephen Haskell to Ellen White, Jan 27, 1883. SNH 1883 WE.
20. William Blakely, American State Papers on Freedom in Religion, 3d ed (1943), p 518; A T Jones, "Civil Government and Religion" (1889), pp 151-52.
21. Blakely, op cit, pp 540-41.
22. Ibid, pp 532-33; G I Butler to Ellen White, Oct 8, 1885, 1885 GIB WE.
23. Jones, op cit, pp 114-15.
24. George Butler to Ellen White, Oct 8, 1885, GIB 1885 WE; E W Farnsworth, "Our Work and the Sunday Trials in Arkansas," ST, Dec 3, 1885.
25. Farnsworth, ibid.
26. Nov 22, 1885, GC Session Action, GCA.
27. Ibid.
28. George Butler to Ellen White, Nov 22, 1886; GIB 1886 WE.
29. A T Jones, op cit, pp 114-136, details 21 separate prosecutions of SDAs.
30. A T Jones, "A Precursor of National Reform," American Sentinel, Oct, 1886, and Jones, "Civil Government and Religion," pp 144-45.
31. R M Kilgore, "The Arkansas Meeting," RH, May 3, 1887.
32. R H Crockett, Speech before Arkansas Legislature, taken from Little Rock (Ark) Weekly Gazette of Feb 10, 1887, published in ST, March 3, 1887.
33. Ellen White, "The Coming Crisis," 5T, pp 449, 451 and "Joshua and the Angel," 5T, pp 472, 473.
34. George Butler, "The Appointment of the Next General Conference," ST, Sept 9, 1886.
35. Records of 1886 GC, Actions of First and Second Meetings, GCA.
36. Records of 1886 GC Session, Nov 22, 1886, GCA.
37. Records of 1886 GC, Dec 1, 5, and 6, 1886, GCA.

38. J H Kellogg to Ellen White, Dec 6, 1886, JHK 1886 WE; Sydney Brownsberger to W C White and Ellen White, Oct 17, 1886, Brownsberger 1886-87 WE;
39. George Butler to Ellen White, May 13 and June 21, 1885; GIB 1885 WE.
40. George Butler to Ellen White, Nov 22 and Dec 16, 1886, GIB 1886 WE; Ellen White to George Butler, Sept 6, 1886, B51-1886.
41. J H Waggoner to Ellen White, March 18, 1886, Miscellaneous 1886 WE; G I Butler to Ellen White, March 28, 1886, GIB 1886 WE.
42. George Butler to Ellen White, Dec 16, 1886; GIB 1886 WE. Emphasis in original.
43. George Butler to Ellen White, Dec 24, 1886; GIB 1886 WE.
44. O A Olsen to W C White, Jan 12, 1889, RG 11, bk 1/2.
45. "Summary of the Proceedings of the California Conference," under date of Sept 21, 1888, pasted in W C White Notebook 1888C.
46. J N Loughborough, "Conference Address," Sept 21, 1888, in ST, Oct 5, 1888.
47. Ibid.
48. S N Haskell, "The Present Crisis," RH, Oct 16, 1888.
49. A T Jones, "Restoration of the Papacy," ST, Aug 26, 1886.
50. A T Jones, "The Place of the Sabbath in the Third Angel's Message," ST, Dec 22, 1887.
51. RH, Nov 22, 1892.
52. Ellen White, "How to Become True Ministers of Christ," Oct 8, 1888, Ms 4-1888.
53. Ellen White, "The Approaching Crisis," RH, Dec 11, 1888.
54. Ibid.
55. Ellen White Diary, Oct-Nov 1890 and "Danger in Adopting Worldly Policy in the Work of God," Ms 44-90, emphasis supplied.
56. Ellen White Sermon, Sept 28, 1885 in Historical Sketches of the Foreign Missions of the SDAs, p 142. This same statement was published in several Ellen White RH articles.
57. Ellen White Sermon, "Tell of God's Love and Power," Oct 13, 1888, Ms 7-88.
58. Ellen White Sermon at Rome, NY, Campmeeting, June 17, 1889, Ms 5-89.
59. Ellen White, "Revival Work in the Battle Creek Church," RH, Feb 12, 1889.
60. Ibid.
61. Ellen White to O A Olsen, June 9, 1890, GCA.
62. Ellen White, "Be Zealous and Repent," RH Extra, Dec 28, 1890.
63. Ellen White to Uriah Smith, Dec 31, 1890, S40-90.
64. Ellen White to George Butler [Nov 1, 1885], B5-85. Portion in TM 297-300.
65. Ellen White, RH, Nov 22, 1892.
66. Ibid.
67. Ibid.

Chapter 5

Ellen White and Justification by Faith

We have thus far attempted to analyze the theological systems of the pioneers and that of Jones and Waggoner. We now seek to do so with Ellen White. One aspect must be clarified, however. If Jones and Waggoner represented theological advance, the advance might be compared with a movement from childhood to the teenage years. When we come to Ellen White, we must jump ahead by years for in her system we see the mature gospel.

It was Mrs White who transcended the pettiness of the times that centered its focus upon such theologically remote issues as the horns/kingdoms debate, and made warfare over Galatians and covenants and other matters. While the Galatians and covenants issues are important theological issues, it is apparent that both sides maintained numerous questionable interpretations in their analysis of those subjects. It was Mrs White who saw a new theme that had been lacking in Adventism and because she based her understanding of salvation entirely upon God's intervening act, her ability to analyze issues far transcended that of the pioneers and also that of Jones and Waggoner.

It cannot be overemphasized how completely Ellen White transcended normal SDA perceptions of heavenly realities. In certain ways, the writings of Ellen White present a false view of SDA history if it is assumed that believers easily accepted and operated under the theological premises that Ellen White was operating under. We must realize that this was not the case.

Adventists really had only one giant during its struggle to understand justification by faith. One group struggled like pharisees, the other like sincere Crusaders, but it was Ellen White who was completely consumed with the marvels of Christ.

When Ellen White asked us to learn from our past, she did so in order for us to take the best from that experience, learn from the errors and march

toward the kingdom. Her analysis of the 1888 experience is truly amazing and her evaluation describes Adventism as it brought its entire past system up to 1888. Her portrait of Adventism's 1888 testing time is anything but flattering. Indeed, she evaluated the SDA past in terms of the recent death of her sister's husband. Just as her brother-in-law lay "cold in death," so was pre-1888 Adventism. She pictures the impact of a faulty view of justification by faith upon the church:

Coldness, formality, want of faith and love and intense earnestness and devotion, has killed the spirit of warmth and religion out of our services. We need everything,—the gold of love, the white raiment, which is the righteousness of Christ, the eye-salve,—that we may discern the goodness and love of God.¹

Minneapolis allowed SDAs to rectify that past, as Ellen White told the church:

We must seek to redeem the neglect of the past. We must come up from the lowlands of earth. We must not preach any more Christless sermons, or any long live Christless lives.²

Adventism was cold and formal because its laity was bombarded with "Christless sermons" that had guided the ministerial perspective. Adventists in the local congregations thus centered on pointing out the defects of their fellow Christians. Mrs White observed that believers "try to pick off the ornaments," and made their test of Christianity diet and dress. Mrs White wanted a revolution and she urged members not to correct others, but rather to "present the attractions of Jesus" and they "need not touch the subject of dress at all." Morality was best advanced when the church understood the way of salvation. Religion was to become something more than "picking flaws and finding defects" in others.³ It was Ellen White who tried to lead the church in a new direction and she began her mission before either Jones or Waggoner made their contribution to Adventism.

Ellen White Anticipates Minneapolis: Justification, 1883 to 1888. The 1883 General Conference session was unique in that it was the first time a

session was preceded by a special institute designed to provide a spiritual and educational advancement of the ministry.⁴ The highlight of the 1883 Institute and GC session was the early morning talks by Ellen White and that session voted to request Mrs White to publish her talks.⁵ It seems the 1883 session somewhat paralleled the session of 1888 and to an amazing extent that which Mrs White endorsed of the messages of Jones and Waggoner, she herself presented in 1883. Nine of Ellen White's talks were published by the Review and are here summarized.

In an address to the ministers on November 7 Mrs White observed a lack within the ministry that increasingly concerned her. The ministry had been too inclined to "rely upon other men's thoughts" that had been presented in denominational publications and not willing to search for themselves to "learn the reasons of our faith." She urged the ministers to "study the Bible diligently and prayerfully every day," for in so doing they would perceive "some beautiful truth in a new, clear, and forcible light." She deplored the tendency of the ministry to be "satisfied with their present position and attainments."⁶

Not only was the SDA ministry weak in its approach to the Scriptures, but it was also tied to an ineffective concept of ministry. It had developed in a defensive atmosphere where the focus was upon protesting its doctrines against other denominations and hence stressed argumentative discourses to the exclusion of practical Christianity. It lacked the essence of all relevant religious thought, the Christ of the Scriptures. "We have certainly made a mistake in supposing that so much depends on long, argumentative discourses," Mrs White told the ministers. "Our duty is not simply to preach, but to minister," she urged.⁷

An entirely new concept of ministry seemed to be springing up before the eyes of the 1883 GC delegates. Earlier that year, Stephen Haskell had

introduced a Bible readings plan that broadened concepts of ministry in such a way as to include numbers of women in its newly inaugurated ministry of city missions. Ellen White praised the "plan of holding Bible readings" as a "heaven-born idea," and urged "both men and women" to engage in that branch of work that "workers may be thus developed." After having seen the successful demonstration of the value of the Bible reading plan during the Institute, the delegates "recommend[ed] that [the plan] be encouraged in all parts of the country."⁸

The central concern of practically every one of the printed messages of Ellen White at the 1883 session was justification by faith. While that theme was expressed in different terminology and in different ways, it is apparent that Ellen White looked toward additional light to come to the church on that truth. On the last day of the session she told the delegates that it was "the best general meeting" she had ever attended. "Through grace the capacity to understand and appreciate the truth has been enlarged" and as the church continued to advance "we shall better understand the ways of God and the plan of redemption."⁹

In her earliest statement to the ministers at the session she challenged the traditional concept that acceptable righteousness could be obtained by obedience. "Nothing but [Christ's] righteousness can entitle us to one of the blessings of the covenant of grace," she affirmed. She decried the tendency to focus within, as though the individual could somehow become worthy of salvation. In Christ was "our hope, our justification, our righteousness," she proclaimed. And lest the ministers not realize that Ellen White was thinking of an objective righteousness, she referred to Christ's mediatorial functions that were even then making the best efforts of all believers acceptable: "At this very time he is carrying on his work in our behalf, inviting us to come to him in our helplessness, and be saved."¹⁰

She continued her theme of a perfect righteousness, placed to the believing Christian's account. That faith to Ellen White always brought with it sanctifying righteousness.

We may commit the keeping of our souls to God as unto a faithful Creator, not because we are sinless, but because Jesus died to save just such erring, faulty creatures as we are, thus expressing his estimate of the value of the human soul. We may rest upon God, not because of our own merit, but because the righteousness of Christ will be imputed to us. We must look away from self to the spotless Lamb of God, who did no sin; and by looking to him in living faith, we shall become like him.¹¹

In her observations at the session, Mrs White noticed that the ministry felt uncertain about the concept of justification. Many could not sense the assurance of forgiven sins, feeling that they must reach a certain standard, and thus "trust partly to God, and partly to themselves" to receive justification. Ellen White denounced the pre-1888 concept of acceptable righteousness by obedience: "They do not look to God to be kept by his power, but depend upon watchfulness and the performance of certain duties for acceptance with him." In arguing against that concept Ellen White considered it a reason for the ineffectiveness of such ministry: "There are no victories in this kind of faith. Such persons toil to no purpose; their souls are in continual bondage, and they find no rest." And she affirmed that "such persons will receive no help, no freedom, until they look to Jesus. There is no merit in self; Jesus is our only hope."¹²

With her constant focus upon the ever-present merits, through the mediatorial functions of Christ, Ellen White clearly transcended the theology that relegated justification to a relevance solely for the past. "Jesus is an ever-present Saviour," she told the ministers. Converted ministers "lose sight of the fact that Jesus came not to call the righteous, but sinners, to repentance." She again argued against the theology that focused upon acceptable obedience: "We can do nothing, absolutely nothing, to recommend ourselves to divine favor," and urged the most experienced of the SDA ministry

to trust not in their obedience, but "come to Jesus" as erring sinful beings to find assurance. "God will accept every one that comes to him trusting wholly in the merits of a crucified Saviour."¹³

Ellen White continued her theme of justification by faith in articles published in the Review and Signs during 1884. Shortly following the 1883 GC session, Mrs White addressed the church at large with counsel similar to that presented to the ministers in 1883. She seemed to look increasingly toward the purpose of the law that identifies the believer as a sinner and thus to drive him to Christ for pardon. She thereby contradicted the pioneer position that stressed that through Christ's strength acceptable obedience would result in salvation. Early in 1884 she affirmed that when believers "compare their characters with God's great standard of right, they see themselves condemned as transgressors." Law has no power to save and pardon comes solely through Christ's merits. "Law, by its demands for undeviating obedience, is continually pointing the sinner to the gospel for pardon and peace." In May she defined faith as "the hand by which the soul takes hold of the strength of the Infinite," and urged a looking beyond the believer "for we must think of self as sinful." The next month she again exhibited her objective view of justification by focusing upon Christ's life as "an offering for transgressions, that through his righteousness imputed to them, men might be reconciled to God." She again looked toward the continual mediation of Christ, which alone was able to bring the sinner into favor with God. Contrary to the positions Jones and Waggoner were even then beginning to formulate, it was not imperfection that placed the sinner under the condemnation of the law, but a refusal to accept "the cleansing blood."¹⁴

It should be observed that Ellen White did not present the points alluded to in a conscious theological manner, nor did she consciously challenge anyone's specific exegetical analysis. Her conclusions seemed to spring from

an objective view of Christ that she maintained from the earliest days of her ministry.

Near the end of 1884, Ellen White attended her first series of campmeetings since the death of her husband. She had come to realize even more fully her dependence upon Christ, and reflected upon her past and the basis for her objective view of the Saviour. That view was prominent with her since childhood and when in 1884 she returned to Portland, Maine, she visited the spot where her girlhood accident "made [her] a life-long invalid." That cruel blow, said Ellen White, "which for a time seemed so bitter and was so hard to bear," was the means by which her eyes were turned to heaven.¹⁵ She consistently looked upward and saw her righteousness there.

The year 1884 was an eventful one for SDAs. A new theological path had been taken and at a time when Adventism seemed about to undergo its final eschatological testing. While the issues were sounding within the United States, it was at that point when Ellen White would leave America and undertake to assist the development of SDA work in Europe. In the United States, issues would intensify.

ELLEN WHITE AND JUSTIFICATION, 1885. It was in 1885 that another symbol of the uniting of the new with the old Adventism came about. Early in that year, Ellen White described her visit to the SDA mission in Chicago. The city mission program as a viable new ministry received increasing emphasis throughout 1885 and an increasing number of such missions were established in the major cities of America. The Chicago mission became an interesting case study to illustrate the potential unity between the old and the new Adventism for it was here that the 70-year-old son of William Miller decided to join the SDA church. Ellen White reported that Miller had not joined any church since he left Vermont "many years ago," because "the preaching in the churches he attended was so different in theory from that which he had been accustomed to

hear from the lips of his father, and so lacking in gospel simplicity, that he could not enjoy it, nor feel confident that the Lord was with those churches."¹⁶

Would it be stretching the evidence too thinly to suggest that perhaps the message heard by Miller's son was the new message beginning to sound ever more loudly within Adventism and concerned the Christocentric element that he was so used to hearing from his father? Did the conversion of the son represent to some extent a return of Adventism to its true Millerite heritage? In 1842 William Miller had decried the teaching he saw developing within Protestantism that focused upon a supposed ability within man to somehow become sufficiently righteous to warrant salvation and that tied personal obedience to that supposedly adequate righteousness. He denied the popular teaching that "works are the medium of acceptance with God," and proclaimed that the only acceptable righteousness was that of the imputed righteousness of Christ. William Miller believed that man's fallen condition, even after conversion, allowed only a dim perception "of the holiness of God's character, his law or government," and that the carnal nature of the converted Christian would remain with him and struggle from within him until he reached the kingdom.¹⁷

Ellen White reflected upon the gospel in the aftermath of the conversion of Miller's son and maintained that focus in her general church articles for that year. Uniquely in Adventism, Ellen White presented the need for continual justification: "The closer you come to Jesus, the more faulty you will appear in your own eyes; for your vision will be clearer, and your imperfections will be seen in broad and distinct contrast to his perfect nature." Indeed, she affirmed that, unless the individual recognized his imperfection, he could not maintain a "deep-seated love for Jesus" and "if we do not see our own moral deformity, it is unmistakable evidence that we have not had a view of the beauty and excellence of Christ." Ellen White had already anticipated the

Galatians argument of Jones and Waggoner and transcended it in her objective view of the imputation of Christ's righteousness to the sinner:

The less we see to esteem in ourselves, the more we shall see to esteem in the infinite purity and loveliness of our Saviour. A view of our own sinfulness drives us to Him who can pardon. Jesus will accept us; for his word is pledged. As our substitute, he takes our guilt on his own soul, and imputes his righteousness to the sinner. When the soul, realizing its helplessness, reaches out after Christ, he will reveal himself in power. The more our sense of need drives us to him and to the word of God, the more enlarged views we shall have of his character, and the more fully we shall reflect his image.¹⁸

In another article published that month, Mrs White continued her theme of justification and its continual relevance, and again instinctively far transcended the theology held by anyone else in the church. A careful reading of the following Ellen White statement will reveal her not only enunciating the new message sounding within the church, but also striking at the core concept of the old message:

The only safe position for any of us to take is to consider ourselves sinners, daily needing divine grace. Mercy through the atoning blood of Christ is our only plea. But let us shun Phariseeism. . . . The question for us each to settle is, "Am I exalting self, or am I exalting God and His grace, seeking salvation through Christ alone?" . . . The ones whom God justifies are represented by the publican rather than by the self-righteous Pharisee.¹⁹

Near the end of the year we see a picture of Ellen White as a mother and presenting an object lesson from her own past experience to illustrate the boundless dimensions in which she held the plan of salvation. She reflected upon the time her family lived in Battle Creek and was horrified to hear the report that her son Willie was drowning. She described how his apparently lifeless body was pulled from the water and how she worked over him "whose life was trembling in the balance." While all others considered the efforts in vain, Mrs White continued "until that little life was given back to me." During that same evening, bells from the city of Battle Creek sounded the alarm that a child was missing and the townspeople searched the entire area until the

joyous shout was heard that the child had been found. Mrs White drew the lesson for the Adventist church of 1885: nothing transcended the importance of understanding and presenting to others God's plan for the salvation of the individual.²⁰

As the 1885 GC session was facing crisis decisions concerning religious persecution Ellen White addressed a message to the session which contained the answer to its eschatological dilemma: "We must hang our whole weight on the world's Redeemer; He must be our dependence for strength. Without this, all our efforts will be unavailing. Even now the time has come when we must recognize this fully, or we shall be outgeneraled by a powerful, cunning foe." As she warned the church of the coming crisis she pleaded for a putting away of the disunifying minor issues for "the Lord teaches that no one man has all the qualifications essential to the upbuilding of his kingdom." Ellen White's final published article for the general church body in 1885 contained one of her finest statements on justification: "Christ has done all that is necessary in the way of merit."²¹

ELLEN WHITE AND JUSTIFICATION, 1886. Even as Mrs White's published articles for 1885 ended with a focus upon the merits of Christ; "Through the merits of the blood of a crucified and risen Saviour, all who will may be overcomers."²² The Old Testament patriarchs and prophets, "heard the gospel through Christ" and as it was anciently true, so it was now that "only through the merits of [Christ's] blood" could the sinner find pardon. Ellen White clearly focused upon the unvarying nature of the means of salvation and warned "we are not excusable in showing contempt" for the assumption that Old Testament believers inadequately understood justification.²³

Another theme that would come increasingly under Ellen White's focus and swell to ever-increasing intensity and beauty of expression was her observations concerning the relationship between the law and the gospel:

Oh that I might impress upon the minds of all the true mission of Christ in coming to our world! It was to redeem man, and at the same time to show the immutability of his Father's law. . . . The very fact that Christ bore the penalty of the transgression of the law, is a mighty argument to all created intelligences in heaven and in other worlds that the law is changeless; that God is righteous, merciful and self-denying; and that his administration is one of justice and mercy.²⁴

Ellen White, in 1886 as in every year, witnesses to the evidence of her inspiration by revealing to us her inherent understanding of objective justification and its continual application through the mediation of Jesus. It cannot be too strongly emphasized that her perspective was unique to Adventism during the period. Notice how she here transcends all others in Adventism in showing the relationship of law to gospel:

Keeping the commandments of God requires of us good works, self-denial, self-sacrifice, and devotion for the good of others; not that our good works alone can save us, but that we surely cannot be saved without good works. After we have done all that we are capable of doing, we are then to say, We have done no more than our duty, and at best are unprofitable servants, unworthy of the smallest favor from God. Christ must be our righteousness, and the crown of our rejoicing.²⁵

In April, 1886, Mrs White visited Europe's second largest church, the Cathedral of Milan, and drew some lessons for Adventists from that experience. Rather than pay the \$1 fee for viewing "bones of dead men called saints," she reminded Adventists that "the Lord's plan was that the living God alone should be exalted," and no church had the prerogative of turning "this reverence from the Creator to the creature." While Ellen White "longed to lift [her] voice in this grand old building, and point the poor deluded souls to God and heaven," she abstained from doing so, but after her return from Europe she would ever more aggressively do so for Adventists. She placed her experience at the cathedral in an eschatological setting as she bemoaned the replacement of Christ's merits alone with "penitential works" and noted that Protestants were looking more and more favorably to the religion of Rome. "It is Protestantism that will change," she warned Adventists. A similar observation had been made

by English Roman Catholic scholar Henry Oxenham who, as early as 1881, noted that practically every theologian, either in England or any other country, had departed from the Reformationist concept of justification. In contrast, Mrs White tied Reformation theology back to the ministry of Christ as she focused upon His merits:

"Christ was a protestant. He protested against the formal worship of the Jewish nation....The Reformers date back to Christ and the apostles. They came out and separated themselves from a religion of forms and ceremonies. Luther and his followers did not invent the reformed religion. They simply accepted it as presented by Christ and the apostles.²⁶

In her ever-increasing analysis of the law-gospel relationship, Ellen White immersed herself in the concept of God's mercy and in doing so sought to present its beauty to those SDAs terrorized by the final events scenes that seemed to overshadow them. To "those who are so gloomy and desponding," she urged to spend an hour daily searching the Scriptures and to "dwell especially upon the mercy of God." Focusing heavenward, Ellen White proclaimed, "We are saved because God loves the purchase of the blood of Christ." The results from that purchase allowed not only the forgiveness of sins and permission to enter heaven, but he, "the Father of mercies, will wait at the very gates of heaven to welcome us, to give us an abundant entrance to the mansion of the blest." Ellen White centered on Adventism's eschatological message: "Oh what love, what wondrous love the Father has shown in the gift of his beloved Son for this fallen race!"²⁷

ADVENTISM'S COMPETING MESSAGES, 1887. The conflicting messages already within the cycle of SDA history continued in 1887 and provide a backdrop to the analysis of Ellen White. The beginning of the year marked the death of John Byington, Adventism's first GC president and oldest minister. "Father" Byington, who had entered the SDA ministry in 1852, had been closely associated in ministerial labor with James White and J N Andrews and his death seemed again to illustrate that a new generation was entering Adventism. Byington had

selected the staunchest proponents of "pioneer" Adventism to speak at his funeral and wanted Butler and Smith to preach on Revelation 3:21 ["To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne"] on that occasion.²⁸

Leon Smith, 24-year-old son of Uriah and assistant editor of the Review, evidenced that the law focus of the earlier generation was passed on to the new. Uriah, during 1887 would publish such evidences of his theological perspective as: "If any one would live up to what is taught in the visions, he was sure of heaven," and "We have reached the last reform [Sabbath]; for we can find nothing higher or holier than that law of liberty which is designed to develop perfect characters in us, and by which we are to be judged in the last day,"²⁹ His son would proclaim the perspective of the pioneers that doctrinal positions were vital since it was obedience to those doctrines that "insures, if faithfully practiced, final salvation." "Believers are to be sanctified through the truth," affirmed the younger Smith as he argued in favor of the acceptance of a "creed." True doctrine was vital since if believers "err in doctrine they have not the truth, and cannot be wholly sanctified through it." Leon seemed to illustrate the path being taken by a theological system that embraced at its core the concept of adequate righteousness wrought through obedience and published it to the readers of the Review:

If there is anything which the Scriptures plainly teach, it is the importance of possessing a clear and definite faith, or summary of religious belief; in short, a "creed" in harmony with the truths God's word has revealed. They teach that it does make a difference what men believe, both with their spiritual life here, and their prospects for a life hereafter; and he who is content to rest satisfied with a belief which embraces nothing definitely except two or three central principles of the gospel, such as the majority of Christendom hold in common, will find out his mistake when too late to find the remedy. Let us take the "creed" which the inspired word give us, become thoroughly grounded in its teachings, and hold on to it regardless of the adverse declamation of those who aspire to be teachers of a new gospel.³⁰

Others of the new generation had a message that contrasted with that of Leon Smith and their message was becoming more solidified in 1887. Acceptable

righteousness could not come through the law, but solely through the gospel. The message of Jones and Waggoner, also insisted that the subjective righteousness infused into the believer through faith was adequate to satisfy the fullest demands of the law. A T Jones stated it this way near the end of 1887:

The law of God is itself righteousness (Ps 119:172), and therefore holds as unrighteous all the race of man, because all have transgressed it (Rom 3:19, 20). And being transgressors, the only way in which they can ever attain to harmony with the righteous law of God is through the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ (Rom 3:20, 21). The righteousness embodied in the Third Angel's Message, therefore, is the very supremacy of righteousness itself, and to receive the love of the truth of this message is to receive the love of the highest manifestation of righteousness that is known to the universe of God.³¹

It was Ellen White again, however, in 1887 as in the past, who would offer the clearest insight into the biblical definition of justification to the Seventh-day Adventist church.

ELLEN WHITE AND JUSTIFICATION, 1887. In a talk given in mid-1886 and published in 1887, Mrs White offers some clue as to why she, alone amongst SDAs, seemed to maintain the fullest biblical perspective of the concept of justification. No one came close to her in her love of and seriousness by which she sought God's truth. She constantly sensed her own inadequacy and relied upon guidance from above as she sought to present salvation to others. Notice her reflection upon her long-term ministry:

When I first felt the burden for souls, I was a little past 14 years of age; but, oh! how I pleaded with God to know what I could say to my young associates that they might be led in the right way! I felt that I must have success; that I must do the work for the Master, and God would give me wisdom. When I was 16 years old I commenced active labor in public. I felt that I must meet my work in the Judgment, and that the manner in which I did this work would be registered in the books of heaven. I wrestled and agonized with God that he would give me wisdom, that his work might not be marred in my hands, but be acceptable. For more than 40 years I have been engaged in active work for my Master, and today I feel in just as much need to seek God for wisdom to present the truth to others as I did when I was 16 years old. And every time I attempt to speak to the people, I feel deeply that I have not done the work as perfectly as it should have been done. I am deeply humbled because I do not reflect more

light, and I plead with God that he will give me more grace, more wisdom, that I may do his work with greater completeness.³²

It has often been the case in Adventist history that statements of Ellen White have been considered in isolation, without reference to her fullest theological focus and 1887 provides important evidence of the harm of such misuse of her writings. Much of the history of SDA theology of the 1890s centered upon assumptions of what became known as "translation faith," belief that a certain quantity of faith was necessary to attain to the character supposedly reached by Enoch that enabled him to be translated. The reasoning went that, if those Adventists of the 1890s were the last generation and would be translated, they too would have to reach the state of sinlessness supposedly reached by Enoch. The following, written by Ellen White in 1885 and reprinted in 1886, 1890, and probably on other occasions, was usually quoted in support of that position:

Enoch was a marked character. Many look upon his life as something above what the generality of mortals can ever reach. But Enoch's life and character, which were so holy that he was translated to heaven without seeing death, represent what the lives and characters of all must be, if, like Enoch, they are to be translated when Christ shall come.³³

In writing to the Oakland church in March of 1887, Mrs White placed that statement regarding Enoch in a broader setting that included justification and urged the people to possess the "strong, living, working faith" that Enoch possessed. "Divine influences were constantly working with his human efforts," she proclaimed and she presented the "appointed method of salvation": "If any of us are finally saved, it will be by clinging to Jesus as to the rounds of a ladder. To the believer, Christ is made wisdom and righteousness, sanctification and redemption."³⁴ Enoch was saved because of Christ's righteousness and not his own.

As Ellen White looked ever more closely at justification by faith, she seemed to see it more fully as a message Adventism needed to give to the world.

As she considered the state of the Protestant churches, she observed that "Jesus is not preached in very many of the pulpits of today." Since the ministers seemed to lack knowledge of Christ, they focused upon literary figures, intellectual discourses and everything but the "blood of Christ and the virtue of His atonement." Protestant ministers needed to be taught "what constitutes sin, and to have the spirit of Christ interwoven in all their labors." She proclaimed, "What the world needs today is to know what they must do to be saved." That which was lacking to make ministry successful was "Jesus, the Light of the world." Adventism should respond to this need and its ministry needed "to comprehend the great plan of salvation more fully" in order to meet the need of the world. "Christ upon the cross of Calvary" was the message that would "touch the hearts of the learned" as well as others and SDA ministers needed "to have a more clear, simple manner in presenting the truth as it is in Jesus." She urged SDA ministers not to preach any sermon "unless a portion of that discourse is to especially make plain the way that sinners may come to Christ and be saved."³⁵ Strongly urging Adventism forward in its new gospel focus and message to the world, she admonished:

God has done his part in the great work, and is waiting for the cooperation of his followers. The plan of salvation is fully developed. The blood of Jesus Christ is offered for the sins of the world, the word of God is speaking to man in counsels, in reproofs, in warnings, in promises, and in encouragement, and the efficacy of the Holy Spirit is extended to help him in all his efforts. But with all this light the world is still perishing in darkness, buried in error and sin. Who will be laborers together with God, to win these souls to the truth? Who will bear to them the good tidings of salvation?—The people whom God has blessed with light and truth are to be the messengers of mercy.³⁶

It seems apparent that Ellen White wrestled more fully with ways of expressing justification by faith than all others within the church and one discovers in her private as well as published writings an increasing beauty of expression as she perceives the awesomeness of that subject.³⁷ She wrote this about justification by faith in March of 1887:

Money cannot buy it, intellect cannot grasp it, power cannot command it; but to all who will accept it, God's glorious grace is freely given. But men may feel their need, and, renouncing all self-dependence, accept salvation as a gift. Those who enter heaven will not scale its walls by their own righteousness, nor will its gates be opened to them for costly offerings of gold or silver; but they will gain an entrance to the many mansions of the Father's house through the merits of the cross of Christ.³⁸

Failure to perceive that aspect of justification led many, she affirmed, "to exalt themselves as possessing wisdom or righteousness" and many went so far as to "compare themselves to Christ, as though they were equal with him in perfection of character." "This," she affirmed, "is blasphemy," and indicated a false perception of the righteousness of Christ. Especially should those "expecting that Christ is soon to come" and to be translated avoid all such concepts of "self-importance" and instead lift up "the Man of Calvary."³⁹ She urged Christ's followers to "look to Calvary, and blush for shame at your self-important ideas."⁴⁰

As Mrs White stood before Sinai, she offered a perspective that by itself would have transformed Adventism's past message and certainly have demolished the concept that Old Testament patriarchs had a limited understanding of the gospel. When Moses ascended from Sinai, "it was the light of the glory of the gospel of Christ . . . that shone in the face of Moses."

As Moses saw the day of Christ, and the new and living way of salvation that was to be opened through his blood, he was captivated and entranced. The praise of God was in his heart, and the divine glory that attended the giving of the law was so strikingly revealed in his countenance when he came down from the mount to walk with Israel, that the brightness was painful.⁴¹

The Seventh-day Adventist church entered the year 1888 with every opportunity for perceiving the message that would see it through its eschatological testing time.

Ellen White and Objective Justification: Problem Statements. The reader has no doubt noticed that, to this point, the author has stressed Ellen White's objective perspective concerning justification by faith and no doubt wonders

about the author's relationship to other Ellen White statements that seem to point another direction. Is it "objective" handling of sources to ignore those other statements. When confronted with a similar issue, Willie White observed that the church might pursue one of two courses. While "it might be much easier to repudiate a few documents that perplex us, and say they are forgeries," he believed it a much more honest course "to deal with them [and] tell the truth, and let our brethren, with help from God, deal with the difficulties."⁴²

The author will present some of the so-called "problem statements" in this section and attempt to place them within a working perspective in the next section. It should be noted, however, that it is not the main concern of the author to resolve the question of the interrelationship between objective and subjective aspects of justification regarding Mrs White's writings, but primarily to point out that within Adventism, it was only Ellen White that maintained a theology of objective justification that enabled its continual application to the believer.

Still, one must admit that there are expressions in the Ellen White writings even in the 1884-89 period that in isolation might read like the old message. There are obvious non-theological usages of the terms "imputed" and "imparted." There are expressions that lead to an interpretation that justifying faith brings "Christ's virtue to us," and that "We must have that faith that appropriates the righteousness of Christ," and that justification by faith has both imputed and imparted aspects.⁴³ Even at Minneapolis, Mrs White stated that "Christ came because there was no possibility of man's keeping the law in his own strength. He came to bring him strength to obey the precepts of the law."⁴⁴

Mrs White has clearly said that a contemplation of the cross will enable the sinner to understand what he "must become in character and life if he

would be accounted worthy of eternal life."⁴⁵ Indeed, she carries that premise even farther:

Says Jesus, "If ye love me, keep my commandments." . . . Here are the conditions upon which every soul will be elected to eternal life. Your obedience to God's commandments will prove your right to an inheritance with the saints in light. God has elected a certain excellence of character; and every one who, through the grace of Christ, shall reach the standard of His requirement, will have an abundant entrance into the kingdom of glory.⁴⁶

Notice the following group of statements that relate to character perfection. Notice also the nontheological usage of the term "impute":

[1] There must be repentance toward God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ. This is the only way to secure excellence of character, the only path to divine favor.⁴⁷

[2] He [Christ] took on him our nature, and became sin for us, that we might have "remission of sins that are past," and through his divine strength and grace, might fulfill the righteous requirements of the law.⁴⁸

[3] What did He [die] for? That He might bring to man moral power to overcome temptation and become a partaker of His divine nature. The redemption that was wrought out for us by our Lord on the cross of Calvary was to bring us to obedience to the law of God, making it possible, through His righteousness imputed to us, to keep [it]. . . . Without the righteousness of Christ man could not give to God perfect obedience. Christ takes upon Himself man's sin. Christ imputes to man His righteousness.⁴⁹

[4] As the sacrifice in behalf of man was complete, so the restoration of man from the defilement of sin must be thorough and complete.⁵⁰

[5] We may be clothed with the righteousness of Christ, but his righteousness will not be a covering for the least iniquity.⁵¹

[6] Man cannot be saved by his own works. Without Christ it is impossible for him to render perfect obedience to the law of God; and heaven can never be gained by an imperfect obedience; for this would place all heaven in jeopardy, and make possible a second rebellion.⁵²

[7] Unless Christ's righteousness was imputed to us we could not have acceptable repentance. The righteousness dwelling in us by faith consists of love, forbearance, meekness, and all the Christian virtues. Here the righteousness of Christ is laid hold of and becomes a part of our being. All who have this righteousness will work the works of God.⁵³

We notice that the previously-quoted list of Ellen White statements both preceded and followed the Minneapolis session. Indeed, from the previous

statements the pioneers might well assume that Ellen White agreed with their system of theology. Such realizations should better help us to understand the intense complexity of the times and the difficulties that occur when a revolution is called for. And the next statement seems to harmonize with the subjective view of justification held by Jones and Waggoner:

Every soul must be saved by his own righteousness. Can we manufacture this righteousness? No. But Jesus has furnished it for us. When the sinner comes to him he takes his load of sin, and gives him his righteousness.⁵⁴

As we will discover, however, Mrs White's perception of the impartation of Christ's righteousness to the believer, did not carry with it the assumptions of Jones and Waggoner who considered such a gift to be the same perfect righteousness we think of in objective terms. To Ellen White, just as "we have life because of Christ's righteousness," and that life was "imparted because of Christ's righteousness,"⁵⁵ she never made the assumptions that because Christ's righteousness was perfect and subjective the individual could not die. Jones and Waggoner made that assumption.

The issue immediately before us is how to harmonize the Ellen White statements in this section with her objective view of justification, or do those quoted statements nullify her objective focus? Several nontheological suggestions will be made in this section, while the theological issue will be analyzed in the next.

We must initially consider editorial handling of Mrs White's writings and the problem of chronology. It appears that the editors of both the Signs and the Review did have the prerogative of republishing past Ellen White writings and on certain occasions appear to have published that which seemed to support their position. Articles could be given new titles and treated as new articles without any indication that they may have been published decades earlier. This appears to have occurred a number of times prior to 1888. Such a procedure obviously inhibits understanding any theological growth that may have occurred

in Ellen White from the time the article was originally published. It may be that editors even had some role in the way the terms "impart" and "impute" were used. That possibility must be taken into account.

Secondly, we must consider the evangelistic nature of many of the articles. Many were published from campmeeting and other public addresses where, in those days, non-SDAs often outnumbered SDAs in such meetings. SDA evangelists and Ellen White in particular were very aware of those Christians who preached that they were "saved," but who also believed they could ignore obedience to the law. Many of the Ellen White articles that focus upon the importance of obedience were designed to relate to that holiness and antinomian perspective.

Thirdly, we face the question of methodology in dealing with the Ellen White writings. Given the volume of the Ellen White writings, one can choose sentences here and there, ignore contextual and chronological considerations and "prove" his initial bias. Some of the previously-quoted "problem statements" can be resolved merely by analysis of the full article in which they appeared. For example, #4 in our list of statements seems to call for the complete subjective restoration of man from the effects of sin, but a few sentences beyond that quoted section, Mrs White states:

When, through faith in Jesus Christ, man does according to the very best of his ability, and seeks to keep the way of the Lord, by obedience to the ten commandments, the perfection of Christ is imputed to cover the transgression of the repentant and obedient soul.⁵⁶

From a more complete context we gain a perspective transcending that which occurred in our initial listing of the statement. This brings us to a consideration that transcends the context of a particular article to the broad context of the theological system under which Ellen White operated during the period that led up to and followed 1888.

Clarification of Problem Statements From Ellen White's Central Theological Perspective. Certain basic premises must continually be kept uppermost before assumptions are drawn from any Ellen White statement. From her earliest days of ministry, Ellen White was exposed to such glories of heaven that earth looked gloomy indeed and throughout her ministry she maintained that heavenly, objective perspective. She constantly looked without, not within, for saving righteousness. Ellen White perceived that there was a theme that, when it was kept central, not only became the basis for interpreting all else, but actually became the guide to new light. Notice how she herself formulates the perception of justification that dominates all other theological considerations:

There is one great central truth to be kept ever before the mind in the searching of the Scriptures:—Christ and Him crucified. Every other truth is invested with influence and power corresponding to its relation to this theme. . . . When Christ in His work of redemption is seen to be the great central truth of the system of truth, a new light is shed upon all the events of the past and the future. They are seen in a new relation, and possess a new and deeper significance.⁵⁷

Notice how an understanding of Ellen White's view of objective justification allows an understanding of what she means when she seems to make such applications subjectively. Here is a section from an article appearing in July of 1888 stating "the white raiment is the righteousness of Christ that may be wrought into the character." Here Mrs White is clearly speaking of Christ's righteousness in a subjective sense. But notice the clarification that comes a little further in the same article:

Do you believe that Christ, as your substitute, pays the debt of your transgression? Not, however, that you may continue in sin, but that you may be saved from your sins; that you, through the merits of his righteousness, may be re-instated to the favor of God. Do you know that a holy and just God will accept your efforts to keep his law, through the merits of his own beloved son who died for your rebellion and sin?⁵⁸

According to Ellen White, we stand solely through the merits of Christ, both for forgiveness and for acceptable righteousness for the present and

future. Christ's work as mediator is always implicit in Ellen White's concept of acceptable obedience. Christ's mediation makes our imperfect, but sincere, works acceptable. It is here where Ellen White far transcended the theological system of both the pioneers and Jones and Waggoner.

It is always through the merits of Christ's righteousness that our best efforts toward obedience are acceptable according to Mrs White's system of theology and that is true even when the point is not specifically made in a particular article. Notice how Mrs White emphasizes that point which is central to her perception of justification as she rejoiced in the truths presented at the South Lancaster, Massachusetts, campmeeting in early 1889. Indeed, Ellen White, alone among SDAs of her day recognized that there was only one righteousness acceptable to God: Christ's righteousness and that perception guided her theological system:

There were many who testified that as the searching truths had been presented, they had been convicted in the light of the law as transgressors. They had been trusting in their own righteousness. Now they saw it as filthy rags, in comparison with the righteousness of Christ, which is alone acceptable to God. While they had not been open transgressors, they saw themselves depraved and degraded in heart.⁵⁹

Notice this restatement of the same point and how that perception must be kept in mind when dealing with the Ellen White statements concerning obedience:

Because the law of God was changeless in its character; because not one principle of it, not even a jot or a tittle, could be dishonored and swept away, God consented to let his Son take upon himself the results of man's transgression of that law, thus making it possible for man to be pardoned, and to become obedient to all God's commandments. It is the righteousness and perfection of his Son, who takes upon himself our sins, our defects, our weakness, which God accepts.⁶⁰

According to Ellen White, Christ's mediatorial work enables God to not only forgive us, but also to deal with the results of Adam's sin. Justification to Ellen White related to the present and future and related to our continuing need of Christ's perfect righteousness. Only as we compare the theological systems of the pioneers and Jones and Waggoner with that of Ellen

White do we realize how fully Ellen White transcended all others in Adventism and what amazing insights were revealed to the church of 100 years ago through the ministry of Ellen White. Note the intensity of Ellen White's elevation of the efficacy of the cross and her abhorrence of the concept of subjective perfection. Even the angels in heaven, in their currently sinless state were kept secure only as they focus upon the cross:

The angels ascribe honor and glory to Christ, for even they are not secure except by looking to the sufferings of the Son of God. It is through the efficacy of the cross that the angels of heaven are guarded from apostasy. Without the cross they would be no more secure against evil than were the angels before the fall of Satan. Angelic perfection failed in heaven. Human perfection failed in Eden, the paradise of bliss. All who wish for security in earth or heaven must look to the Lamb of God.⁶¹

Three additional insights into this vitally central aspect of Ellen White's understanding of justification are of a similar nature and drawn from each of the years between 1889 and 1891. In 1889, Mrs White drew from the illustration of Jacob's ladder to illustrate the relationship between justification and sanctification. She told the believers at the Chicago campmeeting that Christ "is your perfection." We could not "scale the battlements of heaven were it not for the fact that Christ is the ladder." Without Christ as the ladder or Mediator, to continually make our efforts acceptable, we would be unable to ascend one inch toward heaven through our most sanctified efforts. Indeed, it was God's love and mercy that made every phase of our journey acceptable. Notice Mrs White's wording in this outstanding illustration of her concept of justification:

While you appreciate the love of God, you will have living faith. You must climb up by Christ; he is the ladder. We could not scale the battlements of heaven were it not for the fact that Christ is the ladder. The base of the ladder rests upon the earth, and the top reaches into the highest heavens. The base of this divine ladder touches the earth. If it had stopped one inch short of that, humanity could never have reached the first round; but it is the goodness of God that leadeth you to repentance, and the grace and mercy of God shines down on every round, for God is above the ladder. Its topmost round reaches into the heaven of heavens. The light of

God's love brightens the whole length of the ladder, and every step upward is a step toward him.⁶²

The next year, Mrs White chose the best in Adventism as her means of illustrating the immensity of the gulf separating the gift from the best of human efforts:

Give all you have and are, and it is all nothing without the merit of the blood that sanctifies the gift. Could those who hold responsible positions multiply their talents a thousandfold, their service would have no worth before God unless Christ was mingled with all their offerings.⁶³

Not content to limit herself to the best of Adventism, Mrs White applied her principle to the best Christians who ever lived:

The danger has been presented to me again and again of entertaining as a people, false ideas of justification by faith. . . . Let the subject be made distinct and plain that it is not possible to effect anything in our standing before God or in the gift of God to us through creature merit. . . . It is wholly a free gift. Justification is wholly of grace and not procured by any works that fallen man can do. . . . All blessings must come through a Mediator. . . . All must be laid upon the fire of Christ's righteousness to cleanse it from its earthly odor before it rises in a cloud of fragrant incense to the great Jehovah and is accepted as a sweet savor. If you would gather together everything that is good and holy and noble and lovely in man, and then present the subject to the angels of God as acting a part in the salvation of the human soul or in merit, the proposition would be rejected as treason. . . . Any works that man can render to God will be far less than nothingness. My requests are made acceptable only because they are laid upon Christ's righteousness.⁶⁴

Yet more must be said concerning Ellen White's understanding of Christ's intercessory work that was so central to her concept of justification by faith.

Ellen White and Intercession Theology. Ellen White considered the heavenly mediatorial work of Christ at the highest levels of importance for both positive and negative reasons. Here was why it was imperative that pioneer theology change its focus for "Christ cannot take up the names of those who are satisfied in their own self-sufficiency."⁶⁵ If the sinner relied instead upon subjective righteousness, "he has missed his golden opportunity and is lost."⁶⁶ Because of the "odor" of our attempts at earthly perfection, Ellen White considered that it was "as necessary that [Christ] should keep us

by His intercessions as that He should redeem us with His blood."⁶⁷ Indeed, what is constantly required was a "superhuman mediation sprinkled with the blood that is of value beyond estimate because it was the life of God in His Son."⁶⁸ We have seen how both the pioneer system and that embraced by Jones and Waggoner were forced by the logic of their system to look within rather than above for perfect righteousness and we can thus see how such a view would eventually render Christ's intercessory work unnecessary. Ellen White looked fully upward, however, and that brings us to the positive element concerning her understanding of the mediation of Jesus.

As Ellen White searched for security that would apply even to the last generation, she received a heavenly response:

In a vision given in 1880, I asked, "Where is the security for the people of God in these last days of peril?" The answer was, "Jesus maketh intercession for His people."⁶⁹

The location of Ellen White's security was where saving righteousness was mediated, in God's presence in heaven: "It is the righteousness and perfection of his Son . . . which God accepts"⁷⁰ and it was here where "all must be laid upon the fire of Christ's righteousness to cleanse it from its earthly odor" to be made acceptable.⁷¹ Here was where "His mediation secures you everything that your faith claims."⁷² Here is where humanity is perfected for Ellen White drew other concepts from her 1880 vision: "Jesus in His position as Intercessor and Advocate for man is leading all who will be led saying, 'Follow me upward and onward step by step, where the clear light of the Sun of Righteousness shines.'"⁷³ Here is where humanity and divinity are combined for "humanity is perfect only as it is united with divinity" and "Man's only safety is in combining his humanity with divinity."⁷⁴

Notice Ellen White's description of the process that combines divinity and humanity and the place where it occurs:

The religious services, the prayers, the praise, the penitent confession of sin ascend from true believers as incense to the

heavenly sanctuary, but passing through the corrupt channels of humanity, they are so defiled that unless purified by blood, they can never be of value with God. They ascend not in spotless purity, and unless the Intercessor who is at God's right hand, presents and purifies all by His righteousness, it is not acceptable to God. All incense from earthly tabernacles must be moist with the cleansing drops of the blood of Christ. He holds before the Father the censer of His own merits, in which there is no taint of earthly corruption. He gathers into the censer the prayers, the praise, and the confessions of His people, and with these He puts His own spotless righteousness. Then, perfumed with the merits of Christ's propitiation, the incense comes up before God wholly and entirely acceptable.⁷⁵

This now brings us to the aspect of theology where Ellen White stood alone and unperceived amongst the SDAs of her day, her concept of a continually relevant and objective justification. Most Adventists during her time looked solely to her calls to moral behaviour and missed her intense focus upon the location of saving righteousness and the church was the poorer because of their oversight.

Ellen White and Objective Justification. It will be recognized that the previous section dealing with mediation already has somewhat dealt with Ellen White's objective views of justification. More can yet be said, however. It would be difficult to over-emphasize the potential theological contribution of Ellen White to denominational theology, if the church in her day had looked analytically at her contribution relating to justification by faith. An understanding of her objective perspective would have saved the church several decades of aberrant theology. It seems as if the disunity of the period militated against the kind of close analysis that today is possible. Our distance, however, sometimes results in our taking for granted those things that were startlingly different between what Ellen White had to offer and what the remainder of the church was saying. All too often we tend to look at our forefathers through our 20th century theological perspective and fail to recognize the limitations of a century ago. None in Adventism held to an

objective view of justification that made justification constantly relevant as did Ellen White. The theological implications of that truth are overwhelming.

Because the most supreme efforts of the believer toward obedience maintained no saving merit and were tainted with such earthly imperfection they depended upon the intercession of Christ to give that obedience value, Mrs White's system positively demanded an objective focus. And it was that perspective that, in her mind, resolved the controversy concerning justification. Since justification involved our standing before God and not our actions, and was a gift "through faith in Jesus Christ alone," "wholly a free gift," then "justification by faith is placed beyond controversy." Ellen White claimed that "the light given me of God places this important subject above any question in my mind."⁷⁶

One looks in vain in the literature of the church during this period for anything resembling the objective understanding of justification found in this next analysis by Ellen White:

The only way in which [the sinner] can attain to righteousness is through faith. By faith he can bring to God the merits of Christ, and the Lord places the obedience of His Son to the sinner's account. Christ's righteousness is accepted in place of man's failure, and God receives, pardons, justifies, the repentant, believing soul, treats him as though he were righteous, and loves him as He loves His Son. This is how faith is accounted righteousness.⁷⁷

Ellen White recognized that it was "the bewitching power of Satan that leads men to look to themselves in the place of looking to Jesus,"⁷⁸ and such especially was the tendency to those who were facing imminent death. During this period Mrs White had occasion to share her objective focus with two Adventist ministers whose fear of death was forcing an inward perspective. As Samuel Fulton lay dying of consumption, Mrs White pled that he not "worry yourself out of the arms of Jesus," for "try as hard as you will, you cannot manufacture a righteousness for yourself." She urged Fulton to look beyond himself to the place of objective security: "Christ has woven in heaven's loom

the robe of His righteousness, and He will put the same upon you," she told him.⁷⁹

She made a similar point in her personal visit to Andrew Olsen, the dying brother of GC president, O A Olsen. Mrs White noticed the tendency of the youthful minister to "go back to hunt up his mistakes and defections of the past" for that was "natural to do when the soul is letting loose his grasp of this life and looking into the eternal world." Indeed, she observed, "If anyone ever has a distinct view of his own imperfections it is at this point in his experience." Mrs White believed that her ministry to Andrew was successful, for she wrote his brother about Andrew's reaction: "He said he could now better understand that his business was to look and live, to take the robe woven by Christ himself in the heavenly loom, and rejoice in the worthiness and righteousness of Christ."⁸⁰

As Mrs White's twin sister, who was not a SDA, lay seriously ill, Mrs White shared the gospel with her: "With Jesus as your blessed Friend you need not fear to die," for "The curse of sin Christ bore for us that we should not perish." Jesus "was condemned for our sins in which He had no share that we might be justified by His righteousness in which we had no share."⁸¹ To Ellen White saving righteousness was as secure as it possibly could be for it resided in heaven. But what about earth, did Ellen White not believe that justification by faith had implications regarding our behavior?

Ellen White and Justification-Sanctification Relationship. It will be recalled that at the outset the author informed his readers that his aim was to outline the varying perspectives on justification within the church and to notice that Ellen White maintained a unique focus within Adventism. His purpose did not concern the relationship between justification and sanctification or even the question of whether Ellen White considered sanctification within the justification category. While that is still true,

the author has no desire to sidestep the issue and it will be dealt with tangentially here.

Sanctification obviously was a vital concept of Ellen White. It was more vital during this period of SDA history than any other because it was increasingly apparent to Ellen White that the past understanding of sanctification was pathetically narrow. If everything else failed to convince SDAs of that observation, SDA history of the times overwhelmingly revealed it. One need do nothing more than observe the "Minneapolis spirit" to see where Adventism's past message of righteousness through sanctification or by obedience had brought it. Ellen White, through prophetic insight, observed that failure and recognized the need of a message to elevate the SDA concept of sanctification. Justification by faith was just what the church needed from two perspectives: it provided assurance of a salvation based upon the righteousness of Christ and thus an upward rather than inward look; secondly the "increase" of Christ within the denominational focus meant the "decrease" of self-righteousness and thus paradoxically elevation of the moral stance within the church as a whole. Because pioneer Adventism did not understand justification, sanctification had been lost. Because Jones and Waggoner lacked objective justification, they soon arrived at a new self-righteousness. Ellen White had an understanding of sanctification that continually brought it back to justification and, while perceiving them as separate processes, did not separate them from each other.

Mrs White believed that justification by faith would enable us to see "the contrast between our character" and Christ's and that would "lead to humiliation of soul and deep heart-searching." She affirmed that "We are always to feel our continual dependence upon God" for perfect, justifying righteousness for that would "scatter our self-sufficiency, our pride and vanity to the winds."⁸²

As Mrs White assessed Adventist's pre-1888 message, she noticed an appalling lack. One result she noticed was "how far apart has been faith and the righteousness of Christ, from the religious life of those even who claim to be keeping the commandments of God."⁸³ Adventists has focused upon their own goodness, nitpicked over dresses, ornaments, etc, while they failed to love the Saviour.⁸⁴ She condemned the Adventist ministry for "In your talks and prayers there has been so little dwelling upon Christ, His matchless love, His great sacrifice made in our behalf, that Satan has nearly eclipsed the views we should have and must have of Jesus Christ."⁸⁵ The ministry had been dilenquent because of its preoccupation with rules and laws and had fallen into Satan's trap and eclipsed Jesus and "what he was to us, and what he would do for us, and what he would be to us." She urged ministers to "Let the law take care of itself," for SDAs "have been at work on the law until we got as dry as the hills of Gilboa." It was now time to "trust in the merits of Jesus Christ of Nazareth."⁸⁶

She not only observed that the pseudo-sanctification focus of the ministry had redounded against truly moral behaviour, but had actually kept people out of the SDA church. In a severe condemnation of Adventism's past ministry, Mrs White proclaimed:

The law of God has been largely dwelt upon, and has been presented to congregations, almost as destitute of the knowledge of Jesus Christ and His relation to the law as was the offering of Cain. I have been shown that many have been kept from the faith because of the mixed, confused ideas of salvation, because the ministers have worked in a wrong manner to reach hearts.⁸⁷

The specific aspect of salvation where Ellen White considered the ministry weak was also mentioned by her: "The point which has been urged upon my mind for years is the imputed righteousness of Christ." She "wondered that this matter was not made the subject of discourses in our churches throughout the land." Because SDAs did not focus upon Christ's righteousness, upon justification, they could not exhibit sanctification, but instead "cavil over

trivialities, and neglect the weightier matters, mercy and the love of God."⁸⁸ Indeed, Mrs White leveled her severest criticism of Adventism's past in that area: "Faith, love, and holiness are the essentials that give true power to the truth for this time. The manifest absence of these, the little many have known of Christ, and the little we preach Christ's lessons, have been a telling witness against Seventh-day Adventists."⁸⁹

If Adventists truly wanted to bring others into its fold, it must make justification by faith central to its message. Mrs White urged its leaders, "We must look more to the presentation of God's love and mercy to move the hearts of the people." SDAs needed to understand not only God's justice, but also His mercy for Ellen White knew that "those who can blend together the law of God and the mercy of God can reach any heart." She had recognized for years "that there is a broken link" in the Adventist message "which has kept us from reaching hearts" and that link could be mended "by presenting the love and mercy of God."⁹⁰ Justification by faith was the message that Adventists must effectively present to the world.

And when it did, sanctification would be its fruitage, for Ellen White has observed: "The present message--justification by faith--is a message from God; it bears the divine credentials, for its fruit is unto holiness."⁹¹

If the analysis presented in this chapter is correct, a logical question must occur: What went wrong? Why was the church so blind to the Ellen White perceptions concerning justification? That aspect of the 1888 experience concerns us next.

NOTES

1. Ellen White, Sermon at Potterville, Michigan, Dec 19, 1888, RH, May 6, 1889.
2. Ellen White, "Compassion for the Erring," RH, July 16, 1889.
3. Ellen White, "Christ the Living Fountain," ST, July 1, 1889.
4. W C White reminded Butler of the value of the 1883 "Bible Reading Institute" when he advocated an institute to precede the 1888 General Conference session.
5. W C White to G I Butler, Aug 10, 1888, WCW bk B, pp 434-35; Nov 20, 1883 General Conference Session Action, GCA.
6. Ellen White, "Unity in Christ," Address to ministers, Nov 7, 1883, RH, March 4, 1884.
7. Ellen White, "The Christian's Refuge," Nov 9, 1883, Remarks to ministers, RH, April 15, 1884 and "Consecration and Diligence in Christian Workers," Nov 18, 1883, Remarks to ministers, RH, June 24, 1884.
8. Nov 16, 1883 GC Resolution, GCA. Ellen White, "A Missionary Appeal," RH, Dec 15, 1885.
9. Ellen White, "Duties and Privileges of the Christian Laborer," Remarks at closing meeting of GC, Nov 20, 1883, RH, July 22, 1884.
10. Ellen White, "The Christian's Refuge," Nov 9, 1883, Remarks to ministers at 1883 GC, RH, April 15, 1883.
11. Ellen White, "Effectual Prayer," Nov 10, 1883, Remarks to ministers at 1883 GC, RH, April 22, 1884.
12. Ellen White, "The Transforming Grace of God," Nov 16 Remarks to ministers at 1883 GC, RH, June 10, 1884 and "Christian Department and Influence," Nov 17 Remarks to ministers at 1883 GC, RH, June 17, 1884.
13. Ibid.
14. Ellen White, "Nehemiah Causes the People to Be Instructed in the Law of God," ST, Jan 10, 1884; "Faith the Christian's Victory," ST, May 22, 1884; "Walk in the Light," ST, July 24, 1884; "Immutability of the Law of God," ST, Sept 4, 1884; "An Address to the Young," ST, Sept 11, 1884.
15. Ellen White, "Notes of Travel," RH, Nov 25, 1884.
16. Ellen White, "Notes of Travel," RH, Feb 10, 1885.
17. William Miller, Evidence From Scripture and History of the Second Coming of Christ About the Year 1843 (1842), Lectures 10, 11, 17, pp 158, 167, 253. The author is indebted to Tom Norris for his observation of the objective perspective toward justification in the theology of William Miller.
18. Ellen White, "Notes of Travel," RH, Feb 17, 1885.
19. Ellen White, "Sanctification--The True and the False," ST, Feb 26, 1885.
20. Ellen White, "Co-Laborers With Christ," ST, Dec 3, 1885.
21. Ellen White, "A Missionary Appeal," RH, Dec 15, 1885 and "Christian Growth," RH, Dec 22, 1885.
22. Ellen White, "Christian Growth," RH, Dec 22, 1885 and "Rejection of Light," RH, Jan 5, 1886.
23. Ellen White, "The Two Dispensations," RH, March 2, 1886.
24. Ellen White, "The Government of God," RH, March 9, 1886.
25. Ellen White, "The Sin of Selfishness," RH, July 13, 1886.
26. Ellen White, "Visit to the Vaudois Valleys," RH, June 1, 1886; Henry Oxenham, The Catholic Doctrine of Atonement, p 37, cited by Robert Brinsmead, "The Legal and Moral Aspects of Salvation," Part 1, Present Truth, July, 1976.
27. Ellen White, "Christ Our Sacrifice," RH, Sept 21, 1886.
28. G W Amadon, "The Sickness and Death of Eld John Byington," RH, Jan 25, 1887.

29. [Uriah Smith], "Without a Motive," RH, June 7, 1887 and Uriah Smith, "God's Covenants With Men," RH, Nov 1, 1887.
30. Leon Smith, "The Value of a 'Creed,'" RH, May 10, 1887.
31. A T Jones, "The Third Angel's Message," ST, Dec 8, 1887.
32. Ellen White, "Serving God Fervently," Morning Talk at Copenhagen, Denmark, July 22, 1886 in RH, July 26, 1887.
33. Ellen White, "Christian Courtesy," RH, Sept 1, 1885. See also ST, Nov 11, 1886 and Sept 8, 1890.
34. Ellen White, "Practical Godliness," Testimony 33, March 1, 1887, in 5T, pp 535, 539.
35. Ellen White, "Our Sacred Calling," RH, Feb 22, 1887.
36. Ellen White, "Partakers of the Divine Nature," RH, March 1, 1887.
37. If the reader will pardon a personal observation at this point, I will make the following statement based on prolonged handling the various materials surrounding this period. At various points in the research for this study, I immersed myself in writings of Jones and Waggoner, Butler and Smith and periodical articles unnumbered and thus went through various stages of evaluation of content and, in a sense, spiritual reaction to those writings. I would defy anyone to spend a month reading the best of the Jones and Waggoner and then read the Ellen White ST or RH articles and not conclude that Ellen White was indeed inspired by the Lord. The difference in spiritual insight is remarkable.
38. Ellen White, "In What Shall We Glory," RH, March 15, 1887.
39. Ibid.
40. Ellen White, "Christ Man's Example," RH, July 5, 1887.
41. Ellen White, "Christ and the Law; Or the Relations of the Jew and Gentile to the Law," ST, Aug 25, 1887.
42. W C White to A G Daniells, Dec 31, 1913, WCW 1913, WE.
43. Ellen White, ST, March 11, 1889, RH, April 9 and June 10, 1889.
44. Ellen White, Sabbath Sermon, Oct 20, 1888, Ms 8-88.44.
45. Ellen White, "Steps in Conversion," ST, July 6, 1888.
46. Ellen White, "The Value of Bible Study," RH, July 17, 1888.
47. Ellen White, "An Address to the Young," ST, Sept 11, 1884.
48. Ellen White, "Evidences of Genuine Faith," Sermon at Copenhagen, Denmark, July 20, 1886, RH, March 6, 1888.
49. Ellen White, "A Peculiar People," Sermon at Wellingborough, England, July 14, 1887, Ms 25-87.
50. Ellen White, "The Book of Books," RH, Aug 21, 1888.
51. Ellen White, "There Is Help in God," ST, July 29, 1889.
52. Ellen White, "What Was Secured by the Death of Christ," ST, Dec 30, 1889.
53. Ellen White to -----, Jan 14, 1890, A13-90, Z file.
54. Ellen White, "The Christian's Commission," Sermon at Washington, DC, Jan 26, 1889, ST, Sept 2, 1889.
55. Ellen White to Bro Craig, Feb 4, 1891, C8-91.
56. Ellen White, "The Book of Books," RH, Aug 21, 1888.
57. Ellen White, "Circulation of Great Controversy," Ms 31-90.
58. Ellen White, "How Do We Stand?" RH, July 24, 1888, emphasis supplied.
59. Ellen White, "Meetings at South Lancaster, Mass," RH, March 5, 1889, emphasis supplied.
60. Ellen White, "David's Prayer," Sermon at Battle Creek, Dec 8, 1888, RH, Dec 18, 1888, emphasis supplied.
61. Ellen White, "What Was Secured by the Death of Christ," ST, Dec 30, 1889.
62. Ellen White, "Christ's Burden Is Light," Sermon at Chicago, April 6, 1889, ST, Sept 16, 1889.

63. Ellen White, "Relationship of Institutional Workers," c July, 1891, Ms 3-92 [sic].
64. Ellen White, "Danger of False Ideas on Justification by Faith," Ms 36-90, emphasis supplied.
65. Ellen White, "Camp-Meeting at Ottawa, Kansas," RH, July 23, 1889.
66. Ellen White, Diary, Dec 21, 1889, Ms 24-89.
67. Ellen White, "Parables," 1893, Ms 73-93.
68. Ellen White, "Danger of False Ideas on Justification by Faith," 1890, Ms 36-90.
69. Ellen White, Diary, Oct 30-Nov 4, 1890, Ms 44-90.
70. Ellen White, "David's Prayer," Sermon at Battle Creek, Dec 8, 1888, RH, Dec 18, 1888.
71. Ellen White, "Danger of False Ideas on Justification by Faith," 1890, Ms 36-90.
72. Ellen White, Diary, Dec 21, 1889, Ms 24-89.
73. Ellen White, Diary, Oct 30-Nov 4, 1890, Ms 44-90, emphasis supplied.
74. Ellen White, "Devotion to God Needed in the Publishing House," Nov 3, 1890, RG 11 and Diary, Oct 30-Nov 4, 1890, Ms 44-90..
75. Ellen White, "Christ Our High Priest," 1900, Ms 50-00, 1 SM 344, emphasis supplied.
76. Ellen White, "Danger of False Ideas on Justification by Faith," 1890, Ms 36-90.
77. Ellen White, "Christ the Way of Life," RH, Nov 4, 1890, emphasis supplied. As we have seen, while Jones and Waggoner may have at times used some of the terminology of forensic righteousness, in reality they never maintained such an objective perspective.
78. Ellen White, "Danger of False Ideas on Justification by Faith," 1890, Ms 36-90.
79. Ellen White to Samuel Fulton, April 23, 1890, F31-90.
80. Ellen White to O A Olsen, June 9, 1890, GCA.
81. Ellen White to Lizzie Bangs, Feb 21, 1891, B61-91.
82. Ellen White, ST, Feb 10, 1888 and "Experience Following Minneapolis," c June, 1889, Ms 30-89.
83. Ellen White to Brethern, c April, 1889, B85-89.
84. Ellen White, ST, March 11 and July 1, 1889.
85. Ellen White, "Counsels to Ministers #2: The Need of a True Concept of Righteousness by Faith," Sept 13, 1889, Ms 27-89.
86. Ellen White, "Remarks at Bible School," Feb 6, 1890, Ms 10-90.
87. Ellen White, "Danger of False Ideas on Justification by Faith," 1890, Ms 36-90.
88. Ibid.
89. Ellen White, "Peril of Trusting in the Wisdom of Men," 1890, Ms 55-90.
90. Ellen White, Statement Before Council of Presidents Meeting, March 3, 1891, RG 1, GCA.
91. Ellen White, "Camp-Meeting at Rome, NY," RH, Sept 3, 1889, emphasis supplied.

Chapter 6

The Church and the Prophet

After Mrs White had spent almost a month with the cream of Adventism's ministry in early 1890, she wrote this to the secretary of the General Conference, W A Colcord: "I have never passed through such a scene of conflict, such determined resistance to the truth . . . as since the Minneapolis meeting."¹ After Minneapolis, Mrs White felt inadequate "because I could not do more to arouse my brethren and sisters" to look to the new message and "was prostrated by sickness so severe that I had no power to exercise faith." Indeed, by 1890, it seemed to Ellen White that "a discouragement was upon [her] that it seemed [she] should never rise above."² Opposition to Ellen White was so powerful and came from such leading thinkers within the church that in March of 1890 she would tell those assembled at the Battle Creek Tabernacle that she had been driven "to cherish doubt in regard to myself and my work."³ While opposition may have brought some doubts to Ellen White for a short period, it also strengthened her resolve, much to our benefit today for it became "a settled purpose with [her] to write [her] experience in full . . . that these events shall be recorded as they have occurred."⁴ It was because of that resolve that we have so much of Ellen White's historical analysis of the Minneapolis experience.

But why should there be such opposition? What was the rationale behind church leadership's continuing opposition to Ellen White even after Minneapolis? The contradictory views held toward the nature of Ellen White's inspiration held by the laity and those held by church leadership must have brought discouragement to Ellen White.

Laity and the Giles' View of Ellen White's Role. In July of 1890, W W Giles, an Adventist layman enclosed \$25 to Ellen White. The money was intended "as payment" to Mrs White "for composing or writing a small pamphlet embodying

answers & explanations" to a series of questions posed by Giles. In case the Review or Signs publishing houses would not want to publish the pamphlet, Giles himself was willing "at my own risk" to publish the work. Giles expected that Mrs White would not be too long in answering the ten paragraphs of questions he sent for he needed the study "at once" as he knew of many others who had "doubts & perplexities" and wished to help them. And, in case he had overlooked something he urged that Mrs White, "in case you think of other tricks of Satan to ensnare sinners," reveal them in the pamphlet to be "about 40 or 60 pages" in length. Here is one set of perceptions concerning her mission that Ellen White had continually to relate to.

Ellen White and Personal Struggles to Ascertain God's Will: An Example.

The question might legitimately be raised as to why Ellen White seemed not to be given specific insight into the exact points where Jones, Waggoner, Smith, Butler and/or others were theologically erroneous. While, as already hinted, an analysis of her overall theological system does provide such an insight, she did not seem to receive the kind of insight that would say precisely where and in what sense someone was in error.

To Ellen White, the understanding of the will of the Lord was of supreme importance and that could never be taken for granted. When George Butler, recently returned from Europe, read to the delegates of the 1884 GC a request from the Central European field, "in behalf of our mission" that Ellen White visit Europe, "that the cause here may share the benefits of her labors and of the precious light and instruction which the Lord so graciously grants us through his servant." After remarks by Butler and Haskell emphasizing the desirability of both Ellen White and W C White assisting in the development of the work in Europe, "the two latter responded that they stood ready to go whenever God should indicate by unmistakable providences that such was their duty."⁵

From the time of that November 3, 1884, action until her departure on July 13, 1885, Ellen White had no such "unmistakable providence" to guide her. In January, 1885, Butler reminded Mrs White that he himself had protested the necessity of his going to Europe in 1884, but went despite the severe illness of his own wife, "not more than half expecting I should see her alive in this world." Clearly hinting to Ellen White, he pointed out that he went "wholly by faith to carry out the wishes of my brethren." Butler made similar appeals to Ellen White during the next several months.⁶ Besides Butler, W C White urged his mother to Europe and noted in April, 1885, that "she has quite fully made up her mind" to go. "We have all urged it, and she has decided that what everybody thinks is right, it may be safe to follow."⁷

By the next month, however, the situation had shifted and Mrs White decided not to go. We here see an inspired leader of the church, earnestly struggling to ascertain God's will in reference to an importance church situation, but still uncertain.⁸ Mrs White had become seriously ill with a "severe attack of heart disease" from which she was slowly recovering. Her son reported to Butler that "two or three times" his mother had decided that it was "not her duty" to go to Europe, but had recently placed the decision in limbo. Her son seemed not so concerned about the health situation, he told Butler, since "I have noticed many times that her most important labors were preceeded by sickness."⁹ One of the things that did discourage Ellen White from the European trip, however, were the unreal expectations some of the church leaders were placing upon her: renovate the European work, convince all of the value of the gift of prophecy, and return in a few months. When Stephen Haskell anticipated that Ellen White "might be favored with the gift of tongues" to facilitate her European work, Mrs White seriously questioned the wisdom of going since, she affirmed, she had agreed to go more upon the inclinations of

her brethren than upon her own judgment, "and now she was convinced that their judgment was not sound."¹⁰

After she had set her path toward Europe, Ellen White wrote to the church members about her struggle for knowing the will of God in that regard:

As the appointed time for starting drew near, my faith was severely tested. I so much desired some one of experience upon whom I could rely for counsel and encouragement. My courage was gone, and I longed for human help, one who had a firm hold from above, and whose faith would stimulate mine. By day and by night my prayers ascended to heaven that I might know the will of God, and have perfect submission to it. Still my way was not made clear; I had no special evidence that I was in the path of duty, or that my prayers had been heard.¹¹

Mrs White noted that she had received "courage and faith" from her son and finally began her journey "with the best light I had," relying primarily upon the "judgment of the General Conference." When Mrs White had begun her journey and was passing through Oakland, she was invited to speak to the Oakland church on Sabbath. It was not until she began speaking that she received the necessary "physical strength and mental clearness to speak the word with power." Mrs White observed that despite the fact that she had prayed for months to ascertain the will of the Lord, that "God hangs a mist before my eyes," but when she had actually begun the journey she found the assurance that she was "moving in accordance with the will of God." She rejoiced in the rest and assurance she found in Jesus.¹²

So we see that Ellen White's struggles to ascertain truth involved something more than quick, easy answers to doctrinal and other issues. But there was yet another set of perceptions that was becoming more and more dominant because it was held by many in leadership positions, had been widely published in the Review and also taught at Battle Creek College.

George Butler, Ellen White and Inspiration. At the beginning of 1884, President George Butler commenced a series of six articles on inspiration. He enunciated the position that while all the scriptural writings were inspired to

a degree and reflected the combination of human and Divine action, the writings were "authoritative in proportion to the degrees of their inspiration." While the highest form of inspiration was direct communion with God through visions and dreams provided by God, there were special times when some "were inspired in a higher sense than the ordinary prophet." Butler placed the special light given during the time of Moses and Christ, "at the beginning of the Mosaic and Christian dispensations" at the top of his list. His preference for law and prophecy was clearly evidenced. "All of the prophetic books, we understand, were derived from light given through visions," he affirmed. While he did not mean to show disrespect to the books of Ruth, Proverbs or Song of Solomon, he did believe "there are varying degrees of respect." Butler "seriously question[ed]" that the historical books, including the gospels, contained "the same degree of inspiration" to be found "in the prophetic books, and that the writers were inspired in the same manner."¹³ It is not surprising that Butler's views of inspiration and the authority of visions would greatly influence his attitude toward the inspiration of Ellen White.

We have previously noticed how George Butler had written Ellen White several times in 1887 urging that she resolve the Galatians issue and castigate E J Waggoner for publishing his views. In his frustration during the time of the 1888 GC, Butler soundly berated Ellen White for failing to respond to his letters and to resolve the issue. Butler's view of the nature of Mrs White's inspiration, however, prevented him from considering that Ellen White's published articles, that seldom claimed direct visionary authority, in actuality did provide the basis for dealing with his problem. If he had read the following, or applied it personally, even though it was written prior to his raising the Galatians issue with Ellen White, he would never have accused Mrs White of not responding to the issues surrounding the Galatians controversy, and he certainly would have withdrawn his pamphlet:

We have been loved with an infinite tenderness, and yet many of us have little love for one another. We are too severe upon those whom we suppose to be in error, and are very sensitive to the least blame or question in regard to our own course. Hints are thrown out, and sharp criticisms of each other, but at the same time the very ones who do this are blind to their own failings.¹⁴

BUTLER DIRECTLY CONFRONTS MRS WHITE.¹⁵ On the first day of October in 1888, George Butler gave Ellen White an insight into what she could expect at the General Conference session. He dictated from his sick bed an amazing epistle that, among other things, blamed Ellen White for his prostrated condition. Butler had concluded that it was because of the "way that this [Galatians] matter has been pushed and urged by responsible men in the cause, and by your seeming attitude also which has brought me to my present condition more than any one other thing." Butler observed that he had written Ellen White "over and over again concerning it, and no notice whatever was taken of what I said until my mind was filled with perplexity and anxiety by the course pursued by my brethren, that this nervous attack came upon me." There is no doubt about the seriousness with which Butler pursued any theological issue. This was an inevitable consequence of one who considered that the sanctification necessary to pass the judgment resulted from obedience to the truth. If a vital doctrine, as Butler believed the Galatians issue to be, was shown or held to be error, such necessary righteousness could not come from obedience to it.

Butler reminded Ellen White of her April 5, 1887, letter to both him and Smith "censuring [his] course considerably." Because of that letter his "nervous chills returned," and said Butler, he was "unfit" for any work for over five months. Butler affirmed that he considered Ellen White responsible for that period of illness and told her: "I have never had any doubt myself but what it was sadness of heart brought upon me by the position you took" that caused the sickness. He was not finished with Ellen White after blaming her

for months of illness: "I have not, Sister White, been able to see the justice of your letter of April 5, 1887, and never expect to."

Butler decried Ellen White's expressed fears that he would use her letter to Jones and Waggoner as a weapon against them. She also feared Butler would assume that because she reprimanded them, that she considered Butler's theological position correct. Butler affirmed "that I had never used your article up to the time you had wrtitten, in any such way as your letter intimates, and had no thought of doing so." He also reacted to the Ellen White's opposition to his "sharp" tone in Review articles and in the Galatians pamphlet. "With the attitude in which you place my efforts in this matter," he wrote, "I cannot see the justice." Indeed, Butler did not consider that he had been "too sharp with Dr Waggoner," but rather too moderate for "every word that I have said is true and much of the truth has not been told." Butler was used to the methods of debates in evangelism and probably believed that his thrusts were moderate.¹⁶

It is amazingly revealing concerning his perception of the inspiration of Ellen White to notice how Butler could place his personal evaluation side by side with hers concerning this matter:

I think that every word that I said was more than backed up by what you said to him and to A T Jones in your letter to them of Feb 18, which is now before me. I am willing to compare statement by statement, and if your words are not sharper and more condemnatory toward their course than what I have said, then I am unable to understand language.

We have previously noticed Butler's views of the role of the GC president and he again seems in this instance to consider his own role to be close to the prophetic role of Ellen White. He next proceeded to counsel Mrs White concerning her letters to Jones and Waggoner for he regarded their infractions as "an enormous fault, injurious to the cause, destructive to peace and union." He told Mrs White that "a few private words to E J Waggoner and A T Jones is not sufficient to cover such a course as they have taken in public for years."

Butler wanted a higher price for their infractions than the letter of counsel they received from Ellen White. He considered "that this thing needs to be publicly rebuked." Nothing could convince him "that the other course," that is the path followed by Mrs White, "is right."

It is sometimes very easy for us to dismiss the Butler perspective as without merit and it is even easier to "level" him after reading some of the Ellen White testimonies concerning his failures. We need continually to remind ourselves, however, that, in comparison with others, George Butler was not an evil man or an immoral man. Notice his agonizing attempt to present his case to Ellen White:

I am here on a sick bed, a poor broken down nerveless man. As it seems to me my nerve power is ground out and slaughtered in the house of my friends. I have tried to labor with an unselfish purpose in this cause, doing all I could in labor. . . . [I] have given the best I had to the precious cause.

George Butler represented, not the failure of an individual, but rather the failure of a system that relied upon personal adequacy during the time it perceived itself to be undergoing its last testing time. That failure was there beside the GC president as he wrote from his sick bed and as Minneapolis approached. Almost everything within that past system was shown during this period to be inadequate and in that sense, George Butler well represented the failure of the past. Notice his conclusion:

I shall retire with no morose or bitter feelings. To be sure things look dark in the cause, and I see no way but what we are right in the shaking time for which we have been looking. The worldly spirit which seems to be running riot among us, the cold and formal spirit with many, and the lack of spirituality and sacrifice, the avalanche of dark sins and the iniquity which seems to be coming on many, and the lack of humility and the blessed spirit of our Saviour which are everywhere seen, speak sadly to my spirit and show that fearful times are coming.

Still, it must be said that in his representation of pre-1888 Adventism, George Butler's widely-disseminated views on inspiration had done more than anything to nullify Ellen White's ministry, his concept of righteousness by

obedience stifled church perceptions of justification by faith, his "preservation" of the landmarks and entrenchment mentality had inhibited the search for new light, his concept of leadership had fostered a system of control from the top, his understanding of ministry had fostered a harsh tone in denominational publications and his self-righteous demand for more than a soft letter of counsel to Jones and Waggoner illustrated the size of the beam in his eye.

While it was Butler himself who observed the failures of the past system, he did not see the "new energy" that the new message could bring and he did not perceive the continual righteousness of Christ that was the promise of the new message that Ellen White was calling attention toward. Indeed, Butler apparently did not even see the personal inconsistencies in the observations he was making to Ellen White. Obviously exhibiting the effects of his illness, he wrote the following after 40 pages of murmur and complaint: "I will not murmur nor complain." He proclaimed that he had "tried to do my best. I have committed no crimes, or disgraced my name or reputation, or taken a politic or underhanded policy, but have tried to leave a record I would not be ashamed to meet." Of course, Ellen White would evaluate the Butler record in a different manner.

Notice another of his proclamations: "I can tell you that in the meetings I have attended in various parts of the country the past season, I have labored most earnestly to strengthen faith in the Testimonies and your work." What an amazing contention after writing this lengthy letter and after his widely publicized concept of inspiration. No wonder Mrs White would observe to Butler that his work for the testimonies had made her realize that those who proclaimed themselves friends of the testimonies could well become its worst enemies. Butler, however, continued to proclaim loyalty to Ellen White and her testimonies: "They have not lost their interest to me nor is my faith in them

at all shaken," and then included this revealing observation, "Yet I think Sister White is human as well as the rest of us." While it was true that Mrs White was human, it was not like "the rest of us," for she was inspired in a way that Butler had yet to learn.

Mrs White was considerably surprised at the tone of the letter Butler sent her and read it to certain of the delegates at Minneapolis and she was just as surprised to observe the reactions of those delegates. They seemed unsurprised at Butler's contentions for "they had heard him state the same things" in the past. Mrs White also noticed the impact of such views on her ministry: her explanations to that small group "made no impression upon them," for they considered the light given her to be "as idle tales."¹⁷

It appears that Mrs White first responded in a written manner to the issues raised in Butler's letter when she wrote her daughter-in-law, Mary White, on October 9. She considered Butler's letter a "most curious production of accusations and charges against me." In her short letter to Mary, she almost inadvertently demolished Butler's Galatians premises:

Elders' Smith and Butler are very loathe to have anything said upon the law in Galatians, but I cannot see how it can be avoided. We must take the Bible as our standard and we must diligently search its pages for light and evidences of truth.¹⁸

Here was resolved the two basic problems concerning the Galatians question as it appeared to Butler and Smith: the Bible, not past Ellen White positions on the subject was the criterion of truth concerning Galatians and there was no guarantee that because strongly held theological positions were held in the past that they could not be erroneous.

Several days later, Mrs White communicated to Butler concerning his letter. While she was "surprised" at the tone, she had already perceived some of Butler's "feelings." In his "expressions" and relationships with others, Butler lacked "the love and respect that should exist between brethren. Again challenging his view of the presidency, she wrote:

If you think you can indulge in feelings of contempt for men whom God has been raising up to fill important places in his work for this time because you are the president of the General Conference, you do not understand your true position. . . . You must not think that the Lord has placed you in the position that you now occupy as the only men¹⁹ who are to decide as to whether any more light and truth shall come to God's people.²⁰

Mrs White had already made some evaluations of the "Minneapolis spirit" for after only four days of the Institute that preceded the Conference, she discerned that "the spirit and influence of the ministers generally who have come to this meeting is to discard light." Because many at the meeting considered that SDAs were secure in past interpretations of the Scripture, "The spirit that controls the attitude of a large number at this meeting evidences that they are led by another spirit." Again addressing the views of Butler on church leadership, Mrs White informed him that "false ideas of what belonged to your position in the work has turned your mind into wrong channels." And his view of inspiration was also erroneous: "The Lord did not move upon you by his Holy Spirit to write upon inspiration." Butler's position on that subject, warned Mrs White, "will lead many souls astray."²¹

Once the vital issue of inspiration was addressed, Mrs White went on to teach Butler once again how truths were to be decided. Not even considering that her writings were to be the standard, Mrs White referred Butler to a vision given her while she was still in Europe when her "Guide" revealed to her "the condition of the church at Battle Creek" and stated that "the church needed the 'energy of Christ' and that everyone "must cling close to the Bible for it alone can give a correct knowledge of God's will." Mrs White's Guide warned of the "Pharisaism" possessing the church and next:

He stretched out his arms toward Dr Waggoner and to you, Elder Butler, and said in substance as follows:--Neither have all the light upon the law, neither position is perfect.²²

Making certain that Butler understood her thrust, Mrs White again drew the lesson for him: "Let all search the Scriptures diligently for themselves, and

not be satisfied to have the leaders do it for them, else we shall be as a people in a position similar to that of the Jews in Christ's time." The assumptions that church leadership maintained a higher insight on the Scriptures was alien to Mrs White's understanding, but she already saw the fruitage of that assumption at Minneapolis:

The spirit which has prevailed at this meeting is not of Christ. There is not love, there is not sympathy or tender compassion one toward another. Stark suspicions have been suggested by Satan to cause dissension. . . . The Lord is willing to bestow great light upon those who open their hearts to its divine rays. Those who have marked out a certain course in which the light must come will fail to receive it. . . . Before the light of God's truth let human opinions and ideas and human wisdom appear as they are in the sight of God--as foolishness.²³

It was the view of inspiration that callously considered it the prerogatives of individuals to ascertain "inspired" from "noninspired" or lesser inspired views of the Scriptures and Ellen White that hindered her mission more than anything and Ellen White continued to address that issue after Minneapolis.

At the state meeting in Iowa shortly after Minneapolis, Mrs White told the assembled believers not to let "any living man come to you and begin to dissect God's word, telling what is revelation, what is inspiration and what is not, without a rebuke." Almost certainly referring to Butler, Mrs White expressed the dimensions of her concern over that issue:

There is no finite man that lives, I care not who he is or what ever is his position, that God has authorized to pick and choose in His Word. . . . What man is there that dares to take that Bible and say this part is inspired and that part is not inspired? I would have both my arms taken off at my shoulders before I would ever make the statement or set my judgment upon the Word of God as to what is inspired and what is not inspired. . . . Never let mortal man set in judgment upon the Word of God or pass sentence as to how much of this is inspired and how much is not inspired, and that this is more inspired than some other portions.²⁴

The following week, in her Sabbath sermon at Battle Creek, Mrs White raised that issue again when she told the believers "We must stand firm on the Scriptures. We are not to say that part is inspired and part is human." Ellen

White was explicitly challenging the position that Butler had taught in their own college. Minneapolis had clearly emphasized to Ellen White the necessity for individual study of the Scriptures and the Satanic methodology to hinder such study:

We must cling to our Bibles. If Satan can make you believe that there are things in the word of God that are not inspired, he will then be prepared to ensnare your soul. . . . We must know for ourselves that we have the truth of God. Therefore let no one entertain the question whether this or that portion of the word of God is inspired.²⁵

A few days later Mrs White again wrote to Butler concerning that view and how it was successfully nullifying her mission. In a devastating indictment of the results of Butler's views, she informed him that the work that God had given her to do "has not suffered and is not likely to suffer half as much from open opposers as from my apparent friends." She considered that both Butler and Smith, who "appear[ed] to be defenders of the Testimonies," were in reality the "assailants" of those writings because they "weaken[ed] them and make them of none effect." In case Butler had any doubt about the application of this letter to him, Mrs White answered the question: "You ask, do you mean this for me? I do, my brother. I am sorry to say it, but I do most decidedly."²⁶

Early the next year, Mrs White again expressed concern over the devastation to her ministry of the views of inspiration that swirled around the denomination. She had been constantly frustrated by those who considered she was led of God, but who also distinguished between direct visions and "this matter and that matter were Sister White's opinion and judgment." When they were unable to easily explain something from Mrs White and if her counsel seemed contrary to "preconceived opinions" they easily resolved the situation by "defining what is Sister White's human judgment, and what is the word of the Lord." That which was divine was what sustained "their cherished ideas." The result was devastating: "They make of none effect the counsel of God by their tradition." Nullification of Ellen White's ministry was occurring because of

the "wrong track" George Butler had guided the church upon and he would "never want to meet [the] harvest" of that position "in the day of God."²⁷

The actions of pioneers George Butler and Uriah Smith, who had been acquainted with the ministry of Ellen White for almost 40 years, caused her "such sadness and grief" that she could not describe it. She "felt [her] husband's death, O how keenly God alone knows," but experienced "the cruel course of these men toward the work of God He has given me to do more keenly than the death of [her] husband."²⁸ While Ellen White took her post-Minneapolis ministry very seriously, the seeds had been sown that would strongly inhibit that mission and it all sprang up because of the views toward inspiration and the Galatians question.

Galatians Interpretation and Ellen White's Role. While the theology of the Galatians controversy in its minutest subdivisions contained elements that might be considered remote and unimportant (especially as we look back and see the weak exegesis on both sides of the controversy), the issue as a whole was crucial to the contending positions. Galatians brought into question the strength of the entire traditional theological system since it involved the past strength of the Sabbath defense. And the pioneer defense of the Galatians position well illustrated the fervor with which that position was held. As the theological focus shifted from the law to the gospel, it was inevitable that the Galatians position would be examined and the pioneers were not slow to see that danger.

It served the pioneer position to bind Ellen White to their traditional position and that is precisely what Butler and others sought to do. In his amazing October, 1888, letter to her, Butler rehearsed the history of the Galatians controversy as far back at the 1850s and then came to his punch line: "The time came when your testimony was brought in," and that testimony, Butler affirmed supported the position that the law in Galatians referred primarily to

the ceremonial laws, not to the moral law. And, Butler pointed out in strengthening his position in his own eyes, it was not just Ellen White's "opinion" that resolved the issue, but it was the result of an explicit vision that Ellen White had received concerning the subject. Butler had heard from several with first-hand knowledge of that meeting in the 1850s and they all testified to that fact. And because of that vision, J H Waggoner's pamphlet that had supported the moral law position "was taken out of print." All of the past history of the SDA church demanded that Ellen White condemn the E J Waggoner theology concerning Galatians, according to Butler, for James White, Uriah Smith, the actions of the publishing houses since the 1850s, had all evidenced that they considered that Ellen White's testimony had settled the question.²⁹

If that didn't convince Ellen White, Butler quoted back to her her February 18, 1887, letter to Jones and Waggoner where she herself confirmed Butler's point: "I stated to Elder [J H Waggoner] that I had been shown his position in regard to the law was incorrect, and from the statements made to him he has been silent upon the subject for many years." Butler was interested in tying Ellen White to the traditional Galatians position as firmly as it was possible to tie her and we will see that Ellen White would be even stronger in resisting being so bound. Butler continued:

[Your] words I believe to be the exact truth, and if they do not show beyond all question that Eld Waggoner's position on the added law was incorrect and untrue, I should fail to know how human language could make a point clear.³⁰

As we analyze the dimensions of the Galatians argument that Butler sent to Ellen White on the eve of the 1888 GC, we can recognize how unlikely it would have been for a normal person to lend support to any position held by E J Waggoner under the circumstances. Indeed, Butler placed the issue in such a way that for Ellen White to do otherwise would bring her past ministry under very serious question. In fact, Butler is clearly hinting that even to discuss

the Galatians question at the forthcoming Institute would be to question Ellen White's role as a prophetess:

When you condemned in the testimony, as you did, Eld Waggoner's position on the added law, you unmistakably condemned the principle that the 10 commandments are the added law. There can be no escape from this conclusion. That this was settled then and there, and should have remained settled in quiet is too self-evident to me to need argument.³¹

According to Butler, "The opening up of this question as it has been on the Pacific Coast during the last four years is fraught with evil and only evil," and he predicted such dire results as "unsettling" of the minds of many, destruction of the concept of theological unity within the cause, "souls will be lost and give up the truth," and the door would be wide open "for other innovations to come in and break down our old positions of faith." The last thing Butler wanted on the eve of the Minneapolis General Conference session was for a theological "innovation" to enter Adventism. And then he gave Ellen White his punch line:

The way [the Galatians question] has been managed will tend to break the confidence of our people in the testimonies themselves. And this whole matter I believe will do more to break down confidence in your work than any thing which has occurred since this cause has had an existence, if this Pacific [Coast] movement on the Galatians question is sustained. Taking into view the fact that this question was settled and kept in quiet for so many years from the position that the testimony took on it, and now if our people come to think that the other side is supported it will break the faith of many of our leading workers in the testimonies. There is no other possible result but this that can come from it. Who then is responsible for the opening up of this question?³²

Butler's view concerning Mrs White's inspiration had successfully placed her in such a strait jacket that, if it prevailed, no theological innovation could prevail at Minneapolis without wrecking Ellen White's own ministry. No wonder Ellen White would consider that such ardent defenders of her ministry were in reality its worst enemies.

Mrs White well understood that Butler was not alone in his position and if she had any such doubts, Uriah Smith would later clarify them. He considered

the E J Waggoner opening up of the Galatians issue the "greatest calamity that ever befell our cause" with the sole exception of the death of James White. And notice why he considered it so:

I was surprised at the [Galatian] articles [by E J Waggoner], because they seemed to me then, and still seem to me, to contradict so directly what you wrote to J H Waggoner. . . . You saw that his position was wrong. And there was only the one issue then under examination: namely, whether the law in Galatians was the ten commandments as Bro Waggoner claimed, or was the Mosaic law system as Bro Pierce claimed. My recollection on that is quite distinct, and if I was on oath at a court of justice, I should be obliged to testify that to the best of my knowledge and belief, that was the only point then at issue; and on that you said that Bro Waggoner was wrong.³³

Despite the position of the pioneers, Mrs White advocated examining the Galatians issue at Minneapolis and did not feel that to do so at all threatened her past ministry. Such questions should be settled with the "Bible as our standard," and its pages should be searched "diligently" for truth.³⁴ Her position was doomed at Minneapolis, however, for before the conference began, Butler was convinced that Ellen White, either purposely or inadvertently, was party to a conspiracy from California to modify the so-called SDA position on Galatians. He had received a letter from California minister William Healey that outlined the conspiracy thesis and, from his sick bed, alerted delegates to be on guard to "preserve the landmarks."

Mrs White wrote to Healey that she considered he, along with others, had worked "as a traitor" in fomenting the opposition that arose at Minneapolis and that spirit nullified her mission: "Never in my life experience was I treated as at that conference," she wrote him. That, with the "work in the interpretation of the testimon[ies] and upon the inspiration of the Scriptures" engaged in by Butler, had its baleful impact upon Mrs White's influence at Minneapolis. "Will not the truth bear to be investigated," she asked, and informed the minister that neither Uriah Smith, nor George Butler were to be

considered the "guardians of the doctrines for Seventh-day Adventists." Indeed, "no man" was to be "authority for us."³⁵

Butler, Smith and many pioneers, had tied the Galatians issue to Adventism's historical heritage. At Minneapolis, Mrs White heard proclaimed, "If our views of Galatians are not correct, then we have not the third angel's message."³⁶ Indeed, the conflicting positions represented two contrasting views of the SDA church its proponents hoped for. Positions could not be changed without changing views of the nature of the inspiration of Ellen White and without changing the view of the importance of the law to salvation. Both Butler and E J Waggoner sensed that the Galatians controversy transcended the merely theoretical. Waggoner saw it relating to the gospel and its unity in both testaments while Butler saw its relationship to the traditional Sabbath defense and the blessings of unity within a cause that was never wrong on exegesis since Ellen White was there to resolve such issues. Minneapolis was not about Galatians, but the core of Adventism. It turns that both positions on Galatians had truth mixed with error, but the positions represented more than the theology. One thing for sure, however, if the varying positions were analyzed by the nature of their defense, the pioneer position was abundantly revealing and Ellen White made that point to the pioneers:

I say if your views on the law in Galatians, and the fruits, are of the character I have seen in Minneapolis and ever since up to this time, my prayer is that I may be as far from your understanding and interpretation of the Scriptures as it is possible for me to be. I am afraid of any application of Scripture that needs such a spirit and bears such fruit as you have manifested.³⁷

Ellen White herself transcended both positions on Galatians and pointed to the church she believed God was calling SDAs to embrace. While others were consumed with the theology of Galatians at Minneapolis, Ellen White heard "precious truths uttered" that she responded to with all her heart, for she heard at Minneapolis the glorious truths of justification by faith and "knew it was the message for this time."³⁸ But nullification of her ministry also meant

failure to perceive the new message and resulted in opposition to what Ellen White alone fully perceived to be "pure Bible truth."³⁹ Instead of a new focus upon the righteousness of Christ springing out of the Minneapolis session, the pioneers had their own interpretations of that session.

Nullifying the Prophet: Pioneer Interpretations of Minneapolis. By mid-1890, Ellen White felt very grieved and personally discouraged over the way the pioneers had influenced her attempts to make Adventism's new message central. She wrote of her dismay to the GC president, O A Olsen:

The way my testimonies have been treated by those who should have sustained me has made my most earnest labors with them and others whom they influenced, of none effect. Let them now substitute that which they suppose is the better and safer thing than the labors of Sr White. . . . Will those who have withstood my labors and made of none effect the light given of God for the people now take this responsibility and labor to bring in a better state of things? I am troubled deeply, but I have no light to attend any camp-meetings. I do not see what use it is for me to bear my testimony, and the ministers that hear it feel it is their privilege to receive or reject it as best pleased them.⁴⁰

Even at Minneapolis, Mrs White paid the price for her endorsement of the Waggoner focus upon justification. Because of the presuppositions of the pioneers, any support of Waggoner meant support of his Galatians positions and that in turn meant he, Jones and Willie White, had influenced Ellen White. How else could it be explained that she reversed what had earlier been shown to her in vision? At Minneapolis, "There was much talking, much suspicioning, criticising Sister White's testimonies," observed Ellen White. Word had been passed "from lip to lip" that "Sister White was influenced," and the result was inevitable, according to Mrs White: "'Of course, if this is the danger to be apprehended, we cannot depend upon her testimonies any more.'"⁴¹

As she "looked back" on Minneapolis, Ellen White considered even this question of her inspiration an indictment against Adventism's past, for the crisis revealed an already-present spirit merely waiting to reveal itself under testing. SDAs had "great light," but could have received light that

transcended everything in its past. SDAs had "the gift of prophecy," but those past ardent defenders of the "gift" in the past, nullified it at Minneapolis and called "light darkness and darkness light." Minneapolis provided the backdrop for the testing of Adventism, according to Ellen White:

The Lord was testing and proving His people who had had great light, whether they would walk in it or turn from it under temptation, for but few know what manner of spirit they are of until circumstances shall be of a character to test the spirit which prompts to action.⁴²

Ellen White's analysis of the testing contained another remarkable observation. It was not Ellen White who had changed, but a change had clearly taken place. And it was "evident" to Ellen White that the spirit that brought about that change "had been at work for years." The brethren were deluded and "had lost confidence in Sister White, not because Sister White had changed but because another spirit had taken possession and control of them." And for years the ministry had depended upon direction from the top down and now paid the price. The rationale was described by Ellen White: some delegates said, "'If this message that Brother Jones has been giving to the church is the truth, why is it that Brother Smith and Brother Butler have not received it."⁴³ The result was "to make of none effect the testimonies of the Spirit of God"⁴⁴ and to miss the opportunity for the message of justification by faith to become central to Adventism.

Pioneer explanations of Minneapolis reached Battle Creek before Ellen White did and the result was a colored version of the session that Mrs White considered was "unfavorable to Brethren A T Jones and E J Waggoner, W C White and myself, and the work I had been compelled to do at that meeting."⁴⁵ It was with sadness that the pioneers considered Ellen White's actions at Minneapolis and some of Ellen White's "best friends" informed Butler that her actions at Minneapolis "nearly broke the heart" of her "ministering brethren."⁴⁶ Everything conspired to hinder perception of the message of justification by

faith that Ellen White considered to be the key to the Minneapolis meeting. Nullification of her mission after Minneapolis was a vital element in that conspiracy.

Not only in Battle Creek was Ellen White's post-1888 mission suspect. The "leading ministers" of Iowa opposed her,⁴⁷ in fact, Ellen White at various times included the following prominent ministers who actively worked against her ministry: Matthew Larson, R C Porter, Dan Jones, Clement Eldridge, J H Morrison, L T Nicola, R A Underwood, William Gage, A R Henry, D H Lamson, J Fargo, M B and H W Miller, besides Smith and Butler. Undoubtedly, thorough research on the question would uncover many more specifically mentioned by Ellen White.

The results of the combined opposition not only hindered perception of the message of justification by faith, but also physically depleted and discouraged Ellen White. Opposition was so strong that Ellen White considered that "the messages of communication which the Lord has been giving his people the last 45 years" had been rendered "of none effect."⁴⁸ By mid-1890 she was discouraged to the extent that death seemed a welcome prospect. The dimensions of the issues surrounding Minneapolis were of surpassing importance and can be attested to, if for no other reasons, the recognition that the impact of those issues brought such intense reactions from both Ellen White and George Butler. Ellen White moaned that by mid-1890, although she had "a message to the people," yet she was "lying crushed, a cart beneath sheaves" and was judged because of her physical condition: "'It seems so strange that Sister White is laid upon a bed of suffering; why doesn't the Lord raise her to health?'" was the question Mrs White heard her attackers asking. "Well, if Sister White was really doing the work of the Lord He would have sustained her." Notice the depth of Mrs White's reaction and who she considers responsible for her illness:

Well, here I am sick in bed with malaria and rheumatism which first attacked the heart and has now spread over my entire body. I do not feel any burden of my own case. I am too thoroughly sick to try to get up my will power or to present my case to God in faith. I simply do not care. I long for rest. I have wrestled for the victory until I have fallen wounded and bruised and crippled, not by the weapons of the enemy, but those of my own brethren. . . . I have no burden of anxiety to recover. I am a suffering invalid. Just let me be.⁴⁹

Dan Jones, present at Minneapolis as president of the Missouri Conference and soon to replace Uriah Smith as General Conference secretary, well illustrates the "pioneer"⁵⁰ interpretation of Minneapolis. His letter of explanation to Willie White in 1890 illustrates how, between 1888 and 1890 (and indeed even thereafter), the secretary of the GC could work against the ministry of Ellen White. As noticed in chapter 1, Jones, despite the significant Ellen White statements that pointed to justification by faith as the essence of the 1888 focus, effectively nullified Ellen White's statements because of his view of her as a compromised prophetess. Jones "had made up [his] mind from the way things were working" that W C White, E J Waggoner and A T Jones "had formed a plan" to foment the new theology concerning Galatians upon SDAs and there were "using your mother to give influence and power to your work." And then the GC secretary inadvertently came to the central issue of 1888:

I thought the doctrine of justification by faith, with which I have agreed theoretically, and with which all our leading brethren have agreed, was only a rider, so to speak, to carry through these other things that were more subject to criticism; and by connecting the two together,--one with which no one found objection,--that rather than reject those that were unobjectionable, our people would be led to accept that which they could not fully endorse.⁵¹

The position of Dan Jones is amazing as an illustration of how Ellen White could be nullified. The callousness by which the Ellen White identifications of the 1888 message could be relegated to a "rider" status and treated as though all had always believed that doctrine, is truly amazing and it is obvious that Jones, despite his letter of confession to Willie White, still

does not perceive the difference on justification between pioneer Adventism and the focus of Jones and Waggoner.⁵² That which was the beginning of the loud cry to Ellen White was, at least until March of 1890, a "rider" to the GC secretary. And if Ellen White was considered a fully inspired prophetess, how could such differences in the understanding of justification not be noted? Jones clearly stated the background to the pioneer myopia: "I almost doubted the Testimonies, and gave but little weight to what your mother had to say."⁵³

Dan Jones was somewhat more revealing in his statement of the case to George Butler and far less willing to realize the dimensions of his course of action. Jones described to Butler the dimensions of the confrontation between the pioneer positions and those aligned with Jones and Waggoner that occurred at the 1890 Bible School for Ministers.⁵⁴ During the school, issues similar to those that surrounded Minneapolis resurfaced and explanations concerning Minneapolis were made that brought Jones to this observation:

We had been laboring under a misapprehension ever since the Minneapolis meeting; I had thought they came there with a plan all formulated to carry their views in the institute and with the delegates who attended the Conference, and that they had used Ellen White to assist them in this work and I had thought also that since the Minneapolis meeting they were striving to carry out the same plan through ministerial institutes and by having Waggoner and Jones attend workers' meetings, camp meetings, etc. But they say that such was not the case, and all I can do is to accept their statements as true, and change my views in reference to their motives and plans. It is a relief to know that we had misjudged them, and that their motives were not such as we had supposed.⁵⁵

Rather than recognize the effects of his misjudgment and its result upon the reception of the vital message of justification by faith, or upon the impact upon the ministry of Ellen White, Jones was able to shift that responsibility: "If this explanation could have been made 18 months ago, it might have saved a good deal of trouble and anxiety on the part of some."⁵⁶

The next year, Mrs White was "shown the inwardness of matters" at the General Conference office and considered that Dan Jones was the "great instigator" of plans that would allow "that office" to become "a controlling

power." She saw no way "for a reformation in the office" to occur "unless that ring is broken up." She had also "been shown" that the plan was to "disconnect their work from me, and they think they will then be untrameled to work in accordance to their own plans." Upon Mrs White's recommendation, Dan Jones was placed in charge of District No 6 on the West Coast, but Mrs White had also observed that the office group "think if Sister White was only out of the way they could do a wonderful thing" and that "they will try again."⁵⁷ Several months later, Mrs White left for Australia and Adventism in the United States paid a heavy price.

But before she left, Mrs White had given clear warning to GC president, O A Olsen. That warning concerned the results of the pioneer position, not only because of its negative influence, but also because of the removal of pioneer influence from the church, for the church needed "every jot and tittle of the experience" God had given to both Butler and Smith and the rest of the pioneers.⁵⁸ It was a dire warning concerning the future of the SDA church:⁵⁹

It has caused me great sadness of heart to see those who ought to be giving from the walls of Zion the trumpet a certain sound wholly in accordance with the work to be done for this time to prepare a people to stand in the day of the Lord, are in darkness, and have stood as sentinals to bar the way that the confusion they would create would bring confusion misunderstanding and Satan sees it is his time to make a strike and fanaticism and errors will prevail, and as the men who ought to have stood in the light--their voices heart on the right side of the question was exercised on the wrong side to oppose that which was of God and resist that message which the Lord sends, their position is seen to be wrong by very many and their crying danger fanaticism when there was no herisy and fanaticism when these evils really appear and they see the peril and try to avoid it they cannot do it. . . .

Satan fixed up the matter according to his own devices. Because the message of Sister White in testimonies given did not harmonize with their ideas, the testimonies were made of no account--except it vindicated their ideas. Persistently have they followed their own ways in this matter, that should reproof be given to the evils will have arrisen and will still arise, the ones reproved will say, Sister Whites' testimonies are no more reliable. Brn Smith, Butler and other leaders no longer have confidence in them. These men have sown the seed and the harvest will surely follow. Now the churches have a stumblock placed before their feet not easily removed. . . .

Thus the enemys work has done that which has made the work of God of but little account.⁶⁰

The path from Minneapolis led directly to a decade and a half of theological aberration. The church paid a disastrous price when it allowed Ellen White's ministry to be short-circuited. But, because Ellen White's mission to the church of the Minneapolis period had to a great extent become nullified did not mean she did not make strong efforts to advance the message of justification by faith. Even though the impact of that message may have been stifled to that generation, Ellen White's post-Minneapolis mission has intense value to us today and offers convincing evidence of the continuing relevance of Ellen White to the SDA church.⁶¹

Ellen White's Double-Edged Mission After Minneapolis. After Minneapolis, Ellen White considered it her mission to point out Adventism's past erroneous message and also to identify the new. She quickly summarized the dimensions of the failure of the past and contrasted that failure with the new perspective the church had the opportunity of receiving. She considered that "the understanding of the people of God has been blinded," and offered this alternative:

We have precious light to present before the people, and we rejoice that we have a message for this time which is present truth. The tidings that Christ is our righteousness has brought relief to many, many souls, and God says to His people, "Go forward."⁶²

The response of the believer was crucial and Ellen White lamented for those who "with Pharisaic pride" had "vaunted themselves," because "Christ cannot take up the names of those who are satisfied in their own self-sufficiency." Those who were satisfied with the past message that focused upon the righteousness of their obedience would be without the imputation of Christ's perfection for "He cannot importune in behalf of a people who feel no need of his help, who claim to know and possess everything." And Mrs White again described her own mission: "Has not the Lord Jesus sent message after message of rebuke, of warning, of entreaty to these self-satisfied ones? Have not his counsels been despised and rejected?"⁶³

It was near the conclusion of the session at Minneapolis when Ellen White informed the ministers of her next intentions. While others were floundering over all kinds of side issue, Ellen White recognized a vital message that had been lacking and was desperately needed by the church. She determined to become an evangelist of that new message. She told the assembled ministers of her intention to take the message to grass roots Adventists for "if the ministers will not receive the light, I want to give the people a chance."⁶⁴

It is impossible to overemphasize the seriousness that Ellen White felt as she pursued her post-1888 mission and it is impossible to overstress the dimensions of the issues facing the church, for the very rationale of its existence was at stake. At issue was the gospel message the church itself must accept in order to present that message to the world and the personal battle for Ellen White was so intense that she "felt every day" that she "might not be found alive in the morning."⁶⁵

To make room for the new message, the "Pharisaism" that had "leavened the camp" had to be uprooted and the Lord had given Ellen White a message that she, "with pen and voice" intended to proclaim until the "leaven" of the Pharisees "was expelled and a new leaven was introduced, which was the grace of Christ." Those who had bound themselves to their "legal religion" must "see the better things provided for them--Christ and His righteousness," affirmed Ellen White.⁶⁶ Her aim was to "uproot all this Pharisaism and let this self-righteousness be torn all to pieces,"⁶⁷ in order that the believer could behold the righteousness of Christ. Ellen White spoke like an evangelist when she compared the old with the new, and as an evangelist she saw the issues in an eschatological setting:

A false religion has come in among us, a legal religion. We will not keep silent. The church must be roused. We will secure halls in the cities and put out handbills and the people shall be enlightened. God has sent a message of warning. We must soon wrestle with the powers of the land, and we have every reason to in the name of the Lord to view this struggle in its true light. It is

a contest between the Christianity of the Old and New Testaments and the Christianity of human tradition and corrupt fables. This contest is to decide whether the pure gospel shall have the field in our nation. . . . We are years behind, and yet men in responsible positions will in their blindness keep the key of knowledge."⁶⁸

And Ellen White, alone in Adventism, saw the reconciling possibilities between the past message that centered on the law and the new message that centered on the gospel. She told the ministers at the 1890 Bible School of her travels throughout the campmeeting circuit after Minneapolis "where the message of the righteousness of Christ was preached." She was privileged to stand beside Jones and Waggoner to give her support for "the message for the time" as the trio "pointed men to the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." That focus upon the "righteousness of Christ" was "special light" that God had for His people during the past two years. Ellen White urged those ministers to combine the best of the past message with that new emphasis upon justification by faith: "We want the past message and the fresh message," she pleaded.⁶⁹

How the "New" Was Defined by Ellen White. Ellen White was perfectly consistent when she identified the essence of the new message sounding within Adventism. Mrs White's most usual expression concerning the new message, one that appears over a dozen times during this period, is "justification by faith and the righteousness of Christ." Another consistent definition was "justification by faith and the righteousness of Christ as a free gift" or "justification by faith and the imputed righteousness of Christ" and lastly, "justification by faith and the righteousness of Christ, which is abundantly imputed to all who hunger and thirst for it." While the expression may contain a redundancy from a strictly technical definition of justification, since the term "justification" by itself embraces the concept of the righteousness of Christ, her definition is highly significant. It seems to be a reaction to SDA history and its past misunderstanding of that doctrine.

Adventists taught that justification primarily related to forgiveness of sins "of the past," but considered that righteousness came through the will of the believer and his obedience. The converted Christian was provided the same opportunity as Adam prior to the fall, and his final reward would depend upon his righteousness. In putting together the expression "justification by faith and the imputed righteousness of Christ" Ellen White was stressing in the loudest possible terms the fallacy of the old message and focusing all her attention upon Christ's righteousness and not upon "our righteousness."

At the Rome, New York, campmeeting in June of 1889, Mrs White concisely made that point when she affirmed that SDAs, in the past, "have not been instructed as they should have been, that Christ is unto them both salvation and righteousness."⁷⁰ At that same campmeeting, Mrs White clearly identified the hope for the future of the church:

The present message--justification by faith--is a message from God. . . . The thought that the righteousness of Christ is imputed to us, not because of any merit on our part, but as a free gift from God, seemed a precious thought.⁷¹

NOTES

1. Ellen White to W A Colcord, March 10, 1890, C60-90.
2. Ellen White, "Distressing Experiences of 1888," Ms 21-88.
3. Ellen White, Sermon at Battle Creek Tabernacle, March 16, 1890, Ms 2-90. While it is difficult from the context of the statement to ascertain if Mrs White was referring to doubts in her early ministry or more recently, her experience with the ministry the month before and her sermon itself all dwelt upon the Minneapolis issue. It appears to this writer that for a short time, at least, the weight of the Minneapolis experience was an immense discouragement to Ellen White.
4. Ellen White to Colcord, March 10, 1890, C60-90.
5. Nov 3, 1884, GC Session Records, GCA.
6. G I Butler to Ellen White, Jan 27, 1885, GIB 1885 WE. See also Butler to Ellen White, Feb 18 and March 21, 1885, *ibid*.
7. W C White to Butler, April 2, 1885; WCW bk A, p 149, WE.
8. How tragic that we so often make such flippant conclusions based upon noncontextual analysis of her writings and sometimes apply those writings to issues that Ellen White never dreamed of.
9. In this setting, it seems relevant that Mrs White would become ill and recover just prior to the 1888 GC session at Minneapolis.
10. W C White to G I Butler, May 17, 1885; WCW bk A, pp 206-08 WE.
11. Ellen White, "Notes of Travel," RH, Sept 15, 1885.
12. *Ibid*.
13. G I Butler, "Inspiration," Nos 1-6, RH, Jan 8 to April 15, 1884.
14. Ellen White, "Unity and Love Among Believers," RH, Jan 18, 1887.
15. All quotations in this section are taken from George Butler to Ellen White, Oct 1, 1888, GIB 1888 WE, unless otherwise noted.
16. The "pamphlet war" will be considered in our next chapter.
17. Ellen White, "Looking Back at Minneapolis," Ms 24, 1888.
18. Ellen White to Mary White, Oct 9, 1888, W81-88.
19. Mrs White included Uriah Smith in the counsel she was sending Butler.
20. Ellen White to George Butler, Oct 14, 1888, B21-88.
21. *Ibid*.
22. *Ibid*.
23. *Ibid*.
24. Ellen White, Sermon at Des Moines, Iowa, Dec 1, 1888, Ms 13-88.
25. Ellen White, "David's Prayer," Sermon at Battle Creek, Dec 8, 1888, RH, Dec 18, 1888.
26. Ellen White to Brother and Sister Butler, Dec 11, 1888, B18-88.
27. Ellen White, "The Discernment of Truth," Jan, 1889, Ms 16-89.
28. Ellen White to Willie, Edson and Emma White, Dec 6, 1890, W109-90.
29. George Butler to Ellen White, Oct 1, 1888, GIB 1888 WE.
30. *Ibid*.
31. *Ibid*.
32. *Ibid*.
33. Uriah Smith to Ellen White, Feb 17, 1890, WCW bk I, emphasis supplied.
34. Ellen White to Mary White, Oct 9, 1888, W81-88.
35. Ellen White to William Healty, Dec 9, 1888, H7-88.
36. Ellen White, "Looking Back at Minneapolis," Ms 24-88.

37. Ellen White to Willie and Mary White, March 16, 1890, W83-90, quoting statement she made to assembled ministers at 1890 Bible School.
38. Ellen White, "Looking Back at Minneapolis," Ms 24-88.
39. Ellen White to O A Olsen, June 21, 1890, RG 11, GCA.
40. Ellen White to O A Olsen, June 21, 1890, RG 11, GCA.
41. Ellen White, "Light in God's Word," Feb, 1890, Ms 37-90.
42. Ellen White, "Looking Back at Minneapolis," Ms 24-88.
43. Ellen White to Madison and Howard Miller, July 23, 1889, M4-89.
44. Ibid.
45. Ellen White, "Experiences Following the Minneapolis Conference," c June, 1889, Ms 30-89.
46. Ellen White to Bro Fargo, May 2, 1889, F59-89.
47. J H Durland to O A Olsen, June 2, 1890, RG 11, 1890D.
48. Ellen White to O A Olsen, Oct 7, 1890, O20-90.
49. Ellen White to O A Olsen, May 8, 1890, O46-90.
50. Jones was a second-generation "pioneer," being 33 at the time of the 1888 session.
51. D T Jones to W C White, March 18, 1890, RG 21, bk 2, emphasis supplied.
52. And the likelihood of perceiving the difference between Jones and Waggoner and Ellen White was remote, indeed.
53. Ibid.
54. This will be considered in the next chapter.
55. Dan Jones to George Butler, March 27, 1890, RG 21, bk 3.
56. Ibid.
57. Ellen White to O A Olsen, March 20, 1891, handwritten, RG 11, GCA.
58. Ellen White to S N Haskell, June 1, 1894, H27-94.
59. The material here is unedited, except for punctuation, from Ellen White's handwritten copy.
60. Ellen White to O A Olsen, Aug 27, 1890, GCA.
61. Ellen White's post-Minneapolis mission is treated in more detail than the following in chapter 9 and appendix.
62. Ellen White, "Camp-Meeting at Ottawa, Kansas," RH, July 23, 1889.
63. Ibid.
64. Ellen White, Morning Talk at Minneapolis, Oct 24, 1888, Ms 9-88.
65. Ellen White, "Experiences Following the Minneapolis Conference," June, 1889, Ms 30-89.
66. Ibid, and "Ellen White, "Looking Back at Minneapolis, Ms 24-88.
67. Ellen White, "Preparation for Christ's Coming," May 14, 1889, Ms 4-89.
68. Ellen White, "Experiences Following the Minneapolis Conference," June, 1889, Ms 30-89.
69. Ellen White, "The Present Message," Morning Talk at Ministers' School, Feb 4, 1890, RH, March 18, 1890.
70. As we will see in chapter 9, A T Jones had made that precise point in his initial righteousness sermon at Ottawa, Kansas, the month previous when he stated that SDAs, in the past had understood John 3:16 as meaning free salvation, but that they had not perceived of righteousness as likewise being a gift.
71. Ellen White, Camp-Meeting at Rome, New York," RH, Sept 3, 1889.

Chapter 7

Theologies in Contention: Horns and Galatians

Dilemma of the Horns.¹ One of the issues that was to emerge in 1885 and assume an importance far beyond its inherent nature was the question of the names of the European kingdoms represented by the images in Daniel 2 and 7. As an outgrowth of general discussions at the 1884 GC, A T Jones was asked to prepare a documentary study illustrating prophetic fulfillment. As he pursued his study, Jones came to have serious doubts regarding the placing of the Huns in the list of the ten kingdoms as had Uriah Smith in Thoughts on Daniel and Revelation. Jones believed the historical account more accurately demanded that the Alemanni be listed and, in 1885, began correspondence with Smith concerning that issue. Jones considered the question a major one since his view of the final events setting demanded that SDAs be able to adequately defend "every single point of our position," before all comers.²

In an initially favorable response Smith wrote Jones that he was "glad that the time has come when someone is found who has opportunity to undertake a more full historical examination of the ten kingdoms, and I am glad you have entered upon the work." J N Andrews, according to Smith, had long intended to study the kingdoms issue and he himself admitted that "the matter of the ten kingdoms is the least fortified of any of our views." Smith himself considered the task difficult, however. To Uriah, the question of proving the historical veracity of the ten kingdoms was equivalent to locating all the pieces of a building after it had been struck "by a hundred pounds of dynamite."³

By 1886 correspondence between Smith and Jones on this issue had considerably warmed for in late 1885, Jones published four articles on the ten kingdoms in which he replaced the Huns with the Alemanni as one of the kingdoms. When Alonzo sent the entire series to Smith and asked for his opinion on the conclusion, Smith fired back that "it is a little late to enter

into an examination of said conclusions by private correspondence, after you have given them to the public through the Signs." Smith informed him that since Jones had "scattered" his conclusions broadcast, that he would take up the subject in the Review. Smith saw no reason for "bringing in the Alemanni," and if the Huns were out then SDAs were "ten per cent short on the fulfillment of Daniel 2 and 7."⁴

Uriah also decried the effect upon the Adventist ministry, "if our preachers, after presenting the ten kingdoms as they have for the past forty years, should now change upon a point which has been considered so well established, that it has never excited a dissenting voice, nor called forth a challenge from any one." If SDAs were now backtracking on one of their clearest points, enemies could taunt, "If we give you time enough, you will probably come to acknowledge finally, that you are mistaken on everything." This unsettling situation, Smith informed Jones, is why Jones was indiscrete in publishing his position in the Signs "before [it] had been examined by a larger number of brethren." He considered it a departure from policy in such matters and "contrary to the repeated counsel of Sister White." While Smith deplored the forthcoming appearance of "antagonism between the two papers," he clearly placed such blame upon Jones, who, in his opinion, had instigated the controversy.⁵

Jones informed Smith that he was "somewhat surprised at the contents" of Smith's letter "and more so when it is compared with the letter" Smith had written him in May of 1885. Jones noted that he would have been quite pleased to submit his position for examination to the brethren, but since he had been unable to gain any examination from the authority in that area [Smith], it seemed unlikely that others would examine or refute the evidence. Jones also reminded Smith of his likening the issue to the fragmentation caused by dynamite and again "felt quite certain that if the subject appeared that way to

you," there was not much likelihood of enlightenment from other sources. While Jones noted that Smith had declined to probe the issue for lack of time, the fact that Uriah now intended to publish and contradict Jones' views through the Review, indicates that, at least at this point, Smith was willing to take the time. Jones affirmed that if Smith had clear evidence to present, which he had asked for earlier, it would have taken "a great deal less time to convey it to me in the beginning," and thus prevented the issue from developing.⁶

Jones suggested that it would be more valid for those receiving ministerial credentials to earn them on the basis of what they had studied for themselves rather than upon past SDA positions. He boldly inquired whether Smith himself could cite reputable histories "where the establishment of the ten kingdoms is shown." Jones also reminded Smith that Smith's later certainty concerning the ten kingdoms conflicted with his earlier statement that it "was the least fortified of any of our views." Jones considered that Smith should be pleased that an uncertain position had been challenged. Jones also affirmed that because a position had not been challenged in the past was no reason for assuming that it was beyond challenge. Adventists had been treated with scorn in the past and its views hardly noticed, but in its eschatological limelight, "our views are going to be noticed by the high in the land." Jones then expounded on why the kingdoms issue was a major issue to him:

Every point is going to be analyzed and challenged by the scholarship and dignity of judges, statesmen, and the greatest in the land, as well as by the hypocrisy of religious bigots and the trickery of politicians. Then it will be that our views will have to be examined by men who are acquainted with all the avenues of history, and will have to pass the challenges that all these men can put upon the truth in opposition to it. And therefore when we are called to answer for our faith and for the reason of our faith, and, to establish the truth of our own nation's place in the prophecy, and the place of our message, shall have to trace down the lines of prophecy, and history as Paul and Stephen in their day did the line of God's dealings with the people; when we shall have to run down these lines through the history to show that we are right in our statement of the Third Angel's Message, we shall then to these men have to present some better reason for our faith than that "it has been preached for forty years," or that Bishop Chandler said so.

Such reasons as this will be insufficient at such times, but we shall have to present the evidences in the history, and give the references, to these men so that the histories which they know, which are acknowledged as authority everywhere, can be cited to the chapter and paragraph so that these men in their decisions may be guided by such evidence. Because when we shall have to stand before courts and before our rulers to answer for our faith, as Paul and Stephen did, it will not be simply to defend ourselves but if possible, by the help of God, to teach them and convince them as Agrippa was convinced, and if possible not only almost but altogether persuade them to keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus, and to wait for Him from heaven. This is that through which we shall have to pass yet, and such are the evidences which we shall have to present then, and now we have need to be getting this evidence so well in hand that when the time does come, to answer, we shall be able to give every man a reason indeed for the hope that is in us, and not simply pass along by saying that "it has been preached for 40 years."⁷

We can see already developing on both sides an assumption that Adventism's last generation must be technically correct in every remote phase of its teaching and that reputable historical as well as Biblical sources must be readily at hand to use as evidence. Neither Jones nor Smith, in the remotest manner, tied the ten kingdoms issue to a focus upon Christ. In contrast, Ellen White sought to unify the church upon the central testing truth that was then sounding, justification by faith.

Jones continued to magnify the issue to gigantic proportions by pointing to a soon-coming alliance between the National Reform party, Catholicism and the United States government and when that occurred, he affirmed, "we shall have to show what the ten kingdoms were," and it would have to be done by using historical sources and making those sources available "to all our people" so they could tell others where to find them. "It is for this cause that I have endeavored to bring out these things in the Signs," affirmed Jones. If Smith's Review articles were convincing, Jones said he would not hesitate to accept them. If Jones was wrong he would change immediately: "It only shows that I have learned something that I did not know before." Jones then, rather uncharitably, pointed out to Smith certain historical inaccuracies in Smith's book Thoughts on Daniel and Revelation.⁸

When Smith shot back that Jones had his mind made up and had no intention of changing and had been "ransacking" history books to prove his position, Jones offered to print Smith's evidence in the Signs, if he had "any reliable authority" to show the permanency of the Huns. Even if the Huns remained, affirmed Jones, what would Smith do with the newer evidence that gave different dates from that used by Smith. If Smith changed the dates, would he not be attacked by his own reasoning: "Oh, you found you were mistaken did you." Jones strongly reacted to Smith's suggestion that Jones really wasn't looking for evidence, but had his mind made up. Even though Jones was a "stranger" to Smith, "there ought to have been enough charity with you to allow that I was telling the truth." When Smith accused Jones of prejudice against Smith's book, Jones again hit back: "I can only say that it is not a pleasant thing to be told by the receiver of my letters that he thinks that I feel and mean the opposite of what I have said." In closing, Jones promised Smith that "the first chance I get I am coming to Battle Creek, and sit down and have a good long talk with you."⁹

The four Jones articles, published during September and October of 1885 were presented in a fully noncontroversial manner and dealt exclusively with historical sources. The four Smith articles, published January 4 to 25, 1887, was quite another matter. While the average informed Adventist could have been nothing but bored in reading about the Alemanni, Franks, Burgundians, Vandals, Suevi, Visigoths, Saxons, Ostrogoths, Lombards, Heruli and Huns, Smith let his readers know that the very foundations of Adventism were being challenged. The "unanimous view" held by the pioneers of the "great Advent movement" since 1844 was now being challenged. "Is it now to be shown that a view developed under these circumstances and cherished all these years, has all the while been erroneous?" asked Smith. In case anyone doubted his position, Smith told them: "We object most decidedly to the proposed innovation." He believed that "the

old prophetic waymark of now nearly or quite half a century's standing, is the one still to be entertained." After quoting Jones (without specifically naming him), Smith accused the writer of using evidence "directly calculated to mislead."¹⁰

After Smith completed his series, Alonzo wrote him a 16-page letter of response. He first told him that the Review editor had not published one fact that Jones himself had not covered in the Signs articles. Smith had not dealt with the central point made by Jones that since the prophecy showed all ten horns in existence prior to the development of the little horn, the Huns could not possibly be within the group since their power had been broken earlier. Since the Heruli, the first of the three horns "plucked up" by the little horn, lost power in 493 AD, all kingdoms had to be in control by that date. Things boded ill for the future when Jones told Smith, "I think this subject is entirely worthy of more consideration" than Smith had given it and concluded, "the Alemanni belongs in the list in place of the Huns. All the facts confirm this view, and I believe it to be correct."¹¹

W C White and the Horns. The horns issue warmed considerably in 1887 and W C White came to find himself in the middle of it. While the Whites were still in Europe in early 1887, A T Jones sent to them the copies of the correspondence he had with Smith along with his articles on the subject. After reading the articles "carefully" Willie White believed that Jones "had a clear case against the Huns," but had difficulty seeing the matter in such a serious a light at Butler and Smith saw the issue. Indeed, after reading the Jones-Smith correspondence, he wrote Jones that he had "argued the case [so] well," that he could "hardly see how they can avoid" Jones' conclusions. White intended to try to convince Butler that "no great harm has been done" and decided to work earnestly to prevent "another deadlock like the law in Galatians" developing from the horns issue.¹²

The issue remained, however, and Willie White continued to be caught in the middle. Many SDA leaders in Europe had raised serious questions about some of the Smith interpretations and the issue came to the forefront when Daniel and Revelation was due to be translated into German. After the Whites had returned to the United States, J H Waggoner, then serving in Europe and on the committee to translate Smith's standard volume, wrote, on behalf of the committee, a powerful analysis to the 1887 GC session. The European Committee had received input from A T Jones, had consulted major historians and libraries of Europe and concluded that Smith's exposition of the horns would not stand close scrutiny.¹³

J H Waggoner mentioned that the European Committee regretted the strong tone of affirmation over certain disputed points and hoped that "if there cannot be uniformity of faith obtained in regard to them" that more moderate statements should be used. Clearly addressing the Smith-Butler tendency toward "debating" tactics, Waggoner emphasized that "there should certainly be no sharp opposition or appearance of contention" and that it was "no detriment to any one to confess that he does not understand everything in the Bible." He then became explicit in mentioning the issue of the ten kingdoms, noting that the European scholar Gaussen had recently published a three-volume study of Daniel and "devoted one entire chapter" in proving that the "Huns were not one of those horns." Waggoner's point was that it was pure folly "to take a decided position" to the contrary without overwhelming evidence, "or else give his opinion in such a manner that it will not injure the reputation of his general views if this particular point be not accepted." Rounding out the recommendations of the European Committee, Waggoner opposed Smith's use of trains, trolleys, boats and blimps to illustrate that in the last days "knowledge" would be increased. Smith's entire focus upon "material progress" effectively "overshadow[ed]" the true scriptural meaning of Dan 12:4.¹⁴

Leaving the official aspect of his letter, Waggoner then went on to address several important "general principles" that he personally considered relevant. Waggoner objected to the manner in which denominational theology had developed where certain leading thinkers on denoninational theology published their interpretations and those views then became standard. Waggoner suggested a policy that eventually resulted in the formation of the SDA Book Committee at the 1887 GC session:

There are many points which I think ought to be examined and passed upon by a large and competent committee, who can devote time to their careful and thorough examination, before they are further sent forth as the views of the denomination. Many, as myself, do not wish to express opinions differing from those published, yet we cannot understand why we should be bound to teach the opinions of others, when we cannot endorse them as truth, without our being consulted in the matter. I have long believed it to be a serious error which was growing up among us, that an individual, or even a publishing house should send forth their views and hold the denomination bound to that view because it chanced to be published by them. The result has been and must be unhealthy to the cause.¹⁵

Waggoner's statement presents an enlightening picture of how many of the so-called "doctrines" that the pioneers considered so vital, were actually formulated:

Expositions of Scriptures cannot rest on authority. They can be settled only by calm investigation, and just reasoning, and then all must have an equal right to express their opinions. For years past I have been grieved to see the view obtaining that certain opinions must be received as the faith of the church, and that if any dissent they shall be considered rebellious to the cause. This course may secure peace for a season, and an apparent co-inciding with the authorized view, but it will prove a deceitful peace, and many will be weak in the faith, ready to be overthrown when the faith is assailed.¹⁶

Clearly referring to the fallout from the Canright defection, Waggoner applied some of its lessons. The SDA membership had come to depend upon strong "assurances of somebody held as authority" and thus were not themselves "well grounded in the faith." SDAs had not held to the injunctions from Ellen White that "the Scriptures are our safeguard." Thus, when those who "assumed to be expositors of the faith, who demanded that their strong assertions would be

received without questioning" left the church or accepted erroneous beliefs, the membership willy-nilly followed them.¹⁷ Both Ellen White and Willie White would seek to implement some of the suggestions of J H Waggoner at the 1888 GC session.

Willie White agreed with much of what J H Waggoner had written. Several months earlier he had written to the business manager of the Review his opposition to the position many placed upon the premises found in Thoughts on Daniel and Revelation: "I see that some of our brethren and ministers in different parts, place equal importance to the quotations of Scripture, and to Eld Smith's comments."¹⁸

White, however, tried to sooth the "considerable annoyance" that Waggoner's letter brought to Uriah Smith. White wrote Smith that it was unfortunate that Waggoner combined "in one letter of criticism a general statement of the difficulties of translation, a criticism of Daniel and Revelation, and a letter of exhortation on the question of clinging too firmly to old opinions, and being somewhat indifferent of studying for new light on Scripture doctrines." Smith, White said, should not apply all of this to himself, for Waggoner had a number of varying episodes in mind, and was not merely referring to Smith's works. White could understand Smith's annoyance over the letter for "one who does not know as well as I do" all the circumstances "might very naturally conclude that his whole letter" referred to Smith, which Willie White was "sure" was not the case.¹⁹

We can see that as the Minneapolis session was approaching Adventism had some exciting possibilities in front of it. The church was expanding to such an extent that competent translators were coming to the forefront, new concepts of Bible study were before it, new theological insights were emerging and plans were developing to make church members more self-reliant in their approach to the Scriptures. White was "very thankful," he wrote Smith, that the church was

coming to the position "where we are not dependent entirely on the opinion of one person as to what is proper and correct translation."²⁰ Hopefully, the church would also reach that same point in Biblical interpretation.

Willie White had fears that such would not be the case, however. If Smith and other pioneers "refuses to revise any faulty point, because the position has been 'accepted for 30 years' and evidence is allowed to accumulate" that the position was faulty, "someone will be driven to dissent, and when two rivals are in the field, it will be bad for both, and for the cause."²¹ As we shall see, a more accurate prediction of what occurred at Minneapolis could not have been made and Uriah Smith, at Minneapolis, would use the very reasoning that W C White feared would prevail. In the letter previously quoted, White made a marginal statement that exhibits why Minneapolis was a time of opportunity for Adventism:

Seventh-day Adventists claim to be different from all other denominations in this: That they are willing to receive new light. Is this so? or is it now time to settle down on "accepted positions."²²

Recognizing that the horns controversy had crossed the Atlantic Ocean, Willie White looked to European SDAs for a solution. Because it seemed "impossible" for White to "secure an examination of Daniel and Revelation" at the 1887 GC session since "the conference had no time to entangle itself with the heads and the horns" White hoped "that you who are in Europe should study the matter thoroughly, and take your position, and it is quite likely that this will settle the matter for us here" because of the "deadlock on that question" in the United States.²³

White continued to press for help from the Europeans in "straightening out of the heads and the horns" and thought that such denominational scholars as Conradi, Kunz, Frey, Vuillemier and J H Waggoner were in a better position to study that matter than was Uriah Smith. One thing seemed clear to White; it seemed "quite evident" to him that "the Huns will have to give place to the

Allemani."²⁴ Even within the United States, White believed that "those who are studying the matter" were accepting the Jones position and were also beginning to accept another premise: "The idea is gaining ground that while it is important to be united in our positions," it was even more important "to be correct."²⁵

In late June and early July of 1888, W C White, A T Jones, E J Waggoner, C H Jones (manager of the Pacific Press), and "as many of the California ministers" that could be convinced, went into the "California mountains" for a retreat to spend a "few days in Bible study." It was this action that convinced Butler and Smith and many others of a "California conspiracy" to change SDA doctrines at Minneapolis. Two days were spent at that meeting, in studying the horns question and White became even more convinced that A T Jones "had more historical evidence for his position than Elder Smith."²⁶

After that meeting, White wrote to Butler concerning their previous consultation regarding an institute to precede the 1888 GC. And White clearly attributed to Butler the momentous decision to discuss the horns and Galatians issues at Minneapolis. In the absence of Butler's letters to White, much can be surmised from this statement of Willie White:

I cannot believe that the time of such an institute should be given up wholly to the study of doctrinal subjects, but I can see no objection to having one or two hours a day devoted to the study of such subjects as you mention, and others that may be equally important. . . . I note with much interest what you say about the presentation of new expositions of prophecy, and the little prospect there is of our brethren "seeing eye to eye."²⁷

White used the occasion of Butler's letter to present some of the general principles that he hoped would prevail at the proposed institute. It seemed to W C White that "such an institute as we propose" that would be conducted "in a kind, brotherly, and impartial manner" would be the very means of establishing the unity that Butler considered broken because varying positions on the horns were held. White continued:

For our brethren who hold different views to sit down together in a kind and Christian spirit and patiently hear each other present their views, would, I believe, by the blessing of God result in a more intelligent and permanent unity than any other plan. We cannot prevent either our brethren or our opponents from giving a most searching examination and criticism to those points of faith which "have been accepted;" and if our accepted expositions are not sufficiently clear to stand the most severe criticism, ought we not to put forth our best efforts to strengthen them?²⁸

W C White next effectively, and powerfully, analyzed the path pursued by the pioneer system that would explode at Minneapolis:

If we should use our influence to discourage criticism and investigation, and refer all investigators to certain books as standard authority, would we not be taking a position somewhat similar to those who settle their controversies by reference to a creed which their church has adopted?²⁹

White believed that the ministry was capable enough to "choose the right position on any question in which both sides are fairly and kindly presented" and looked for an increased role for the church membership as a whole. He proposed that at the forthcoming institute that "instruction may be given with reference to the duties of church officers," to enhance that local responsibility.³⁰

In his announcement of the forthcoming institute, W C White listed the topics of study to be "the duties of church officers, the education of home and foreign laborers, the Sunday movement, the third angel's message, and an examination of several prophetic expositions and Bible doctrines" and suggested that "Scripture study and the duties of church officers" would be the major priority. He considered that the forthcoming institute and session would be "more interesting, more laborious, and, we trust, more profitable, than any that has preceded it."³¹

Horns Debate at Minneapolis.³² Minneapolis became the spark that ignited the past four years of animosity over the horns of the prophecy of Daniel. Uriah Smith set the tone for the institute after A T Jones had made five presentations on the question of the horns. On Monday, October 15, Smith

exploded. He considered it "utterly unnecessary" to even be discussing the issue and such discussion "tended" toward "evil." Smith objected to his being forced on the "defensive" on the question and suggested that historical Adventism had exhonored the past position for over 40 years. Why not test the "new view" as long. Indeed, Smith affirmed, "if we have diversity of testimony, why change." The new track was not a reform, but instead was "tearing up" of the old and Smith did not intend to "sit calmly by and see" Adventism's "foundation stone[s] taken out with ruthless hands." Already alluding to his and Butler's "conspiracy" theory, Smith saw himself "laboring at a disadvantage" since he "did not know" the horns question would be discussed. Others clearly did, for they "brought in libraries" with them, Smith caustically noted.³³

Jones responded to Smith the next day and recited the history of the horns controversy beginning with his assignment from the 1884 GC session and his correspondence with Smith. In his analysis, Jones responded to two of the Smith thrusts concerning "why we came prepared with libraries" and the accusation that he was tearing up "established positions" with "ruthless hands."³⁴

The horns debate carried over into the session itself which began October 17 and that debate was not lost to the newspaper reporters that attended the session. Both the Minneapolis Journal and Tribune featured the horns debate in major headlines. The Journal headed its story, "A Question of Ten Horns" with "The Adventist Conference Tackles a Knotty Point" as a subhead, while the Tribune heading was "Talk of a Prophecy" with "Daniel's Story of the Beast With Ten Horns Causes a Debate" as a subhead. Both newspapers reported items concerning the initial day of the conference that were of surpassing interest.

The conference proper began its work at 9:30 am, Wednesday, October 17, and after one hour of organizing procedures, Uriah Smith made his second

presentation on the horns. He spoke about an hour and then opened the floor for questions during which time a "spirited discussion" occurred.³⁵ G B Starr, secretary of the Illinois Conference, proposed that the Conference take a vote on the issue for he wanted "to put an everlasting settler on this question so it would not come up for argument again." His proposal was accompanied with cries of "amen," "amen." E J Waggoner opposed such a quick vote on the question and urged that it be "thoroughly investigated" before such a settlement. His proposal "created considerable stir" since many of the ministry "wanted to know what they were to preach in the meantime."³⁶

Willie White then expressed his view of the matter by affirming that "he should feel compelled to preach what he believed, whatever way the conference decided the question." Newspaper accounts also noticed another aspect of White's position, for he added: "If I should disagree with my brethren who have studied the question more than me, I'd touch just as light as I could on my view and try to bridge it clean over to theirs." White, too, received "amens" for his proposal and the motion he proposed prevailed over that of G B Starr. According to the Journal, White's motion urged "that certain questions be made topics for consideration by congregations and not settled and decided for them beforehand by the General Conference."³⁷

W C White was very disturbed by Smith's version of the horns debate that Smith reported in the Review. On October 23, Smith noted that the "principal question" thus far discussed at the conference was the "ten horns of the fourth beast of Daniel 7." Here is Smith's version of the debate:

The claim is set up, as our readers are aware, that the enumeration usually given of those kingdoms should be changed, and the Alemanni be put in place of the Huns as one of the ten. This position was advocated at great length, and as much was said on the other side as the limited state of preparation would allow. In view of all that was said on both sides, the sentiment of the delegates appeared, from unmistakable indications, to be overwhelmingly on the side of established principles of interpretation, and the old view. Whether or not this will make any difference with those who are urging the new position, remains to be seen.³⁸

Willie White's understanding differed considerably for he expected SDA views on that issue to change "quite materially" since "it was voted at the close of the discussion at Minneapolis that all should study the question faithfully during the year." That vote "was not reported in the Review, but a report was made which conveyed quite a different impression." White told J H Waggoner of his opinion of Smith's interpretation of the episode at the conference:

I told our people in the presence of Eld Smith that while it was right to demand of the editors of the Signs that they be cautious, that it was also demanded of the editors of the Review that they be honest, and I showed them how this report was calculated to mislead the people.³⁹

While the horns episode was more of a diversion, except for its revelation of the spirit under which the pioneer system was operating, the Galatians issue is far more revealing about the theological premises under which the principal antagonists operated.

Battle of the Pamphlets. While two days were used by the California ministers to discuss the horns question in their pre-Minneapolis meeting, they spend another day considering a manuscript written by E J Waggoner that was designed to respond to Butler's pamphlet on Galatians. It is perhaps useful at this point to attempt to ascertain the essential issues raised by Butler in his pamphlet that was circulated to the 1886 GC session delegates, and also to examine Waggoner's presentations to those "knots of delegates" that went to listen to him in 1886.

In his initial half-dozen pages, Butler rehearsed the history of the Galatians controversy within the denomination. The issue had existed "since the rise of the message," and at times been discussed "with more or less warmth." Because of that past history, it had been not recently been publicly discussed "so that bitterness of feeling between brethren" had thus "been

avoided." Butler then gave his view of what it meant to be a "leading brother," and in a sense touched on the organizational dilemma.⁴⁰

He clearly considered that the "leading brother" role meant arbiter on points of theological conflict. He quickly referred to the time when "some of our leading brethren, to whom our people have ever looked as safe counsellors in questions of perplexity, gave up the view that the moral law was mainly under discussion, and took the position that it was the ceremonial law." Because James White and Uriah Smith, the "safe counsellors" referred to by Butler, had changed to the ceremonial law interpretation, "many others who have come later to act a part in the work, have accepted the latter view with strong confidence." Butler went on to decry the breaking of the truce of silence by the Bible teaching at Healdsburg, Sabbath School articles in the Instructor, and the articles in the Signs. Even though the GC president considered himself overwhelmingly in the majority position on the Galatians issue, he had declined to publicly discuss the law in Galatians out of deference to the minority position. Butler observed that the "question has lain quite dormant" for "half a score of years past." Thus, one cannot help observing, the SDA church was stymied for at least a decade from pursuing the route to justification by faith pursued by the Protestant reformers. This was because Butler's premise prevailed during that time.⁴¹

After berating the publication of Waggoner's position in the Signs, because it would "tend to make this difference far more prominent," not only to SDAs, but to those "outside of our ranks," Butler presented his thesis. He believed strongly "that the law principally considered in Galatians" was "the typical remedial system," and hence considered it "not only proper but a duty to bring the subject before the General Conference of our people," since that was "the only tribunal in our body where such controverted questions can be properly considered and passed upon."⁴² It will be recalled that it was Butler

himself who opposed bringing the issue before the entire session, and had wanted it resolved by the nine-member Theological Committee, that he himself could well have appointed.

Butler considered that the issue could not be treated as an insignificant one because the interpretation that Paul was primarily referring to the moral law in Galatians was "used by our opponents as a strong support to their antinomian doctrines." To Butler the Galatians controversy did not center upon the question of justification by faith. The difficulty faced by the church in Galatia "was the opposition of Judaizing teachers and disciples who still taught the obligation of the ceremonial law, and of circumcision and those laws connected with it which served to separate between Jews and Gentiles." Butler's treatment of the Jewish laws, ordinances, rites and services as "a wall of separation, which has made them a distinct people" and his consideration that it was God's effort "to maintain a pure people" by means of the rite of circumcision makes it apparent that he believed those acts had merit in creating a people of virtue.⁴³

Since Butler considered that there was saving merit attached to obedience to the ceremonial law in Old Testament times, he virtually argued for two plans of salvation and when that ceremonial system ended the "special privileges" of the Jews, "they all [i.e., Jews and Gentiles] stood now upon the same level in the sight of God. All must approach him through the Messiah who had come into the world; through him alone man could be saved." This concept of saving merit attached to obedience of the typical law obviously impacted upon Butler's view of the results of obedience to the moral law and thus of justification. Notice this analysis:

The apostle [Paul] proceeds in a most lucid and powerful argument to show the agency of the moral law in the plan of salvation in all its various relations to the sinner; the necessity of faith in Christ in order that the law-breaker may be justified [i.e., interpreted to mean forgiven for past sins]; its [i.e., the law's] agency in the death of the old carnal man; and its necessity as a

standard of right-doing which the repentant sinner alone can reach by the assistance of Christ through the Holy Spirit.⁴⁴

In analyzing Galatians 3:19, Butler challenged the interpretations of Waggoner concerning the "added law" and "seed" issues and in Galatians 3:23 challenged his interpretation of "under the law." Although analysis of these varying positions is unnecessary here, it should be noted that today virtually no SDA theologian would accept either the Butler or Waggoner positions in toto on these subjects and would undoubtedly reject both interpretations of "under the law."

While Butler spoke disparagingly of both Jones and Waggoner throughout his study, using such terms as "our friends," "our good brethren," in a patronizing sense, his thrusts sharpened as he neared the conclusion of his pamphlet. He hinted that the Signs position could be construed by the antinomians to give them "aid and comfort," and that "our friends, we suppose, are still under the old covenant of bondage, represented by Hagar." Butler affirmed that he would "pity them greatly if their own theory was true," but he "hope[d] to save them in spite of their theories." While not explicitly stating that the moral law position constituted "blasphemy," he used that term in such a way as to come quite close to attributing it to "our friends."⁴⁵

As he neared the conclusion of his study, Butler again displayed his understanding of justification as he looked at Galatians 5:4 ["Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace"]. While, as might be expected from his past analysis, Butler considered that Paul was here speaking of the ceremonial law, his treatment clearly reveals that Butler considered obedience to the moral law as meritorious in the salvation process. While he affirmed that "no man can be saved by his good works alone," since the sinner required forgiveness for past sins, Christ provided sufficient power to "meet God's favor in the line of good works." If, however, one is tied to the ceremonial law to achieve sufficient

righteousness, as were the Galatians according to Butler, then they were "fallen from grace." "It is evident," he affirmed, "that for forgiveness and justification for their transgressions of the moral law, many of the Jews had always looked to the works required by the typical law. It was for this purpose that it was added, because of transgression."⁴⁶

Butler seems here to be stating that when the ceremonial law was in effect, obedience to its provisions was the route to justification or forgiveness for past sins [as justification was defined by SDAs]. Paul, in Galatians 5:4 was exposing the "utter worthlessness" of the system of obtaining forgiveness through obedience to the ceremonial provisions, according to Butler. Butler believed, and hoped to convince "our friends if possible who hold the opposite view," that the question of the proper understanding the role of the ceremonial law "in its effects upon the progress of Christianity and the presentation of gospel truth, was equal in the apostle's mind to even the much-vaunted doctrine of justification by faith." Butler concluded by asking "our leading brethren" to consider his "consistent, harmonious argument" and he left "the result with them and God."⁴⁷

Waggoner's response was only 14 pages less than Butler's 85-page pamphlet and, although it was completed by February 10, 1887, was not circulated until the 1888 GC session. Waggoner wanted to prevent the appearance of acting "precipitately in the matter, and desire[d] to counsel with others of larger experience." He described his motivation for involvement in the question, not as challenging past SDA positions either on justification by faith or upon the law in Galatians, but rather to show that some of the objections to the law often quoted by antinomians "are really the strongest arguments for the perpetuity of the law," when carefully analyzed. Waggoner challenged Butler's use of the "pioneers" by affirming that he had successfully proved before the Theological Committee that his own positions were "perfectly in harmony with

works published by our people" and had "no knowledge that any different view on any text used in those [Youth's Instructor] lessons was ever printed by our people before the appearance of your pamphlet." Waggoner objected to the premise that he had made either the Signs or the Instructor a "medium for taking an unfair advantage of any of our people," and he intended to introduce excerpts from standard works that would exhibit his harmony with past denominational positions.⁴⁸

Waggoner immediately illustrated the core difference between the two theologies represented by the two pamphlets when he analyzed Butler's views of the significance of circumcision. Butler pictured that rite as an indication of Jewish separateness from the rest of humanity while Waggoner considered it "a seal of the righteousness of the faith which [Abraham] had" [Romans 4:11]. In other words, one position considered that the rite itself possessed merit while the other stressed that it was an evidence of the faith of the possessor. Waggoner next illustrated how it was that SDAs had the opportunity to look more closely at the central theme of the Bible when he argued against Butler's contention that the essential purpose of the book of Galatians differed from that of Romans. To Waggoner the crucial message of both books was justification by faith.⁴⁹

Waggoner's next point is crucial and, even though it contains his questionable interpretation of "under the law," illustrates the difference between the traditional SDA message and the "new" message that was sounding within the church. Waggoner perceived of circumcision as a gospel ordinance, that is, it served as an indication of the faith possessed. Note his analysis:

The perverted gospel which the Galatians were being taught, was to keep the commandments of God, and circumcision. But since circumcision is nothing, and there is in the universe no means of justification outside of Christ, it follows that they were practically relying upon their good works for salvation. But Christ says, "Without me ye can do nothing;" that is, the man who rejects Christ, by accepting some other mode of justification, cannot possibly keep the commandments, "for Christ is the end of the law for

righteousness to every one that believeth." [Romans 10:4] So we find that the Galatians, although they had once accepted Christ and known God, were now insensibly turning away from God, and of course going back to the heathen practices which came so naturally to them.⁵⁰

While Waggoner is applying his analysis to the circumcision question, its implications to the SDA message of an acceptable righteousness accruing from obedience even to the moral law would come under similar condemnation. Such a concept, according to Waggoner, would place the believer back "under the law," since anything that replaced the perfect obedience of Christ precluded acceptable obedience. Only faith availed to bring acceptable obedience. The Galatians, according to Waggoner, were going back into idolatry, not "because the Jews were teaching them to break the commandments, but because they were putting their trust in something besides Christ, and the man who does that cannot keep from sin, no matter how hard he tried."⁵¹

Waggoner strongly attacked the Butler premise that the ceremonial law served as a means to approach God prior to the advent of Jesus and also the Butler premise that the Jerusalem Council did not deal with the moral law. He reminded Butler of his "plain talk" on fornication at the 1886 GC and that at that conference Butler had emphasized that "the seventh commandment may be broken by even a look, or a desire of the heart," and yet Butler alleged that the Jerusalem Council which forbade fornication took no notice whatever of the moral law. "How you can make such a statement after reading Acts 15, is beyond my comprehension," wrote Waggoner. He likewise pointed out Butler's inconsistency in that the action of the Council in forbidding "pollutions of idols" directly related to the first two commandments. Waggoner asked Butler, "Will you please cite me to that portion of the ceremonial law which forbids fornication and idolatry."⁵²

In challenging the Butler position of merit accruing from obedience to the ceremonial law during the Old Testament period, he would again exhibit the difference between the old and new messages within Adventism. He argued that

there was no merit or penalty attached to obedience to the ceremonial law, for if any law outside of the ten commandments was required to define sin or righteousness, then the moral law itself was less than perfect. Obedience to the ceremonial law was solely an indicator of the faith possessed by the believer. Here Waggoner was suggesting a vital point, for his analysis also meant that personal obedience was unsatisfactory to obtain saving righteousness from either the ceremonial or the moral law. In making his point, he was effectively showing that the Butler position actually downgraded the stature of the moral law while ostensibly thinking it was exhonoring it and, in doing so, likewise perverting the gospel:

I do not see how from your position you can avoid the conclusion that the moral law is not, or at least was not, in the Jewish age, of itself a perfect standard of righteousness. The great fault which I find with the position you hold is that it depreciates the gospel.

Let me repeat the argument: If the curse attaches to the ceremonial law, then violation of the ceremonial law is sin; and if violation of the ceremonial law is sin, then there is sin not forbidden by the ten commandments; and then the ten commandments are not a perfect rule of action; moreover, since the ceremonial law is done away, it follows that the standard of righteousness is not so perfect now as it was in the days of Moses. If this is not a legitimate conclusion from your premises, I must confess my ignorance of logic. Another point: No sin can remove itself, neither can it be atoned for by any subsequent good deed. So then there must be some scheme of atonement for sin. Now if sin were imputed for neglect of the ceremonial law, what remedy was provided for that sin? The ceremonial law was simply the ordinances of the gospel. If condemned sinners were still further condemned by the very remedy provided for their salvation, then indeed it must have been a yoke. A man is in a truly pitiable condition when the remedy given him for a sore disease only aggravates that disease.⁵³

Waggoner explained the fact that violators of the ordinances of the ceremonial law were slain, not because there was a curse attached to the ceremonial law, but because their violation of the moral law merited death and they had refused to accept the forgiveness possible by faith in Christ that would have been manifested through obedience to the provisions of the ceremonial law. "The penalty was not for failure to carry out the rites of the ceremonial law, but for the sin which might have been remitted had he

manifested faith," argued Waggoner.⁵⁴ Here was an argument that had the potential of transforming Adventism for the focus was clearly shifting from the performance of the believer to the significance of the performance of Christ. The purpose of the "added law," of Galatians 3:19 was to make the sinner aware of the extent of the "perfect righteousness" wrought out by Christ, "and if men ever attain to this perfect righteousness, they must have the law in its fullest extent, and must know that many things were sinful, which they might previously have thought were harmless." The law was not "added" in a "mathematical" sense but was "spoken" to exhibit the extent of "depravity," and to show the superabundance of grace to "cover" sins.⁵⁵

Despite the Butler attack upon his "under the law" interpretation, Waggoner held firm. While he believed that the term would mean "subject to the law" when applied to the ceremonial law, since there was no condemnation in that law, he held to his position that when applied to the moral law the term always meant "condemned by the law." "Christians are all subject to the moral law, but they are not under it," he again affirmed. "If they were under it they would not be Christians." Waggoner's position on that phrase is vital to understanding his concept of the gospel. Lacking an objective view of the gospel, he believed that anyone who relied upon something other than faith in Christ for rendering perfect obedience to the moral law, brought themselves under condemnation of that law and thus were no longer Christians, because of the inability of carnal nature to fulfill the perfect requirements of the law. The gospel to Waggoner provided the subjective means of rendering that perfect obedience.⁵⁶ He would no doubt have seen the morals cases at the 1886 session as evidence of the veracity of his position.

He then mounted a strong attack on the ceremonial law interpretation of Galatians 3:24, and again illustrated the profoundly differing theologies

between the two positions. To Waggoner faith was the prime motivator to obedience, not the converse:

Now it is an undeniable fact that the possession of faith led to the offering of sacrifices, and not the offering of sacrifices to faith. "By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain." Now I ask, How could the ceremonial law lead a man to that which he already had? Since it was faith that prompted Abel and all others to offer sacrifices, how can it be said that those sacrifices served as a schoolmaster to lead them to Christ that they might be justified by faith?⁵⁷

He directly challenged the position taken by both Butler and Canright at one of the meetings of the Theological Committee at the 1886 session when they both maintained that the Old Testament "patriarchs had very limited, if any, knowledge of Christ's real work," and that the gospel was really introduced by Christ "at his first advent." Waggoner was as capable as Butler of making sharp thrusts at his theological opponent and he pointed out to Butler that since angels held communication with Adam and instructed him concerning the plan of salvation,⁵⁸ "if Adam was ignorant of the great system of justification by faith, it was not because of the incompetency of his teachers." Waggoner continued:

After the battles which we have had to wage with Campbellites concerning the value of the Old Testament Scriptures, and the unity and universality of God's plan of salvation, it seems almost incredible that anyone should be called on to defend, against Seventh-day Adventists, the idea that the well-informed Jew had a full knowledge of Christ, and was justified only through faith.⁵⁹

Waggoner's position on the nature of Christ, introduced in this 1887 pamphlet, was directly related to his interpretation of the meaning of "under the law" and also conditioned by his nonobjective manner of interpretation. He directly challenged the Butler point that considered it almost blasphemy to consider one "that was pure, and had never committed a sin in his life" to be born under the condemnation of the law in the manner that Waggoner interpreted "under the law." Waggoner exhibits his completely subjective manner of thought in his rejoinder:

You are shocked at the idea that Jesus was born under the condemnation of the law, because he never committed a sin in his life. But you admit that on the cross he was under the condemnation of the law. What! had he then committed sin? Not by any means. Well, then, if Jesus could be under the condemnation of the law at one time in his life, and be sinless, I see no reason why he could not be under the condemnation of the law at another time, and still be sinless. And Paul declares that God did make him to be sin for us.⁶⁰

Waggoner considered that Jesus was baptized, not merely as an example to others, but "must have been for the same reason that he died, namely, for sin." While it was not for His own sins, Christ died because "our sins were counted as his." Once again Waggoner used objective expressions, but meant it in a subjective sense. Our sins were literally a part of Christ and hence he was baptized for that reason, according to Waggoner: "And thus it is that he could be all his life, even from his birth, under the condemnation of the law. It was not on his own account, but on ours," Waggoner observed.⁶¹

Waggoner again affirmed that his purpose was to strengthen the SDA defense of the law, especially in view of the "approach [of] the end," and to illustrate "the beautiful harmony" between the law and the gospel. While he believed Butler would consider it "a humiliating thing to modify our position on so vital a point as this, right in the face of the enemy," it was far better to correct a "faulty position" than to risk final defeat with a faulty position. Waggoner did not see any humiliation in the matter, however. If SDAs changed their view on the law in Galatians, "it would simply be an acknowledgment that they are better informed today than they were yesterday." Theological growth was "never humiliating except to those whose pride of opinion will not allow them to admit that they can be wrong." To change positions on this subject, Waggoner observed "would simply be a step nearer the faith of the great Reformers from the days of Paul to the day of Luther and Wesley." The position he advocated, Waggoner said, was one held "by all the eminent reformers" and thus he took no credit for advancing it.⁶²

In concluding his pamphlet, Waggoner brings us to the central issue and gives a clue as to why Ellen White would identify with the message that was more and more strongly sounding within Adventism and why elements of disunity were constantly striving to stifle the clarity of that message:

I cannot refrain from expressing my regret to see in your book the expression, "the much-vaunted doctrine of justification by faith." Do you know of any other means of justification? Your words seem to intimate that you think that doctrine has been overestimated. Of one thing I am certain, and that is, that those who have held to the theory of the law, which you are endeavoring to uphold, have not overestimated the doctrine of justification by faith; because that theory leads inevitable to the conclusion that men are justified by the law [emphasis supplied]. But when I read Romans 3:28, and read also that Paul knew nothing among the Corinthians but Jesus Christ and him crucified, and that "the just shall live by faith," and that "this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith" (1 John 5:4), and that Paul wanted to be found when Christ comes, having nothing but "the righteousness which is of God by faith" (Philippians 3:9), I conclude that it is impossible to overestimate the doctrine of justification by faith. You may call it a "much-vaunted" doctrine if you please; I accept the word, and say with Paul: "God forbid that I should glory (or vaunt), save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world."⁶³

A complex situation had developed within the SDA church by the end of 1886. Traditional Adventist views of the purpose of the moral law was being effectively challenged by two editors capable of forcefully presenting their positions and church leadership was strongly reacting. The view of church administrators at Battle Creek that such theology should be centrally guided further entrenched the combatants. The issue was further complicated by the mixture of elements of theological insight and aberrant theological error within both perspectives and the limited theological training of the major combatants. Given the mixture of truth and error in both the theological systems, the SDA church was blessed beyond measure through the ministry of Ellen White, but would that ministry itself be stifled and nullified in the setting of disunity and Pharisaism that became more and more prevalent?

In the aftermath of the great law conference of 1886, both George Butler and Stephen Haskell had written to W C White in Europe about their

discouragement about the state of Adventism and the fact that SDAs seemed so difficult to reach spiritually. In early 1887 Willie White wrote and relayed an analysis of his mother. The inducement to true spirituality involved a focus upon the "precious promises" of God, rather "than by dwelling upon the threatenings and judgment." Again turning to the gospel and not the law as the ground of her security, Mrs White had decided that it was time to return to the United States.⁶⁴

Ellen White and Galatians Controversy, 1887. Although by early 1887 Willie White believed that A T Jones "had a clear case against the Huns" and supported the Allemanni, Ellen White had no desire to become embroiled in that issue. When her son wanted to read the Jones articles to her, "she had no time to hear them and did not think it was profitable for her to engage in the investigation of historical matters." Although W C White supported the new position, he also had difficulty considering the horns controversy as of supreme importance: "I cannot regard it as so serious a matter as opening up a controversy of the law in Galatians," he wrote Jones.⁶⁵ It will be recalled that Butler tried to involve Ellen White in the Galatians matter at least three times in 1886 and she would respond, although not fully in the way Butler had hoped.

In February of 1887 Ellen White wrote to Jones and Waggoner that she had been "looking in vain" for an article she had written and read to J H Waggoner "nearly twenty years ago" concerning the "added law." Ellen White recalled that the thrust of the article involved her "being shown" that his position on the law "was incorrect" and thus "he has been silent upon the subject for many years." Ellen White noted that it was not her practice to read purely theological articles to avoid being influenced by other's theoretical arguments.⁶⁶

She wrote her protest "immediately" upon hearing of the introduction of controversial matter at Healdsburg and in the Signs, but received no response and wondered if her letter had been lost.⁶⁷ She told the young editors that they should not have "pursued the course you have" in advancing their opposing views: "Especially at this time should everything like differences be repressed." She berated the editors for being more "self confident" and "less cautious" than they should have been and even though they might have been fully convinced of the truth of their positions, "you do not show wisdom that the difference should be made apparent."⁶⁸

She seemed to agree with Butler's position that the editors had departed from denominational policy and the "positive directions" God had given about broadcasting theological differences. Others would now advance "their various ideas and theories and bring them before the public, because you have done this" and "a state of things that you have not dreamed of" would result. Perhaps including the horns controversy as well as the disputed points in Galatians, Ellen White informed them that "these questions are not vital points."⁶⁹ It will be recalled that the theological points of conflict in Galatians involved interpretations on the "added law," the term "under the law," the meaning of "until the seed shall come," etc, and that an angel had told Mrs White that neither Waggoner nor Butler had all the truth concerning those matters. While the route to understanding justification by faith would involve interpretations of Galatians and Romans, only Mrs White in Adventism understood justification in the biblical sense and she arrived at her understanding apart from the theological analysis that consumed the contestants.

No doubt referring to the vital message seeking entrance into the Adventist church, Mrs White noted that "twice" she had been shown that "everything of a character to cause our brethren to be diverted from the very

points now essential for this time, should be kept in the background." Christ himself, she affirmed, did not reveal many truths "because it would create a difference of opinion and get up disputations" and yet "young men who have not passed through this experience we have had" were so eager for controversy that "nothing would suit them better than a sharp discussion." To bring such differences into a General Conference session was "a mistake" and "if these things come into our Conference, I would refuse to attend one of them." She urged both Jones and Waggoner to greater humility of opinion, felt "pains" in her heart when she read the controversial articles published by the pioneers in the Sickle and criticized the ministry in general for "dwelling too much on doctrines, preaching altogether too many discourses on argumentative subjects." She considered that it would be years before the disunity fomented at the 1886 GC would be erased:

There has been a door thrown open for variance and strife and contention and differences which none of you can see but God. His eye traces the beginning to the end. And the magnitude of mischief God alone knows. The bitterness, the wrath, the resentment, the jealousies, the heart burnings provoked by controversies of both sides of the question cause the loss of many souls.⁷⁰

Perhaps reflecting upon the dream she had just received or would soon receive concerning the Canright experience, Mrs White informed the editors: "Were it not that I know the Captain of our salvation stands at the helm to guide the gospel ship into the harbor I should say let me rest in the grave." We again see Ellen White transcending all of the issues that consumed the combatants. Because of her focus upon the "Captain" and upon the "gospel," she saw beyond the eschatological anxieties that caused many of the pioneers to wish for death. Her objective focus transcended the theology offered by the Signs editors and she urged them to "have so large a measure of the Spirit of Jesus that self will not be interwoven into anything that we may do or say." The entire church could have profited from the counsel: "There is danger of

keeping the discourses and the articles in the paper like Cain's offering, Christless," and from her final observation, "Everything is so mingled with self that the wisdom from above can not be imparted."⁷¹

Ellen White sent a copy of this testimony to Butler and he felt so exhonored by its contents that he quickly sent a copy to Haskell.⁷² Butler was still ecstatic when he wrote Ellen White in late March. He declared that Ellen White's letter to Jones and Waggoner "did [him] much good and greatly relieved [his] mind." Butler had been in great perplexity over the Galatians matter and saw views advanced that he could not "believe to be the truth." Indeed, he was so sure Ellen White had harmonized with his position that he affirmed:

If [Waggoner's] views were to be sustained, I confess I shall never know what to believe and I think it would close up my ever trying to write anything on doctrine as I should, and could have no confidence in my own judgment, of an argument. It would finish me on that score and even in regard to my knowing the leading of the Spirit, and perfectly unfit me for acting any leading part. It is not a slight matter with me, as I have given it much thought for many years. . . . But when Dr Waggoner came out in our pioneer paper with nine long articles directly presenting the subject, I felt that this course could not go on. So I wrote to you several times, but got no reply. Then when Dr W came on to the [1886] Conference, fully armed for the fray, and was sustained so fully by Brother Haskell, B L Whitney, [M C] Wilcox and others, so that he and Bro Whitney got little companies of our brethren together to indoctrinate as much as possible in quiet, and so the Dr [Waggoner] went home feeling that he was sustained and that he had really carried his point.⁷³

As Butler got into his subject he seemed to again display irritation as he reflected upon the Galatians issue. "Of course I felt very badly," he told Mrs White. He had avoided publishing on the issue for six to eight years out of consideration to the minority position and those who well knew his own personal views, who had long been in the work, supported Waggoner. The situation brought "such a load of sadness" to his heart that he never wished to bear again and he "felt that some of my leading brethren did not walk uprightly in their course, though [he] was powerless to prevent it." As he reflected upon it, he told Mrs White, "it almost makes me sick at heart at the present time."

Still, he was pleased with Mrs White's letter to Jones and Waggoner, although he could not avoid again reminding her that she had only responded "after this long time." Clearly transcending Ellen White's intentions in her letter, Butler made his theological application: "Of course your statement made in this letter that you had told Elder [J H] Waggoner 'that his position on the law was incorrect,' referring to the 'added law,' is very satisfactory to me." While he claimed no elation over it, "it is the truth and I am glad to see the truth established" for he considered the theological issue resolved since the added law issue was "really the key to the whole position."⁷⁴

The youthful editors were obviously taken aback and surprised at Ellen White's letter, observed Butler, since he had recently heard that Jones believed Ellen White would sustain the position he and E J Waggoner had taken. Butler felt sorry for the youth, since he always pitied "those who suffer keen disappointment." While the president was now willing to let the matter rest, "though the matter has been a sore trial," yet he concluded the matter could not rest long "as the subject is sure to come into every thorough examination of the law, and we cannot help it." He continued:

The added law is either the moral or the ceremonial law systems. You say in substance that Elder Waggoner's position was not correct; his position was that the moral law was the added law, hence it must be the other. If our people knew that you had light that the moral law was not the added law, the question would be settled in short order. That is precisely what our people are waiting with much anxiety to know. I am not urging you to say anything, but I feel certain that after all the stir over this question it will make constant trouble, till your opinion is known. You see if it don't.⁷⁵

Ellen White's letter to Brethren Butler and Smith clearly demolished the premises under which Butler was operating. Her letter to Jones and Waggoner was designed to deal with the issue of "keeping in the front and making prominent subjects on which there are differences of opinion" and not as a means of theologically resolving the Galatians dispute. While she could not recall the nature of the "caution and warning" given to J H Waggoner earlier,

"it may be it was a caution not to make his ideas prominent at that time, for there was great danger of disunion." Neither Butler nor Smith should draw theological implications from her earlier letter to the youthful editors nor should they use that letter as a "weapon" against "the brethren mentioned." She did not want the pioneers assuming "that your ideas are all correct and Dr Waggoner's and Elder Jones' are all wrong." Now that Butler had published on the issue and made "pointed" and "too sharp" remarks concerning the Waggoner position, Mrs White could not "feel that you are just right at this point to do this unless you give the same liberty to Dr Waggoner." If Butler had avoided his barbs and the controversial question, "it would have been more in accordance with the light God" had given Mrs White.⁷⁶ It would appear that Mrs White's earlier position that such controverted points should not be considered at GC sessions was now to be modified because of the unfair and unwarranted conclusions Butler was drawing from her testimony to Jones and Waggoner.

Mrs White then referred to her "impressive dreams" that indicated to her that Butler and Smith were "not altogether in the light," for they seemed in a boat under the "shadow" of Canright.⁷⁷ Instead of the methodology used by Butler to ascertain theological truth as evidenced by his use of her letter to Jones and Waggoner, Mrs White proclaimed her consistent position: "We want Bible evidence for every point we advance."⁷⁸

Both Jones and Waggoner responded to the Ellen White counsel to them. Jones read the letter "three or four times," then passed it on to Waggoner and thanked the Lord "for His goodness" in showing him where he had "done wrong." Jones regretted his role in creating division and doing harm "in any way to the cause of God." He had never before heard of the Galatians incident with J H Waggoner or of Ellen White's role in that episode and was sure that E J Waggoner had not heard of it either. Neither did he believe that Ellet had received earlier Ellen White counsel concerning his teaching at Healdsburg for

Jones was "quite sure he would have showed it to me had he got it, for he has always been very frank and cordial with me in the matter of his articles and views on the law."⁷⁹

Jones then told Ellen White how he dealt with the Galatians question in his teaching at Healdsburg. When the question was asked directly of him by class members, as it had been on several occasions, he had avoided any attempt to settle it for anyone, but told the class "that some brethren honestly held one way, while others just as honest held the other," and he would not try to settle that matter in the classroom. He told his class members to avoid discussing the law question in Galatians, but rather "to look for the gospel of Christ in Galatians" and that "if others chose to discuss the law and to make prominent the question of which law it is, they could easily avoid danger by looking for the gospel underneath it all." The controversy could be resolved by having "Christ and his salvation before them as the one great thing that is beneath and above all."⁸⁰

Through Jones' analysis we can clearly see why the Galatians issue was so central to the new message of justification by faith, for that issue provided a Christ-centered perspective previously subdued in Adventist literature and thinking by all except Ellen White. Jones thought that if his students "would keep Christ and the gospel before their minds they would be sure to be on the right side whichever way the question of the law should be finally decided." He told his students that, while they could find both laws in Galatians, they would find that the "gospel--justification by faith--underlying the whole" of that book. Jones believed that the Lord had helped him as he had "tried to make the gospel plain" to his students.⁸¹

Waggoner also affirmed he was thankful to God "that his spirit" continued to strive with him, "pointing out the errors" to which he was so subject. The more he read the testimony the more convinced he was "that it is timely and was

needed." While he had previously considered that he was actuated by the purest of motives and "love for the truth" when he wrote on the law and Galatians issue, he now realized and saw plainly "that there has been very much love of self mixed in."⁸² Waggoner could now realize that he too had "hindered the advancement of the truth" when he considered he was "helping it." Waggoner, as had Jones, maintained a perspective toward Ellen White that enabled spiritual application of her counsel and assumed the inspiration of that counsel whether it sprang from direct vision or not. Notice how Waggoner was being prepared for Minneapolis:

That testimony has been blessed by the Lord to my good. I have been looking at myself in the light of the word of God, and have been conscious of my insignificance as never before. As I have humbled myself before God, he has heard my prayer, and has given me a measure of peace greater than I have known before. Again I thank God for the testimony of His spirit. The strongest proof to me of their genuineness is that they have revealed to me my heart to an extent that it could not possibly be known by any one besides God.⁸³

Waggoner had neither received Ellen White's letter concerning the teaching at Healdsburg, nor had he heard of her "having read a testimony to [his] father in regard to the law." If he had known that Ellen White had "spoken on the subject" the "case would have been different." Ellet emphasized, however, that the position on the law that he held was "quite materially different from that which Father held." Waggoner affirmed that as he had perceived more fully the "character of Christ, in contrast with myself," he was "heartily sick of all strife" and determined that his writings "shall be characterized by more of the love of God." He longed for the "righteousness of Christ," and hated his previous spirit of criticism and saw in it "the meanest kind of pride" and thanked Mrs White for her "kind admonition."⁸⁴

Galatians and Minneapolis. We have previously noticed the remarkable letter of October 1, 1888, that Butler sent to Ellen White and his blaming her for his past and current illness. Butler's analysis, even more than the horns issue, set the tone for Minneapolis. He went so far in his attempt to persuade

Ellen White to drop the Galatians discussion that he told her that "this whole matter I believe will do more to break down confidence in your work than any thing which has occurred since this cause has had an existence." And he didn't stop there:

Taking into view the fact that this question was settled and kept in quiet for so many years from the position that the testimony took on it, and now if our people come to think that the other side is supported it will break the faith of many of our leading workers in the testimonies. There is no other possible result but this that can come from it.⁸⁵

Contrary to Butler's expressed fears, Ellen White had something else in mind concerning the Galatians issue. While she realized that "Elders Smith and Butler" were "very loathe to have anything said upon the law in Galatians," she could not see how a disscussion of that question could be avoided at Minneapolis and she gave her reason: "We must take the Bible as our standard and we must diligently search its pages for light and evidences of truth." It was clear that Mrs White approved the discussion on Galatians for she had written the preceding on the third day of the institute, before the discussion on Galatians had begun.⁸⁶

E J Waggoner presented his initial study on "The Law and the Gospel" on Monday, October 15, and seemed almost consciously to avoid quoting from Galatians, using only Galatians 5:18 with some 20 other texts.⁸⁷ Nevertheless, the controversial areas of the "added law," coming of the "seed," and the theology of "under the law" clearly emerged. But other elements also emerged in this initial presentation. Waggoner stressed that Romans 10:4 illustrated that Christ was the purpose of the law "for righteousness" and it was solely His righteousness that satisfied the law. Realization of that truth, Waggoner affirmed, warred against the antinomian discarding of the law for "He who comes to Christ for righteousness admits that the law demands righteousness." Waggoner was pointing the church to a new stability, a stability that Ellen White would consider the beginning of the loud cry. Here is how the Willie

White notes reflect Waggoner's presentation of Adventism's new message: "Justification by Faith. Our anchor. A key to unlock."⁸⁸

Here was the potential for a new beginning for Adventism. One can only pause and moan . . . "If only . . ." Waggoner was clearly seeing that justification by faith must become central to Adventism; it must become Adventism's anchor. And he himself seemed to perceive that its note was only beginning to sound for it was "a key to unlock." Perhaps he also realized that when that message became central, it would unlock every other aspect of Adventism.

Our "if only . . ." includes Waggoner's needs, too, for his fully subjectivized interpretation is also present in his initial message. Willie White took this note: "Christ justifies us, by giving us His life." If Waggoner thought of justification in an objective, substitutionary sense the statement would be orthodox, but we have seen that such theology was applied completely subjectively and thus led another direction. Waggoner's initial presentation on justification at Minneapolis leads us to conclude that the church desperately needed unity and Ellen White in 1888.

As did the issue of the horns, the consideration of the law and gospel extended into the session itself and by his fifth presentation on the subject, Waggoner had entered into the areas of dispute concerning the law in Galatians. Also introduced was an issue that would soon replace Galatians as the point of friction between the pioneers and Jones and Waggoner, the question of the interpretation of the two covenants. In this talk also, Waggoner again hinted at his view of subjective perfection in affirming that the Christian could be led by Christ to the full righteousness demanded by the law.⁸⁹ After Waggoner's sixth or seventh presentation, J H Morrison, president of the Iowa Conference began his rebuttal.

The ground had been prepared for Morrison by G G Rupert, a minister from Michigan, who had distributed the Butler pamphlet to all the delegates. Even though George Butler was ill, his spirit was indeed present at Minneapolis. Before Morrison began his presentation on October 24, Uriah Smith made a few remarks questioning Waggoner's position on "under the law," and on the "danger" of the position on the law in Galatians. Smith was then interrupted by R M Kilgore, president of the Illinois Conference, who virtually exploded. Kilgore was totally opposed to the Galatians discussion at Minneapolis because of the illness of George Butler. If Waggoner "had been sick" he would have opposed the discussion for the same reason. Conducting the discussion in the absence of Butler was "cowardly" in Kilgore's opinion. Referring to the large number of presentations by Waggoner, Kilgore considered that "there has never been an opportunity as Dr Waggoner has had." It can be seen that if the perspective was on justification by faith rather than upon opposition, Waggoner's "opportunity" was Adventism's opportunity, but Kilgore and the pioneers did not see the issue in that manner. Another thing that troubled Kilgore was the Ellen White involvement in the past. At this point, Smith re-entered the discussion.⁹⁰

Somewhat chagrined by the Kilgore interruption, Smith interjected that that was the very issue he was about to address and pointed out that he could agree with about "3/4" of Waggoner's presentations. At that point, Morrison began his presentation and noted that he, too, had opposed the discussion "because no one is present who has given this subject special study."⁹¹ We can see the dilemma faced by the church. Here was a subject that the pioneer system claimed to be crucial to its understanding of Adventism. It saw its entire theological structure under attack because of Waggoner's position on the law in Galatians and its spokesmen are now considering a discussion on that very subject to be "cowardly" because their spokesman was ill. The church

indeed paid a horrendous price for reliance upon men and established positions rather than the Scriptures for its understanding of truth. It would pay an even heavier price in the future. Mrs White clearly perceived the fallacy of the pioneer position and R D Hottel, secretary of the Virginia Conference, noted in his diary of the next day that Mrs White "went for Smith and Bro Kilgore," at the 5:30 am morning meeting.⁹²

The traditional pioneer position of merit accruing from obedience was represented in the Morrison presentations who went so far in his initial presentation as to indicate that the initial "gospel" was the gospel of ceremonies which then became another gospel at Christ's incarnation. Straining in his analysis of Galatians 1:6-7, Morrison affirmed: "Christ led them from one Gospel to another, which is not another." In his third presentation Morrison again focused upon meritorious obedience: "Does not the sinner have to make some advancement before Christ will accept him?" After Morrison's sixth presentation, Uriah Smith saw "no material difference" between he and Morrison on the law in Galatians and tried to tie Ellen White to the position by "rejoic[ing] in the Spirit of Prophecy because of its harmony" and because it was "easy to be understood." Smith told of the experience of an Adventist minister who had held to the moral law position enunciated by E J Waggoner until he tried debating a Cambellite and "had to resort to" the ceremonial interpretation of the law in Galatians.⁹³ Smith considered his case won, but Ellen White did not.

It the midst of the Morrison presentations, W C White wrote concerning the amazing analysis that Ellen White made of the Minneapolis experience to that point. Mrs White was "discouraged" for "it is a dark time." Much that Waggoner had taught harmonized with that which Mrs White had "seen in vision." Mrs White feared the "Spirit of Pharisaism" that seemed determined to "crush" Waggoner "down and condemn all he says as erroneous." There was also danger of

the opposite position and Mrs White was already aware that "some then take it that she endorses all his [Waggoner's] views," and that also was a dangerous position for "part of his teaching" was not in harmony with her. Willie White was seen as a villain by the pioneers for they interpreted his "endeavor to push Dr Waggoner's views" as having an influence upon Mrs White that led to her deception and resulted in her taking "a position contrary" to her own past writings.⁹⁴

Mrs White had already detected the results that would spring from the Minneapolis spirit. Her ministry would be largely nullified, some would assume too much from what she endorsed of Waggoner, others would consider that he had no contribution to offer. The result would continue to be a "dark time" for the church, but Willie White also noticed one hopeful prospect: "There will be much earnest studying next year."⁹⁵

NOTES

1. The author is indebted to Tom Norris for providing copies of the Jones-Smith correspondence on the horns controversy.
2. A T Jones to Uriah Smith, May 18, 1885 and Dec 3, 1886; L E Froom Personal Collection, GCA.
3. Uriah Smith to A T Jones, May, 1885, as quoted by Jones in Jones to Smith, Dec 3, 1886; *ibid*.
4. Uriah Smith to A T Jones, Nov 8, 1886; *ibid*.
5. *Ibid*.
6. A T Jones to Uriah Smith, Dec 3, 1886; *ibid*.
7. *Ibid*.
8. *Ibid*.
9. Uriah Smith to A T Jones, Dec 15, 1886 as cited in Jones to Smith, Dec 27, 1886 and Jones to Smith, Dec 27, 1886; *ibid*.
10. Uriah Smith, "The Ten Kingdoms," RH, Jan 4, 11, 18, 1887.
11. A T Jones to Uriah Smith, Feb 3, 1887; *ibid*. Emphasis in original.
12. W C White to A T Jones, Jan 6, 1887, WCW bk A-2.
13. J H Waggoner to General Conference, Oct 10, 1887, RG 25 (Files of GC Book Committee), 1891-96 General Files, W fld.
14. *Ibid*.
15. *Ibid*.
16. *Ibid*.
17. *Ibid*.
18. W C White to Captain Clement Eldridge, May 14, 1887, WCW bk A-2.
19. W C White to J H Waggoner, Dec 23, 1887, and to Uriah Smith, Feb 6, 1888, WCW bk B.
20. *Ibid*.
21. W C White to F E Belden, Feb 9, 1888, WCW bk B.
22. *Ibid*.
23. W C White to B L Whitney, L R Conradi and J H Waggoner, Dec 13, 1887, WCW bk A-2.
24. W C White to J H Waggoner, Feb 16, 1888, WCW bk B.
25. W C White to J H Waggoner, May 16, 1888, WCW bk B.
26. W C White to D T Jones, April 8, 1890, RG 9, WCW fld and W C White Notes of Meetings Attended, "Camp Necessity," June 26, 1888.
27. W C White to G I Butler, Aug 16, 1888, WCW bk B, emphasis supplied.
28. W C White to G I Butler, Aug 16, 1888, WCW bk B.
29. *Ibid*.
30. *Ibid*.
31. W C White, "The General Conference Workers' Meeting," RH, Sept 11, 1888.
32. The author is indebted to Tim Poirier for providing transcriptions of the Minneapolis Journal and Tribune and St Paul Pioneer Press reports of the 1888 GC session.
33. W C White to Mary White, Oct 12, 1888, WCW 1888; W C White Notebook E, Reporting Meeting of Oct 15, 1888.
34. W C White, Notebook E, Oct 15 and 16, 1888.
35. 1888 GCDB, p 2.
36. Minneapolis Journal, Oct 18, 1888 and Minneapolis Tribune, Oct 18, 1888.
37. Minneapolis Journal, Oct 18, 1888.
38. Uriah Smith, "The Conference," RH, Oct 23, 1888.
39. W C White to J H Waggoner, Feb 27, 1889, WCW bk I.
40. George Butler, "The Law in the Book of Galatians," pp 3-6.

41. Ibid.
42. Ibid, p 6.
43. Ibid, pp 7-10.
44. Ibid, pp 10, 12-13.
45. Ibid, pp 64, 66, 71.
46. Ibid, pp 74-5, 78, 85.
47. Ibid.
48. E J Waggoner, "The Gospel in the Book of Galatians," 1888, pp 3-4.
49. Ibid, pp 5-6, 8-10.
50. Ibid, pp 10-11.
51. Ibid, pp 10-11.
52. Ibid, pp 11-13.
53. Ibid, pp 18-20.
54. Ibid.
55. Ibid, pp 25-9.
56. Ibid, pp 44-5, 52-3.
57. Ibid, pp 44-5.
58. He cited Ellen White, Great Controversy, Vol 1, p 58, for authority.
59. Ibid, pp 55-6.
60. Ibid, pp 60-3.
61. Ibid.
62. Ibid, pp 69-70.
63. Ibid, pp 70-1, emphasis in original.
64. W C White to O A Olsen, Jan 3, 1887; WCW bk A-2, p 22.
65. W C White to A T Jones, Jan 6, 1887; WCW bk A-2, pp 40-2.
66. Ellen White to E J Waggoner and A T Jones, Feb 18, 1887, B37-1887.
67. It is indeed tragic how many of the Ellen White letters written from Europe were apparently not copied and thus are not available today.
68. Ibid.
69. Ibid.
70. Ibid.
71. Ibid.
72. Stephen Haskell to Ellen White, April 11, 1887; SNH 1887 WE.
73. George Butler to Ellen White, March 31, 1887; GIB 1887 WE.
74. Ibid.
75. Ibid.
76. Ellen White to George Butler and Uriah Smith, April 5, 1887, B13-1887.
77. Since this dream was considered at length in the section on Canright, it will not be considered here.
78. Ibid.
79. A T Jones to Ellen White, March 13, 1887; WCW bk A-s, pp 189-90.
80. Ibid.
81. Ibid.
82. If Waggoner had made theological application of this admission he could perhaps have seen his need for a concept of original sin and continual Mediator that might have assisted in developing a forensic view of righteousness that he so desperately lacked. Ellen White would write: "The religious services, the prayers, the praise, the penitent confession of sin ascend from true believers as incense to the heavenly sanctuary, but passing through the corrupt channels of humanity, they are so defiled that unless purified by blood, they can never be of value with God. They ascend not in spotless purity, and unless the Intercessor, who is at God's right hand, presents and purifies all by His righteousness, it is not acceptable to God. All incense from earthly tabernacles must be moist with the cleansing drops of the blood of Christ. He holds before the Father the censer of His own merits, in which there is no taint of earthly corruption. He gathers into this censer

the prayers, the praise, and the confessions of His people, and with these He puts His own spotless righteousness. Then, perfumed with the merits of Christ's propitiation, the incense comes up before God wholly and entirely acceptable. Ellen White, Mss 30, 1900 in 1 SM, p 344.

83. E J Waggoner to Ellen White, April 1, 1887; Waggoner 1887 WE.

84. Ibid.

85. George Butler to Ellen White, Oct 1, 1888, 1888 GIB WE, emphasis supplied.

86. Ellen White to Mary White, Oct 9, 1888 [concluded Oct 14], W81-88.

87. The very useful study prepared by Tim Poirier of White Estate entitled Manuscripts and Memories of Minneapolis, 1888, enables full textual analysis of Waggoner's and other presentations at Minneapolis.

88. W C White, Notebook E, Oct 15, 1888.

89. W C White, Notebook E, Oct 19, 1888. Here is the actual notation by White: "I am dependent on Christ to lead me. Can be led to the place of G R." Gospel righteousness was probably the meaning of the abbreviation by White.

90. W C White, Notebook E, Oct 24, 1888.

91. Ibid.

92. R D Hottell, Diary entry Oct 25, 1888, GCA.

93. W C White, Notebook E, Oct 24, 26 and 30, 1888.

94. W C White to Mary White, Oct 27, 1888, WCW 1888 WE.

95. Ibid.

Chapter 8

Judgment at Minneapolis

The Time of Testing. The year 1888 opened on a Sunday and the conflicting messages were readily perceptible to those who would compare the varying views on justification. George Butler saw his system vindicated as the year began and he sent a circular letter to the ministers of the church telling them so. Butler clearly wasn't looking for new theological insight during a time of crisis. He proclaimed to the SDA ministry:

We have much reason to thank God and take courage as we enter upon the year 1888. Every in-coming year adds, if possible, to the strength of our positions. Seventh-day Adventists have never taken a stand upon Bible exegesis which they have been compelled to surrender; but, on the contrary, the lapse of time only strengthens their positions.¹

Butler went on to affirm the veracity of the traditional SDA interpretations of prophecy as evidenced by the state of society and the growth of the National Reform Movement and the "increased prominence of Sunday legislation."

As 1888 began, Uriah Smith also considered that the signs of the times confirmed the pioneer system. Here was the setting, outlined by Smith, in which he was willing to test his system: "The second coming of Christ, and the Judgment, events the magnitude and importance of which language is tame and powerless to describe, are now at our very doors." And he was optimistic as he looked toward the final testing of that system:

We turn our eyes to the future. The prospect, year by year, grows clearer, the evidence surer, that we have not followed cunningly devised fables in making known the soon coming of the Lord. Prophecies are converging to their fulfillment. Events are moving with accelerated velocity.²

Smith also presented his view of the means of personal preparation for that final test, and why he felt secure with the pioneer system. His article was significant entitled "The Main Point," and brings with it the necessary

question: could justification by faith ever become central to the pioneer system?

In the early years of this message the laborers had before them one specific object--to herald to the world the great fact that the last proclamation of the advent of Christ, to be given previous to his appearing in the clouds of heaven, is now going to the world, and to lead souls to Christ through obedience to this closing testing truth. This was the one objective point of all their efforts; and the end sought was not considered gained unless souls were converted to God, and led to seek through an enlightened obedience to all his commandments, a preparation for the Lord from heaven.³

Sanctification through obedience continued to dominant pioneer thinking as 1888 commenced and Uriah Smith insisted that that system must prevail: "The main object to be gained is still, as it has been from the beginning, to persuade men to believe and practice the entire truth which is to sanctify a people for the coming of the Lord." Adequate righteousness through personal obedience was the key to the pioneer system enunciated by Smith as 1888 began. Under his system, justification by faith could never become central or swallow up every other issue, for sanctification and "our righteousness" swallowed up everything. Lest there was any doubt, Smith informed the readers of the Review of his view of what should be central: "The main object of the message is to develop this company--to prepare a people for the coming of the Lord."⁴ The obedience of the believer, or sanctification, swallowed up everything.

Smith presented another picture of his system as January of 1888 drew to a close. The key to final salvation was sanctification and Smith illustrated it in an article entitled "Conditions of Everlasting Life" as he analyzed the story of the rich young ruler. That ruler could have become perfect, Smith affirmed, "only by disposing of his surplus property." The righteousness necessary for the salvation of that ruler must, Smith affirmed, exceed that of the scribes and Pharisees. Smith informed his readers how saving righteousness was to be secured as he analyzed Matthew 5:19:

And how is this excess of righteousness to be secured?--Only by keeping, and teaching others to keep, the commandments to which he

refers in the preceding verse; and these commandments constitute that law, not a jot or tittle of which shall pass, so long as the heavens and the earth endure, that law he came not to destroy, or release any one from obligation to obey.⁵

If Adventists could, by their personal obedience, out-Pharisee the Pharisees, their sanctification would enable their salvation. Smith baldly affirmed that "all who would enter heaven must show a better record" than the Pharisees and attributed such teachings to Jesus: "This appeal to an acceptable degree of righteousness, or attainments of moral character, as the test which shall determine our fitness to enter heaven, shows that it is the moral law and no other to which Christ has reference." The key to final salvation was sanctification for "while our works of obedience cannot enter into the account at all as a ground of our justification (Rom 3:28) since faith in Christ alone can mend that link in the chain of our hope which we have broken by transgression," acceptable obedience was the key to the final judgment in the pioneer system.⁶ That system was judged at Minneapolis and found inadequate.

A T Jones preached at the Healdsburg College church the Sabbath before the new year and presented "lots of texts" and told the believers that if they studied those texts, they should "have a happy year."⁷ No doubt, one of the texts given by Jones was Romans 10:4: "Christ is the purpose of the law, for righteousness to every one that believeth," for that text was the key to the message Jones and Waggoner were emphasizing in the church. Happiness and security came from the realization that the law required Christ's perfect righteousness and that righteousness was received as a gift through faith.

Waggoner, too, made that point early in 1888. Notice his stark contrast between "our righteousness" and the righteousness of faith and its implied indictment of the past message of attaining righteousness by obedience as he analyzed Romans 9:30-32:

The Jews followed the law, and so far as anybody could see, they kept it strictly. Then they trusted to their own works, and did not submit to the righteousness of God. But the Gentiles, and the

publicans and harlots, had no good works to trust in, and therefore they willingly accepted the righteousness which is of God by faith. Thus the publicans and harlots receive the blessing of God more readily than the Pharisees.⁸

But the system of Jones and Waggoner, while potentially contributing greatly to theological advancement in Adventism, would also reveal certain inadequacies early in 1888. Even in the article just cited, Waggoner made evident the results of a failure to distinguish between a perfect, objective righteousness set to the sinner's account in heaven and the subjective results of such a faith. As he analyzed his key text, Romans 10:4, he drew a logical premise from his fully subjective application: "The one who has the most faith, will live the most upright life."⁹ Given its fully internalized application, justification by faith would become a quantitative matter to both Jones and Waggoner. Because of merging justification and sanctification, the route to satisfaction of the law was not the completed act of Christ, but rather a question of the believer's exhibiting more and more faith and thus receiving more and more of Christ's perfect righteousness. This premise would become central to the theological aberration that developed in the 1890s as believers sought to develop sufficient faith to be translated and actually called the doctrine "translation faith."

All assumptions about preparation for the last days would be tested at Minneapolis and only that system held by Ellen White would emerge vindicated.

Session Planning. We have previously noticed how Ellen White, at the 1883 GC session had anticipated the truths that would again become prominent in 1888. She had observed that the 1883 session was "the best general meeting" she had ever attended and that the "capacity to understand and appreciate the truth has been enlarged" at the session and noted that "as we continue to advance in grace, our ability will still further increase, and we shall better understand the ways of God and the plan of redemption."¹⁰ It was the success

of the Bible study institute that preceded the 1883 GC that led W C White to propose a similar institute in 1888.¹¹

The location of the 1888 GC session was initially proposed in early 1887 by O A Olsen, who was then directing SDA work in Denmark and Norway. Olsen considered that a session at Minneapolis would be a great boon to the advancement of the "Scandinavian branch of the work" in the United States because of the number of such believers in that area.¹² Although the 1887 session, held in November of that year, voted that the next GC session should be held in South Lancaster, Massachusetts, the case for Minneapolis continued to surface. Its centrality and large groupings of Germans, French and Scandinavians would require less traveling time to the leaders of the European work than would California, another likely site.¹³

One thing seemed certain in the mind of Willie White: the session should not be held in Battle Creek. He believed that a session "freed from the financial interests which center at Battle Creek" had every likelihood of being a "profitable one."¹⁴ While California was a possible location, he considered that Minneapolis continued to have much to offer because of his desire for the "advancement of the work among the foreign nationalities in America."¹⁵ After meetings in South Lancaster and correspondence with "leading brethren," Butler believed that Minneapolis was supported by the consensus and so informed the church.¹⁶

The Press Judges Adventists at Minneapolis. Press reactions to the session at Minneapolis were fairly complementary and upbeat, giving primarily factual reports of the session itself with little or no comment. Reporters were not present for the early morning social meetings or the morning meetings during the institute, but were present for those meetings on the horns and Galatians that were held after the session itself began.

The St Paul Pioneer Press reported that visitors and "people of all faiths" were especially invited to the evening "talks or lectures" that were scheduled and would be "live subjects of interest to everybody."¹⁷ All the newspapers reported on the industriousness of the Adventists, their tendency to rise early, their orderliness and even the "comely young ladies" who served as attendants at the dining tables. The Tribune even headed its article of October 19, "Very Early Risers" and commented that SDAs "believe in getting up early," observing that the opening meeting of that day began at 5:30 am.¹⁸ The St Paul newspaper was quite descriptive in its analysis of the preparations for the conference held at the 80-member "little wooden" church on the corner of Fourth ave south and Lake st, with its recently constructed mammoth hall:

The army tents pitched in regulation style in the vacant lot adjoining the dining hall, have been floored and yesterday were provided with cots, chairs, cooking stoves, a small mirror for each, and a few other of the adjuncts to temporary housekeeping. Tables are set in the dining room for 200 persons. Each table is covered with a bright red cloth, and the attendants are comely young ladies from church society. Everything in and about the culinary department looks as neat as a pin, and an especially appetizing odor of good, wholesome home-cooked food pervades the establishment.

The large basement of the church will be used as a reception room. In this are long tables, surrounded with chairs and a couple of extemporized toilet rooms, and in the center a roaring wood fire gives the room a genial warmth. Here is gathered all the reading matter published under the auspices of the conference, including both home and foreign synods, periodicals, pamphlets and general literature concerning Adventist work. Adjoining the church is the office of the international tract association, and this, with the reception room, will be the rendezvous of the delegates when the meetings are not in session.¹⁹

The St Paul paper was also flattering in its praise of SDA leadership. S N Haskell, who had been chosen chairman because of Butler's illness, was "regarded as one of the ablest men in the Adventist church" and as the "second member" of the General Conference Committee; only George Butler exceeded him "in authority." Uriah Smith was ranked as "one of the ablest writers and speakers" within the church and "is, moreover, a profound scholar." He was the author of major theological works, including Thoughts on the Book of Daniel and

the Revelation, "said to be the most exhaustive work on that subject" that had "ever been published." Kellogg, Jones and Waggoner were also listed amongst the reputable Adventists.²⁰

Attitudes toward Sabbath observance were also analyzed by the St Paul paper, considering that "Adventists keep their Sabbath pretty rigidly." While Adventists "have no objection to quiet indulgence in a good hearty laugh," such was considered out of place on Sabbath, "nor is there any visiting among the brethren" and "on this last point the law is very strict." "A short walk in the open air when the need of exercise is felt is not discountenanced," observed the reporter. The "people are supposed to spend most of the day in religious exercises and in reading appropriate literature."²¹

Touching upon several key aspects of the SDA theological system, the Pioneer Press noticed that SDAs "try to so live that they will be ready at any time and under all circumstances for the inevitable" ending of the world. Indeed, "the children, as a general rule" were "brought up to take a more serious view of life in general than the ordinary run of people." Sanctification was strongly emphasized by the church. "As a rule the Adventist churches are pretty particular about those whom they accept into the church," since the "applicant must convince the committee that he is thoroughly converted and has had a complete change of heart before he will be accepted." It considered that Adventist "church discipline" to be of a "high order" and anyone not coming "right up to the scratch is pretty likely to be brought up with a sharp turn."²²

Adventist diet was scrutinized and Dr Kellogg stole the show on "health reform." Not only was Kellogg a vegetarian, he "even goes farther and entirely eschews butter." Kellogg had eaten "no meat or butter for a quarter of a century, and, though descended from a race of consumptives, he is still a hale and hearty man and growing more healthy every year."²³ SDAs were praised for

"good food, plainly cooked and plentifully eaten," The lack of salt, meat, butter and lard and the plentiful supply of graham bread, well-cooked oatmeal, fruit and grain products seemed to account for the "robust muscles and rosy glow" on the cheeks of both males and females at the conference.²⁴

All papers gave notoriety to Mrs White, the Tribune considering her a "female oracle," a "sort of prophetess" and, not recognizing the power of the "Minneapolis spirit," considered that "everything she says is listened to by the Seventh-day Adventists with awe." Here is its colorful description of Mrs White's sermon on the first Sabbath after the conference proper began:

[Mrs White] has been connected with this sect ever since its origin, and has revealed a number of things to the believers. . . . Mrs White spoke for nearly an hour and a half, and did not see[m] to tire any, although she is very old.²⁵ She has a very clear and high pitched voice, so that there was no trouble in hearing every word she uttered. She was clad in a straight dress of black with nothing to break the somberness, save a tiny white collar about her neck and a heavy metallic chain which hung suspended near her waist, and she stood by the side of the pulpit with arms outstretched as if appealing to those in front of her. During her discourse many of the elders were moved to tears and as she uttered some especially prophetic sentiment, they would break out in one long, hollow murmur of "Amen."²⁶

The Journal reporter noticed that "all the time" Mrs White was speaking, she "kept rubbing her hands together as though washing them, in invisible water."²⁷

The Journal, the most antagonistic of the papers toward Adventists, considered Mrs White a "homely, plain woman who preaches in the pulpit with all the fire and severity of a man," and also inaccurately reported that "her utterances were received as coming from God himself and were revered and obeyed accordingly." Clearly relying upon reports from the delegates themselves (reports which would soon become remarkable for the difference between the theory in which Ellen White was held versus the actual nullification of her mission at Minneapolis), the Journal considered that "forty years of experience in the denomination" had given "a sort of sacred character to the utterances of

Mrs White, and everything that she says is listened to with the greatest reverence by pastors and people."²⁸

The Journal had adopted a somewhat antagonistic stance from its opening article "Here's a Strange People," which featured a subheading entitled: "A Peculiar People Who Keep Saturday as Sunday, Revere a Prophetess, and Believe the End of the World Is Nigh." Their story began, "Next week one of the most peculiar religious sects in the country, the Seventh-Day Adventists, begin a world's conference in this city." In its initial article it pictured the Millerite movement inundated with wild-eyed fanatics who sold their possessions, donned "shining white robes" and went to the rooftops "with ears attuned to hear the last trump of the Angel Gabriel." Those that survived Millerism eventually became SDAs. James White was viewed as a "strong, hard-headed man whose word was law among his people," and certain of Adventism's "peculiar ideas" were attributed to some of the "peculiar men in their ranks."²⁹

By the second week, the Journal seems to have somewhat mellowed in its description of SDAs, describing them as a "thrifty and sober people" who also maintained a "thrifty and sober religion." It considered that the "thrift, sobriety and industry" that were the "cardinal virtues of [SDAs] creed" had "become embedded in the character of the people." No doubt after attending one of the debates on the horns of Daniel's vision, the reporter noted that SDAs "tackle difficult problems in theology with about the same industry that an earnest man would assail a cord of wood." After discussing the publishing and overseas mission work of the church, the reporter again considered that in everything the church did, "it brings with it thrift, sobriety, and industry, and everywhere it prospers."³⁰

By the end of the week, the Journal was even more upbeat. During the Sabbath worship, people from "all the country round" came and they were

"conspicuous by the sober neatness of their Sabbath dress" and in their faces "shone the radiance of inward peace." This reporter inadvertently identified the key issue of the 1888 session, that of the relationship between the law and the gospel when he considered that it was "either monstrous egotism or sublime faith" that led SDAs to apply Revelation 14:12 ["Here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus"] to themselves."³¹

The day following the Journal article just cited, the Tribune identified what Ellen White would consider the central issue of Minneapolis. It observed that E J Waggoner, "of Oakland, Cal, began a discussion of law and Galatians, or Justification by Faith, that lasted an hour and a half."³² Significantly, the article was describing the meeting of the previous day, October 22, 1888, forty-four years after the "great disappointment." Even earlier, the St Paul newspaper noticed that E J Waggoner, during the opening day of the session, had presented a "sermon or lecture" on the "Law and the Gospel." Waggoner "asked many questions of his hearers," it reported and "at divers times the discussion waxed warm."³³

"According to the testimony of the delegates," affirmed one reporter, "the present conference has been not only a significant one as regard the amount and character of the business done, but it has been unusually animated." Perhaps evidencing the limitations of an outside observer, the reporter observed that "the utmost harmony reigned, and all go away feeling that much has been accomplished," and in a classic inaccuracy entitled his article "A Successful Conference."³⁴ SDA observers would conclude otherwise.

Observations by SDA Participants. Several of the delegates at Minneapolis kept diaries or day-by-day reports of some of the meetings and thus shed some details concerning the events of that session. R D Hotte³⁵, secretary of the Virginia Conference arrived at Minneapolis on Sabbath, October 13, and his diary notes provides some interesting details concerning various meetings,

even though most of his brief notes were non-analytical. He observed that Mrs White, on the opening day of the conference, had already become sufficiently concerning about the spirit of the brethren and spoke "plain to us" following the 7:15 morning meeting. After an illness of several days, Hottel attended the October 25 early morning meeting and was there when Mrs White "went for" Smith and Kilgore concerning their attitude toward the Galatians discussion. At the 5:30 am social meeting on Tuesday, October 30, Mrs White read a letter to the group and "said she never expected to attend another General Conference." Unfortunately, Hottel did not give the context of her statement.

A foretaste of what Adventists would face in the 1890s, was witnessed by those attending the early morning meeting on November 1. After Mrs White and others had spoken, "one man spoke who was a crank on religion" and he alleged that "Christ had come," probably meaning a "spiritual" coming. He was also there the next morning and "Sister White rebuked him" and outlined the history of such theology that had developed shortly after 1844. Mrs White also issued "warnings" concerning that theology.

Hottel attended the 5:30 am meeting on the last day of the conference and experienced an amazing portent of what Adventism's future would bring. Mrs White, who would be in Australia when numerous manifestations of theological aberration would erupt within the United States in the 1890s, was not present at that last meeting, but Hottel noted that several "cranks" were present. After Hottel left Minneapolis and returned home to Virginia, he spent his first Sabbath under a tree comparing the scriptures and the Butler and Waggoner pamphlets on Galatians. Minneapolis would witness to the need for everyone to study the scriptures for themselves.³⁶

L E From, in his research on the 1888 session, sent questionnaires to all of the delegates still alive in the 1930s and thus obtained a number of eyewitness reports of the session. Those reports are analyzed in two chapters

of Froom's Movement of Destiny. Because of the accuracy and astute analysis of F H Westphal's recollections, it is here reproduced. Westphal was a minister from Wisconsin who apparently attended the conference as a non-delegate.

[Westphal] states that the preliminary Institute was held in the basement of the Minneapolis church. And as soon as the Conference proper opened there was a recapitulation of the "basement discussions" for the latecomers. (FHW to LEF, April 28, 1930). Another comprehensive and confirming recital was by C C McReynolds, of Kansas.

When E J Waggoner appeared at the Conference, a blackboard was already in position with two opposing propositions lettered upon it: (1) "RESOLVED--That the Law in Galatians is the Ceremonial Law"--with J H Morrison's name affixed. (2) "RESOLVED--That the Law in Galatians is the Moral Law"--

This last proposition was for Waggoner to sign. But he refused to do so for, he said, he had not come to debate. Moreover, his fundamental point was that we do not get righteousness by law, but by faith--irrespective of whether it be moral or ceremonial. (Jessie F Moser-Waggoner to LEF, April 16, 1930.) . . .

Westphal likewise reported that on the opening day of the Conference he too saw the blackboard with the two propositions. Westphal similarly stated that the reason Waggoner did not sign the second proposition was that he did not believe that salvation could be earned through either the moral or the ceremonial law--that if one could earn salvation by obedience to the law, then it would not have been necessary for Christ to die for us. (FHW to LEF, April 28, 1930; also in personal interviews.)

Westphal stressed the point that the concept was held by not a few that by fully obeying the moral law we could obtain salvation. But trying to do the same through the ceremonial law would bring one under the curse of the law by denying that Christ had died for us, and that forgiveness of sins comes only as a consequence of His death. . . .

Waggoner was neither courting debate nor afraid to debate. He simply said Righteousness is a gift, and cannot be earned. The paramount question was, Shall we continue to attempt to earn salvation, or shall we receive it as a gift from Christ?

Westphal states that he had studied the Butler pamphlet on Galatians thoroughly as a textbook. He was teacher of the German Bible doctrines class at Battle Creek, and had had similar studies under Uriah Smith. He was thus well acquainted with the current teachings, and was fully committed to them and faithfully reflected them. At the time they seemed logical to him. (FHW to LEF, April 28, 1930.)³⁷

Westphal, in his analysis, has clearly noticed the difference between the pioneer understanding of justification and that of Jones and Waggoner. Justification to the pioneers was seen solely as the means of obtaining forgiveness and final salvation depended upon the righteousness that was

received through obedience to the moral law. Waggoner stressed that the righteousness that came from obedience to the law was insufficient, for only Christ's righteousness was adequate and that righteousness came as a gift of faith. Because Westphal, with his prior familiarity with the debate over Galatians, was clearly in a position to observe the new message in comparison with that of the old, his observation is of vital importance. And his recognition that, in the pioneer understanding, final salvation depended upon personal obedience to the moral law or sanctification, is fully in harmony with the evidence. Westphal's observation identifies justification by faith at the center of the debate at Minneapolis.

W C White and Minneapolis. As the session neared its close, Willie White began to describe some of its particulars to those not in attendance. Somewhat diplomatically he wrote Kansas minister, Smith Sharp that "this has been a very interesting conference, and although not accompanied with all that peace and harmony that sometimes has been manifest, it is perhaps as profitable meeting as was ever held, for many important principles were made prominent." White believed that "many" would leave that meeting, "determined to study the Bible as never before," and the result would be "clearer preaching."³⁸

White was more frank when he described the conference to his wife. He considered that it had been a "remarkable conference," where negative influences had "to be met at every step." While those "influences" made great calls for unity and "having everything brought into perfect harmony," White observed that the steps necessary to create that harmony were "overlooked." Indeed, he observed that "there is almost a craze for orthodoxy." The 1888 "craze for orthodoxy" went so far, he observed that a resolution was proposed that "no new doctrine be taught [in colleges] till it had been adopted by the General Conference." Willie White claimed some role in defeating that motion: "Mother and I killed it dead, after a hard fight," he wrote his wife. Willie

White sensed the feeling of alienation that was extended him at Minneapolis and told his wife he had made himself "very unpopular at this meeting" because of the positions he took, and even more so "by things" he was accused of doing, but had not done. He was already sensing, on the next to last day of the conference, the alienation that would be extended to both he and his mother after Minneapolis.³⁹

In his description of the conference to pioneer J N Loughborough, Willie White told of the varying interpretations of Minneapolis that were already within Adventism. Some of the delegates believed Minneapolis was "the greatest blessing of their lives," while others considered that "it marked the beginning of a period of darkness, and that the evil effects of what had been done at the conference could never be effaced." Willie himself was philosophical about the conference and considered that "all things work together for good to those who love God."⁴⁰

White was especially open in his evaluation of the conference to O A Olsen, who had been elected GC president at Minneapolis. White saw "some features" of the Minneapolis conference that he "could not understand," while there were other features that he well understood, but "are not very pleasant to write about." What he did understand was the "influences" that had "been working for some time which culminated at this meeting in the manifestation of a spirit of pharisaism." W C White considered that Minneapolis represented the culmination of a long-term development within Adventism and he told Olsen that that evaluation was not only his own for his mother had first named that long-term development as SDA pharisaism. White also had already noticed the diverging paths from Minneapolis:

The delegates at the close of the meeting carried away very different impressions. Many felt that it was one of the most profitable meetings that they ever attended; others, that it was the most unfortunate conference ever held. Some who left the meeting before it closed carried high[ly] colored reports to Battle Creek and

other places of quite a discouraging character. Mother has met this spirit and rebuked it at every turn.⁴¹

White went on to describe the resignations of Butler and Smith and his own appointment as temporary GC president until Olsen could return from Europe. White's appointment, while unwelcome by him, provided the occasion for certain organizational developments that came as an immediate aftermath of the Minneapolis experience. The General Conference Committee met at Battle Creek after the GC session and while Willie White was meeting with his mother one morning, the committee in his absence chose him acting president. White thereafter proposed a "division of responsibility among the members of the committee" and that suggestion resulted in the "appointment of various members of the committee for different sections of the country as counselors." The rationale for this precursor to the idea of union organization was given by W C White:

Mother has told me that it has been shown her that it would be more pleasing to God and for the advancement of the cause, if men should be chosen to take charge of the work in various divisions of the country, each one acting freely in his field, not referring all questions to one man, because the field is too large for one man to carry all the burdens. Then she says these men should meet together frequently for consultation and the formation of plans, all meet as equals, each expressing freely his views and listening with respect to the views of others. And it really seems that we must adopt some such plans as this for our work is certainly too broad for any one or two men to understand and manage, in all its detail.⁴²

The movement toward dissemination of authority away from the control of Battle Creek seemed to indicate that one of the lessons of Minneapolis was being learned by the church. Ellen White certainly agreed that pre-1888 concepts of leadership and organization had been judged inadequate at Minneapolis. On the last day of the conference she wrote to her daughter-in-law that "a sick man's mind has had a controlling power over the General Conference Committee and the ministers have been the shadow and echo of Elder Butler about as long as it is healthy and for the good of the cause." The

result was apparent at Minneapolis, "Envy, evil surmisings, jealousies have been working like leaven until the whole lump seemed to be leavened."⁴³

One of the results from mistaken concepts of organization was that while Ellen White was "grateful to God for the strength and freedom and power of His spirit in bearing my testimony" at Minneapolis, yet her testimony "has made the least impression upon many minds than at any period before in my history." Satan had been able to hinder her work to a remarkable degree. Minneapolis had been a "most laborious meeting" for Mrs White for she had "to watch at every point lest there should be moves made, resolutions passed, that would prove detrimental to the future work." Although she spoke "nearly 20 times with great freedom," she had "the hardest and most incomprehensible tug of war we have ever had among our people." Indeed, Mrs White wondered, "what would have been in this meeting if we had not been here, I tremble to think."⁴⁴

Ellen White at Minneapolis. The notes taken by Willie White⁴⁵ at the conference are much more detailed than those of Hottel, and his notes, along with pertinent Ellen White observations will be considered here. The Whites arrived at Minneapolis Monday, October 8 in time to find Butler's October 1 letter waiting and by the third day of the institute, Mrs White "bore a very plain testimony to our brethren" that "had quite an effect upon them." But later that day during the Friday evening sermon, the "gloom" of Adventism's past burst forth and it depressed Ellen White. She observed:

At the commencement of the Sabbath Eld Farnsworth preached a most gloomy discourse telling of the great wickedness and corruption in our midst and dwelling upon the apostacies among us and there was no light, no good cheer, no spiritual encouragement in this discourse. There was a general gloom diffused among the delegates to the conference. But the Lord gave me testimony calculated to encourage. My own soul was blessed and light seemed to spring up amid the darkness.⁴⁶

Willie White took notes on some of the "gloomy" details of Farnsworth's talk on the initial Sabbath at Minneapolis and Farnsworth's picture seemed indeed to be a severe indictment upon Adventism's past. Farnsworth considered

that Adventists were in a "time of indifference" and decried the "iniquity among us." Because of the sins within the church, Adventists were being separated from God. Campmeeting revivals were no longer sufficient stimulus to Adventists for like metals, every time SDAs were "heated and then cool, they grow harder." Not only had some 13 or 14 ministers left Adventism in the past two years, but "some have gone into iniquity and nastiness too horrible to be told." The answer to Farnsworth was a greater emphasis upon sanctification. "We should bring before all the relation that a converted man should sustain to God" for "his whole life should be devoted to God."⁴⁷

Not only did Ellen White attempt to create a different atmosphere during that Friday night meeting, but the next day in her Sabbath morning sermon she sought to create a different setting for the delegates. She set a stark contrast between the old and new as she observed the congregation and reported, "I look over this congregation and you look like discouraged men." Ellen White's solution can be seen in her sermon title variously entitled "Behold What Manner of Love" or "Tell of His Love and Power." Drawing upon 1 John 3:1-9, Ellen White revealed what to her was the essence of 1888 and urged the congregation that it must "take into our souls the great plan of redemption." She told those who were convinced that they had already received the last great truth of the third angel that there was hope for them: "We can become intelligent in regard to this great plan of redemption."⁴⁸ The old and the new was starkly contrasted by Ellen White on that initial Sabbath as we compare her perspective with that of Farnsworth. It is clear that Ellen White was not at war with the pioneers in a personal way, but perceived their manifestations of the old message and its inadequacy. She favored Jones and Waggoner, not because of their complete theological system, but because they represented a new focus upon Christ's righteousness, not the "gloomy" self-righteousness of the past.

Ellen White saw at Minneapolis the potential for that "new energy" that the angel had promised in 1886 and in her initial sermon pleaded: "There is a power here for us that will bring in the light of heaven to our dark world." She proclaimed to the delegates that God "wants you to take a view of His matchless love and His power" and the delegates needed to understand the plan of salvation "from beginning to the close, that we may present it justly to the world." Adventists in the past had not presented that plan "justly" and they needed to "talk of the crucified and risen Saviour" and that would move them from the gloom: "We want to act like individuals who are redeemed by the blood of Christ; we are to rejoice in the blood of Christ and in the forgiveness of sins." Gloom came because of the focus upon self-righteousness and the fears of final events and Ellen White urged a different perspective: "Don't make a time of trouble before it comes," she pleaded.⁴⁹ The debate on the horns began the day following Ellen White's sermon and the next day Uriah Smith said he was not willing to "sit calmly by and see" the Adventist "foundation stone[s] taken out with ruthless hands." Later that same day, E J Waggoner proclaimed that justification by faith was "our anchor," and "a key to unlock."⁵⁰ The old and the new were struggling at Minneapolis.

Butler Judges Himself. We have already examined much of the content of the letter George Butler sent Ellen White on October 1, 1888, in which Butler was very revealing concerning his views of Ellen White's inspiration, his concept of leadership and organization, his understanding of the nature of SDA ministry, his view of how theological issues should be resolved. All of those concepts, held by many of the pioneers, were judged by Adventism's new message and found inadequate at Minneapolis. But Butler revealed even more in his 42-page letter to Ellen White. Yet more revealing was Mrs White's response to Butler which she made on Sunday, October 14, the day after her initial Sabbath sermon.

Perhaps Butler symbolically represented the failure of the pioneer position of works righteousness when he informed Ellen White at the beginning of his letter that, in his illness, he was "not in much pain unless I try to arouse up and do something." The new message would focus upon what Christ had done and the poverty of those who believed in the merit of their righteousness was everywhere apparent. While Ellen White had consistently looked upon her past physical illnesses as an evidence of her own inadequacy and dependance upon God, Butler went so far as to blame Ellen White and her apparent support of Waggoner for his illness. He was not alone in blaming Ellen White for in a section crossed out, but still legible in the letter he sent Mrs White, Butler affirmed that his wife had "no doubt but what it was" Ellen White's actions that resulted in her husband's illness. But true to his theology, the GC president saw merit in his "unjust" suffering as he quoted 1 Peter 2:19 to Mrs White. ["For one is approved if, mindful of God, he endures pain while suffering unjustly."]51

It is difficult to explain the bluntness of the Butler letter to Ellen White except for the severe mental anguish that he must have been going through and as an illustration of the poverty of the system he represented. Butler went through most of the foundation stones of the pioneer system and every position was judged inadequate to stand at Minneapolis and Ellen White would tell him as much. One might place a symbolic interpretation upon another of Butler's evaluations as he came toward the end of his massive letter: "I think now that you will be fully prepared to say that the time has come for me to retire from all public and official trusts in this body." He considered that Ellen White "will think my views so blind and darkened, that I must be unfit to hold any such positions, doubtless."52

While Ellen White would recognize that Butler had exhibited traits in the presidency that had been harmful to the church, she also realized that the

church needed the positive perspectives of the pioneers and would not recommend the course that Butler seemed to be recommending for himself. Perhaps again symbolically judging the poverty of the system that he was seeking to entrench, he again exhibited the inadequacy of personal works righteousness:

I am here on a sick bed, a poor broken down nerveless man. . . . I have tried to labor with an unselfish purpose in this cause, doing all I could in labor, giving all I could in means. . . . But I have got to the point where I feel that my only chance is to throw up the sponge. . . . If it were God's will it would be a pleasure for me to sleep in the grave until the troubles are overpast. . . . I have tried to do my best. I have committed no crimes, or disgraced my name or reputations, or taken a politic or underhanded policy, but have tried to leave a record I would not be ashamed to meet.⁵³

As Butler closed his letter, he exhibited two hopeful words as he plead: "May God have mercy upon us all is my prayer. Your unworthy brother in the work, George Butler." The retiring GC president had been driven to the fullest dependence upon Christ by his own sense of weakness. If he had not been so tied to his past theological preconceptions, what beauty the "gospel" in Galatians could have offer him and perhaps he too could have offered something to Jones and Waggoner.

Ellen White spent a good portion of Sunday, October 14, preparing her 19-page response to Butler's letter. She wrote "inadequate" in her evaluations of Butler's concept of the presidency, his view of himself as guardian of the doctrines of Adventism, the spirit he had unleashed that was pervading Minneapolis and causing the "ministers generally" to discard the light being presented there. Inadequate also was Butler's view of inspiration and church organization. Perhaps her most devastating evaluation of Butler and the inadequacy of Adventism's past was her recalling of her 1886 vision and the words of the angel who had warned that "a time of trial was before us, and great evils would be the result of the Pharisaism which has in a large degree taken possession of those who occupy important positions in the work of God." Those evils could come in very unexpected ways, for the angel said that neither

E J Waggoner nor G I Butler "have all the light upon the law, neither position is perfect." For that reason, Ellen White warned, "Let there be no such oppression of conscience as is revealed in these meetings" for God "has not laid this work of judging upon any man."⁵⁴

Ellen White told Butler that she foresaw far-reaching results from the spirit of Pharisaism she witnessed at Minneapolis and saw her own mission being hindered: "Faithful warnings and admonitions sent from God will be scorned by some, unheeded by others, and the influence of this meeting will be as far-reaching as eternity." Instead of realizing the "justice, mercy, and the love of God," "blindness and self-righteousness" would be the focus of some. Butler was deceived if he considered Ellen White responsible for his illness for if he had received her counsel in "in the right spirit, it would have had no such results."⁵⁵

Ellen White's Second Week at Minneapolis. Mrs White against presented the Sabbath sermon during the second Sabbath of the session and she warned the delegates "what a terrible thing it is" to reject God's light and warned that "God will withdraw His Spirit unless His truth is accepted." Those looking for new insights into the plan of salvation could have clearly perceived the perfect righteousness of "our substitute" made available to sinners through the mediatorial work of Christ. "The human race is accepted" because "God accepts Christ, our substitute," and that saving righteousness was secure in heaven because "the gates are ajar today" for "Christ is in the heavenly sanctuary and your prayers can go up to the Father." Believers could rejoice because "Christ comes in and imputes to me His righteousness in His perfect obedience" to the law. Saving righteousness was available because Christ "imputes to you His righteousness," both active and passive, "because He has died, and because He has been obedient unto every requirement of that transgressed law of God."⁵⁶

It would appear that most of the delegates took Ellen White's message far less seriously than the news reporter who reported the sermon of "a female oracle," who spoke in a "very clear and high pitched voice," and "kept rubbing her hands together" as she spoke.⁵⁷ If SDAs believed an oracle to fit the Webster definition of a "person or agency believed to be in communication with a deity," justification by faith would have been analyzed a lot more closely.

The delegates would have another chance to see a new direction for their church as Ellen White delivered another sermon the next day and again indicted the pioneer assumption that adequate righteousness could be acquired through obedience to the moral law. Ellen White did not limit her understanding of justification to forgiveness for she informed the congregation, "There is no power in the law to save or to pardon the transgressor." Clearly identifying with Waggoner's Galatian argument, Ellen White defined the purpose of the law: "What then does it do? It brings the repentant sinner to Christ." Acceptable righteousness was received through Christ's merits, not through personal obedience.⁵⁸

That same day, Mrs White continued her amazing indictments of Adventism's past in a statement she made to the ministry. Not only was the past message inadequate, but the basic understanding of the nature of ministry was flawed. Referring to resolutions that had been introduced since the 1886 GC session and were again introduced in 1888 that would prevent new doctrinal teachings being introduced into SDA schools, Mrs White proclaimed that "instructors in our schools should never be bound about by being told that they are to teach only what has been taught hitherto." "Away with these restrictions," she proclaimed. Clearly showing the inadequacy of a basic tenet within the pioneer system, Mrs White looked for theological growth: "That which God gives His servants to speak today would not perhaps have been present truth twenty years ago, but it is God's message for this time."⁵⁹

The "sanctification" that sprang from the pioneer focus on the law was devastatingly pictured as inadequate by Ellen White and she noticed the "evil-speaking and evil-thinking" about fellow-believers that had pervaded the church and "has been current in this conference." The pre-1888 church was indicted by Ellen White: "There is nothing the church lacks so much as the manifestation of Christlike love." The path to true sanctification was presented to the assembled ministers if they would hear it: "We may each reveal that we depend on Christ's righteousness, not upon our own manufactured righteousness." Christ was to become "the center of attraction" of Adventists.⁶⁰

Adventism's ministry was also indicted because it had been fostering a "controversial spirit" developed by "men who have educated themselves as debaters." And even worse, "many, many discourses, like the offering of Cain, are profitless because Christless." The "sermonizers" presented their purely doctrinaire messages and failed to learn how to truly labor for the salvation of others. Ellen White's solution to Adventism's past was consistent and she urged the ministers: "Hang your helpless soul on Jesus Christ."⁶¹

Three days later, Mrs White described the draining nature of her Minneapolis experience in informal remarks to the ministers. Her description of the failure of Adventists who had both the Bible and "the testimony which God has given us" was remarkable. God's professed people were basically not even Christians and that truth was "discouraging to the very life and soul" of Ellen White. Ellen White described a recent vision where she had been shown "sins of every description" among the "ministers and people" and during that very time she heard a voice proclaim that "the time had come when the work in heaven is all activity for the inhabitants of this world." The vision again impressed upon Ellen White, Adventism's greatest deficiency:

The worst thing, the most greivous, is the want of love and the want of compassion one for another. That is what God presented in such a light before me and I wanted to say it to you that if ever

there was [a] time when we should humble ourselves before God it is now.⁶²

The reason for the "want of love" was a flawed concept of the basis for sanctification for "just as soon as [we] begin to lift ourselves up and to think that we are something, the views of Christ grows dimmer and dimmer." The solution was likewise theological: we should "talk of the great plan of redemption and the matchless power of Jesus Christ to come to our world and take upon him human nature that we through him might be elevated." The solution was not optional and Adventism had no divine promise that it could reject vital truth and continue to receive the blessing of the Lord:

What more, says Christ, could I do for my sheep than that I have done. What more? Will he have to let us go? He will unless you change your attitude before God for he has done all he could to save us. According to the light that we have received so is our accountability before God.⁶³

By the next day, Ellen White had decided upon her path from Minneapolis: "If the ministers will not receive the light, I want to give the people a chance; perhaps they may receive it."⁶⁴ Perhaps they might, but as Ellen White analyzed the exposure of Adventism at Minneapolis, she had fears for Adventism's future. She was never more alarmed "than at the present time," and feared the results to the church because "it is not right to fasten ourselves upon the ideas of any one man." Because Elder Kilgore considered it "cowardly" to discuss the law in Galatians in Butler's absence, Mrs White told him: "I was grieved more than I can express to you when I heard you make that remark, because I have lost confidence in you." Not only was Kilgore's position inadequate, but that day Ellen White pronounced another devastating indictment against Adventism's past message and ministry:

I have seen that precious souls who would have embraced the truth have been turned away from it, because of the manner in which the truth has been handled, because Jesus was not in it. And this is what I have been pleading with you for all the time--we want Jesus.⁶⁵

Ellen White wrote "inadequate" to the area that pioneer Adventism considered its strong point. In the absence of stationary pastorates, the key to success in Adventist ministry had always been evangelism and Ellen White was affirming that the very message of the evangelists was inadequate, "because Jesus was not in it." Truly, Adventism was being judged at Minneapolis, but Ellen White also had an optimistic note for those who heard this "morning talk." The message that was beginning to sound at Minneapolis concerning justification by faith, "will stand just as long as time shall last."⁶⁶

As the session neared its conclusion, Ellen White made one last evaluation of the Adventist past as it had been exposed at Minneapolis and also identified the message she would bring to the people the next year. Indeed, Ellen White's analysis of the SDA past was most strongly presented in her last address. "For years" she had received messages that Pharisaism, spiritual pride, self-righteousness, self-sufficiency "was the danger to our people." We have seen that the roots to those defects of character were theological. Because of the debating ministry that had developed, "There are men in our churches all through the land who will pervert the meaning of the Scripture to make a sharp point and overcome an opponent." The result was a failure to appreciate the sacredness of the scriptures.⁶⁷

In a devastating analysis of pre-1888 ministry, Ellen White considered that "the debating spirit" had so permeated Adventist ministry that it had taken "the place of the Spirit of God." Ellen White would "discourage the discipline that tends to make persons debaters," and those who were training to be ministers should not be connected "with one who has a debating spirit." As she evaluated Adventism's past, she told the ministers that "some things must be torn down," and other things "built up." That which was worthwhile from the past "must be reset" within a new framework, "a framework of truth." The Scriptures could not "be treated in a debating style," for that methodology

inhibited perception of vital, new truth. Because that system had prevailed at Minneapolis, Ellen White opposed any decision concerning doctrines being taken there: "It is not wise for one of these young men to commit himself to a decision at this meeting, where opposition, rather than investigation, is the order of the day."⁶⁸

But there was one thing the ministry should committ itself to that was presented at Minneapolis. Ellen White saw "the beauty of truth in the presentation of the righteousness of Christ in relation to the law" as it had been presented there and while many ministers considered that doctrine as one they had always accepted, Ellen White thought otherwise: "You have not presented it in this light heretofore." At Minneapolis, Ellen White again identified the new message:

If our ministering brethren would accept the doctrine which has been presented so clearly--the righteousness of Christ in connection with the law--and I know they need to accept this, their prejudices would not have a controlling power.⁶⁹

But lest the ministers follow the message of a man instead of the Scriptures, Ellen White again referred to her 1886 vision in Europe. In that vision, Mrs White was told "there was not perfection in all points on either side of the question under discussion." Her solution was that "we must search the Scriptures for evidences of truth." Mrs White again quoted her heavenly "Guide" as authority for the fact that Adventists misunderstood the way of salvation:

"There are but few, even of those who claim to believe it, that comprehend the third angel's message, and yet this is the message for this time. It is present truth. But how few take up this message in its true bearing, and present it to the people in its power! With many it has but little force." Said my guide, "There is much light yet to shine forth from the law of God and the gospel of righteousness. This message, understood in its true character, and proclaimed in the Spirit, will lighten the earth with its glory."⁷⁰

Ellen White, through her reflection upon the vision of 1886 and the inspiration from heavenly sources, was telling the church that after 1886,

"There is much light yet to shine" concerning the interrelationship between the law and the gospel and that neither of the two contending groups were "perfect." And there was no guarantee that all of the light that was to shine would shine in 1888. The "loud cry" promise had been given in 1886 and we can see why 1888 could well mark the beginning of the loud cry, but there was no indication that the message of Jones and Waggoner, even as presented at Minneapolis, contained the fullest exposition of that loud cry. As earlier shown, the position of Ellen White on justification by faith, because her analysis more nearly reflected the scriptural position, was a much safer guide to follow.

In this final message, Mrs White outlined two paths that would be taken in the future. One path would be taken by SDA "Pharisees," and by their choice, "they take steps which lead to results of which they have never dreamed." Another path was possible, however, and its results were just as certain: "Truth will triumph gloriously, and those who have received the truth because God has revealed it in His Word, will triumph with it." Ellen White's perception of the Adventist church of the future was hopeful for one specific reason: "One interest will prevail," justification by faith will swallow up every other issue in Adventism.⁷¹

NOTES

1. George Butler, "A Circular Letter to All State Conference Committees and Our Brethren in the Ministry," RG 9, Documents 4 fld.
2. Uriah Smith, "A Bird's Eye View of the Great Field of Prophecy," Bible Echo and Signs of the Times, Jan, 1888 and Smith, "1887," RH, Jan 3, 1888.
3. Uriah Smith, "The Main Point," RH, Jan 3, 1888, emphasis supplied.
4. Ibid.
5. Uriah Smith, "Conditions of Everlasting Life," RH, Jan 31, 1888.
6. Ibid.
7. W c White to Mary White, Jan 1, 1888, WCW 1888 WE.
8. E J Waggoner, "Different Kinds of Righteousness," ST, Feb 24, 1888.
9. Ibid.
10. Ellen White, "Duties and Privileges of the Christian Laborer," RH, July 22, 1884.
11. W C White to Uriah Smith, July 10, 1888, WCW bk B; W C White to George Butler, July 11 and Aug 10, 1888, WCW bk B.
12. O A Olsen to G I Butler, Feb 23 and April 18, 1887, RG 11, bk 1/2.
13. W C White to George Butler, March 23, 1887, WCW bk A-s.
14. After the 1888 session, W C White would observe that Battle Creek had come to represent far more than centralized financial control of the church as he looked toward the 1889 session: "I most earnestly hope that our next conference will not develop such a struggle to break the idea of monopoly in business, as last years' meeting developed over the question of monopoly in the matter of doctrine." [W C White to D T Jones, c Sept 16, 1889, WCW bk H.]
15. W C White to O A Olsen, May 6, 1887, WCW bk A-2.
16. George Butler, "The Next General Conference," RH, June 26, 1888; W C White to George Butler, July 11, 1888, WCW bk B.
17. "A Coming Conference," St Paul Pioneer Press, Oct 15, 1888, p 6.
18. "Very Early Risers," Minneapolis Tribune, Oct 19, 1888, p 5.
19. "All Things Are Ready," St Paul Pioneer Press, Oct 17, 1888, p 6.
20. "Men of Mark," St Paul Pioneer Press, Oct 17, 1888, p 6.
21. "No Business Today," St Paul Pioneer Press, Oct 20, 1888, p 6.
22. "Patiently Waiting Still," Oct 21, 1888, p 3, "Sabbath Disclosures," Oct 22, 1888, p 6, St Paul Pioneer Press.
23. "The Adventist Sunday," St Paul Pioneer Press, Oct 28, 1888, p 6.
24. "The Adventists," Minneapolis Evening Journal, Oct 17, 1888, p 2.
25. Mrs White would be only 61 the next month, but clearly revealed that age had nothing to do with receptivity to truth.
26. "A Female Oracle," Minneapolis Tribune, Oct 21, 1888, p 5.
27. Ibid.
28. "Here's a Strange People," Minneapolis Journal, Oct 13, 1888, p 8 and "Truth Travels in Ships," Oct 19, 1888, p 2.
29. "Here's a Strange People," Minneapolis Journal, Oct 13, 1888, p 8.
30. "Truth Travels in Ships," Minneapolis Journal, Oct 19, 1888, p 2.
31. "The Saturday Sabbath," Minneapolis Journal, Oct 22, 1888, p 2.
32. "They Are for Temperance," Minneapolis Tribune, Oct 23, 1888, p 5.
33. "Religion in a Rainstorm," St Paul Pioneer Press, Oct 19, 1888, p 6.
34. "A Successful Conference," St Paul Pioneer Press, Nov 2, 1888.
35. Recognition must be given Tom Norris who persisted in examining every nook and cranny of the GC Archives and thus was led to discover the Hottel diary.
36. R Dewitt Hottel, Diary entries for Oct-Nov, 1888, GCA.
37. L E Froom, Movement of Destiny, RH Pub Assn, 1971, pp 243-44, emphasis supplied.
38. W C White to Smith Sharp, Nov 2, 1888, WCW bk D.
39. W C White to Mary White, Nov 3, 1888, WCW 1888 WE.

40. W C White to J N Loughborough, Nov 20, 1888, WCW bk G.
41. W C White to O A Olsen, Nov 27, 1888, WCW bk D.
42. Ibid.
43. Ellen White to Mary White, Nov 4, 1888, W82-88.
44. Ibid.
45. Recognition must go to Tom Norris who persisted in examining every corner of White Estate and thus discovered the Willie White notes on the horns and Galatians discussions. Since Tom's discovery of about a decade ago, even more notes taken by Willie White at Minneapolis have been uncovered.
46. Ellen White to Mary White, Oct 9, 1888 [completed Oct 14], W81-88.
47. Notes on E W Farnsworth Sermon, Oct 12, 1888, WCW Notebook 1888 AA.
48. Ellen White, "Tell of His Love and Power," Oct 13, 1888, Ms 7-88, Willie White Notebook 1888 AA, Oct 13, 1888.
49. Ibid.
50. W C White, Oct 15, 1888, Notebook E.
51. George Butler to Ellen White, Oct 1, 1888, GIB 1888 WE.
52. Ibid.
53. Ibid.
54. Ellen White to George Butler, Oct 14, 1888, B21-88.
55. Ibid.
56. Ellen White, "Advancing in Christian Experience," Oct 20, 1888, Ms 8-88.
88. While Ellen White uses the terms "imputed" and "imparted" somewhat interchangeably in this sermon, knowledge of her objective focus has guided the preceding analysis. Chapter 5 has provided the framework for such analysis.
57. "A Female Oracle," Minneapolis Tribune, Oct 21, 1888, p 5.
58. Ellen White, "A Chosen People," Oct 21, 1888, Ms 17-88.
59. Ellen White, "Counsel to Ministers," Oct 21, 1888, Ms 17-88.
60. Ibid.
61. Ibid.
62. Ellen White, Statement Following "Remarks on Missionary Work," Oct 23, 1888, Ms 10-88, WCW bk 6.
63. Ibid, emphasis supplied.
64. Ellen White, "Morning Talk," Oct 24, 1888, Ms 9-88.
65. Ellen White, Morning Talk, Oct 24, 1888, Ms 9-88.
66. Ibid.
67. Ellen White, "Need for a Deeper Study of the Word," Nov, 1888, Ms 15-88.
- 88.
68. Ibid.
69. Ibid, emphasis supplied.
70. Ibid.
71. Ibid, get reference for second quote.

Chapter 9

Ottawa, 1889: Diverging Paths From Minneapolis

In late 1903, O A Olsen, president of the General Conference from late 1888 to 1897, received a copy of an Ellen White testimony entitled "Decided Action to Be Taken Now." That testimony warned against the theology found in the book Living Temple, written by John Harvey Kellogg and approved by both Jones and Waggoner. In her testimony, Mrs White observed that "God has permitted the present crisis to come to open the eyes of those who desire to know the truth." Her issuance of that testimony during the Kellogg crisis of 1903 was indeed a bolt of truth to Olsen as he contemplated his past presidency.

He especially reacted to the point made in the testimony that the theology of the Living Temple had been developing "for years" and been received "even by men who have had a long experience in the truth." Olsen, president of the British Union Conference in 1903, wrote to the current GC president, A G Daniells and referred to the long-term roots of the Kellogg theology. As Olsen reflected he looked backward not to Kellogg, a nontheologian, but to the theological system of Jones and Waggoner of the 1890s.

Indeed, Olsen observed that Waggoner himself had claimed to have been the responsible source for the theology in Kellogg's book. Olsen thus observed that the theology was developed by the "best Bible teacher in the denomination" and thereby attained a "very high prestige."¹

In 1903, Olsen recalled the dilemma he faced during his past presidency. He outlined his situation somewhat as follows: (1) church leadership, prior to 1889, had opposed the Jones-Waggoner theology; (2) in 1888, Mrs White had thrown her entire support to Jones and Waggoner; (3) because of Mrs White's support, Jones and Waggoner had set the theological tone of Adventism throughout the 1890s; (4) during the period of the 1890s, Olsen as well as

others sensed something wrong with aspects of the Jones-Waggoner theology, but were powerless to understand its divergent characteristics and were hindered since they assumed Jones and Waggoner had the fullest support of Mrs White and were also ranked as the outstanding theologians of the denomination; (5) now, in 1903, it would appear that the erroneous theology of Jones and Waggoner had reached such proportions that the church was approaching the nullification of its central message and Mrs White was warning the church against that erroneous theology.² Indeed, Mrs White had stated:

Men have given to our leading physician [John Harvey Kellogg] allegiance that is due to God alone; and he has been permitted to show what self-exaltation will lead men to do. . . . Few can see the meaning of the present apostasy. But the Lord has lifted the curtain, and has shown me its meaning, and the result that it will have if allowed to continue.³

The author hopes in this chapter to suggest that the roots to the aberrant theology that were confronted in 1903 were consistently present in the theological system of Jones and Waggoner because they lacked objective views of justification. Those roots of aberration are visible in the presentations on justification by faith given by A T Jones in May of 1889 at the Ottawa, Kansas, campmeeting. And it is also true that the elements of Jones' contribution to Adventism's "new" message are also present. Since Ellen White was present at the Ottawa campmeetings, implications concerning the nature of her endorsement of the theology of Jones and Waggoner are of overriding importance.

The aberrant aspect of the Jones theology might not have developed if the spirit of disunity that flourished at Minneapolis could have been dispelled. The pioneers, who opposed Jones and Waggoner in 1888 did have insight into objective righteousness, but applied it solely to the past.

Ellen White's Concept of Her 1889 Role. As the breath slowly left the dying husband of Ellen White in 1881, a new vision of her role entered her consciousness. In late 1888 she reflected upon that vision and recalled that she even yet was at a loss for words to describe the intensity she felt as she

"discerned" the new mission she was given in 1881. She understood that her ministry was to take on "a burden stronger" than she had previously borne.⁴

The experience and insight of Mrs White in 1881 became the basis for her actions during 1889. She believed that Satan was exercising his powers upon the Adventist church by creating dissension and thereby distracting the church from the vital message necessary for the church to receive. She believed that "tenderness, kindness, and esteem for one another," would end such dissension. As she reflected upon her attendance at the meetings held in Minneapolis in October, 1888, she considered it "the saddest experience" of her life because of the "harshness, of disrespect, and the want of sympathetic love in brother toward brother." She emphasized that because of those attitudes, truth did not have its proper forum at Minneapolis and she vowed to do her best to create a different atmosphere in 1889. She fervently committed herself:

I have pledged myself by a solemn vow to God that wherever this spirit of contempt and unkindness and want of love should exist, I would lay it out in clear lines before my brethren, show them the sinfulness of their course, and with decided testimony turn the current if possible.⁵

It was no doubt providential that Mrs White reacted so negatively to the spirit she witnessed at Minneapolis that she reconsidered "that confidence which [she] had hitherto had that God was leading and controlling the minds and hearts of my brethren." She considered that she "dare not rely upon the wisdom of my brethren" because they were looking "in large degree to the men they have set before them in the place of God." And as she saw the continuation of the Minneapolis spirit into 1889, Mrs White became ever more convinced of her role. As her "spirit stirred within" her, Mrs White told the brethren that a spirit of "Phariseeism had been at work" at Battle Creek and that spirit had permeated the denomination and that she had received a message from the Lord "and with pen and voice" intended to work "until this leaven was expelled and a new leaven was introduced, which was the grace of Christ."⁶

Clearly considering that the church was immersed in a crisis situation, Mrs White proclaimed that "a reformation must go through the churches." Adventists, who had previously been blessed with great light were now in a state of "spiritual weakness and blindness." In a statement surrounded with devastating implications, Ellen White observed:

As reformers they had come out of the denominational churches, but they now act a part similar to that which the [fallen] churches acted. We hoped that there would not be the necessity for another coming out. While we will endeavor to keep the "unity of the Spirit" in the bonds of peace, we will not with pen or voice cease to protest against bigotry.⁷

Ellen White considered that the "spirit of bigotry" that prevailed at Minneapolis nullified the opportunity for the vital truth of justification by faith to be perceived. She believed that only "shadows and dark outlines" of truth were perceived at that session. She observed "a remarkable blindness upon the minds of many," and was "pained" to consider that it was those responsible for being the guardians of the flock that were so blinded. Those who were so lacking in knowledge of "what constituted true Christian experience" had "no sense that the enemy of all good was guiding their judgment."⁸

Mrs White believed that Satanic forces had successfully plotted at Minneapolis to divide the church and create an atmosphere that would inhibit the acceptance of the vital truth Adventism needed. She recognized that her attempts at Minneapolis to dispel that atmosphere were unsuccessful and sorrowed that "there was a spirit upon our brethren that I never met in them before." As she looked toward 1889, Mrs White vowed to attempt to create an atmosphere where truth could flourish. That concept of her role partially explains her consistent emphasis upon the interrelationship between Christian graces and perception of truth:

We know that if all would come to the Scriptures with hearts subdued and controlled by the influence of the Spirit of God, there would be brought to the examination of the Scriptures a calm mind,

free from prejudice and pride of opinion. The light from the Lord would shine upon His Word and the truth would be revealed.⁹

As Ellen White reflected upon the eschatological setting and the intolerance that would be exhibited in the world, she had fears for a similar atmosphere of intolerance within the SDA church. As she perceived such possibilities in the future, she consistently urged a brotherly spirit of unity that would prevent a magnification of theological differences. She warned:

Shall there be with the people of God the cropping out of the very same spirit which they have condemned in the denominations, because there was a difference of understanding on some points--not vital questions? Shall the same spirit in any form be cherished among Seventh-day Adventists--the cooling of friendship, the withdrawal of confidence, the misrepresentation of motives, the endeavor to thwart and turn into ridicule those who honestly differ with them in their views? I have in my last few weeks' experience, learned what little dependence may be placed in man, for these things must be met. Alienation and bitterness give evidence that if possible Satan will deceive even those who claim to believe the truth for this time, showing that they have need to study the character of pure and undefiled religion.¹⁰

Mrs White became even more specific about the roots to the alienation that resulted at Minneapolis:

A difference in the application of some few scriptural passages makes men forget their religious principles. Elements become banded together, exciting one another through the human passions to withstand in a harsh, denunciatory manner everything that does not meet their ideas. This is not Christian, but is of another spirit. And Satan is doing his utmost to have those who believe present truth deceived on this point, for he has laid his snare to overcome them, that those who have accepted unpopular truth, who have had great light and great privileges, shall have the spirit that will pervade the world. Even if it is in a less degree, yet it is the same principle that when it has a controlling power over minds, leads to certain results. There is pride of opinion, a stubbornness that shuts the soul away from good and from God.¹¹

When Ellen White might consider the intricate points of theological dispute at Minneapolis "not vital questions," her ministering brethren had far different concepts of the points at issue, for in their minds the debate over Galatians involved a vital issue theologically and to them, it also involved the question of the integrity of the Spirit of Prophecy.

During the Minneapolis meetings, Mrs White responded to the assertion that "if our view of Galatians is not correct, then we have not the third angel's message," by emphasizing that "the question at issue is not a vital question and should not be treated as such." In her stress upon unity, she purposely deemphasized the importance of the theological issues surrounding Galatians that would warrant the negative spirit created. Her apparent sympathy to the new position on Galatians, however, created certain doubts regarding her role as a prophetess since many considered that she had theologically resolved the Galatians controversy years before. This assumption caused many to suppose that Mrs White had recently been influenced by her son, A T Jones, and E J Waggoner, the proponents of the new position. This then, to many, meant that the church in 1888 had a compromised prophetess and that conclusion was evidenced by a low esteem given to Mrs White's actions at Minneapolis and thereafter. Rather than directly analyzing her past views on Galatians, however, Mrs White countered:

When men in high positions of truth will, when under pressure, say that Sister White is influenced by any human being they certainly have no more use for messages that come from such a source. This was freely spoken at the Minneapolis meeting, and it came from the lips of men who were acquainted with me, with my manner of life, and the character of my labor, men who had made the most of the testimonies in times past in correcting existing evils in the churches, who had felt no hesitancy in declaring their authenticity--that they bore the Divine credentials. . . .

Why were not these men, who knew of these things, afraid to lift their hand against me and my work for no reason except their imagination that I was not in harmony with their spirit and their course of action toward men [i.e. Jones and Waggoner] whom they and I had reason to respect. These men were just as sincere as those who criticized, men of correct principles--but who did not harmonize with their views concerning the law in Galatians. I knew how the Lord regarded their spirit and action and if they did thus in ignorance, through perverted ideas, they have had all the opportunity God will ever give them to know He has given these men a work to do, and a message to bear which is present truth for this time.¹²

Some years later W C White would analyze the relationship between Galatians and understandings of the nature of Ellen White's inspiration:

Those who stood . . . for the old position regarding the law in Galatians, argued long and loud that it would be very detrimental to our work to change our position. . . . They believed that the old positions had been sanctioned by the Testimonies, and to make a change would unsettle the confidence of our people everywhere in the Testimonies; and this, they regarded as the most serious feature of the whole question.¹³

Uriah Smith continued to believe that the veracity of the Spirit of Prophecy and indeed of the denominational theological structure were at stake in the Galatians issue. His position in September of 1892, over a year after his public confession concerning his Minneapolis opposition, remained essentially the same:

Up to a certain ill-fated move our cause might be called a unit, and it was our boast that Seventh-day Adventists preached the same thing from Maine to California, from Minnesota to the Gulf. But, sad to say, it is not so now. This unity was broken when the articles [on Galatians] appeared in the Signs, and in the Sabbath School lessons, and in the instructions given at the Healdsburg College on the law in Galatians, contrary to what has been considered the settled view of the body, according to the Scriptures, confirmed by the Spirit of Prophecy, as long ago as 1856. Since those articles appeared division and confusion have been coming in.¹⁴

Smith, in contrast to Ellen White, greatly magnified the theological points of dispute. He did so to such an extent that he missed the essential point that Ellen White was emphasizing: righteousness, even in the last days, came as a gift, just as did forgiveness. Notice Smith's 1892 description of the Galatians question:

The whole question turns on this: Is what the Review teaches correct? If it is, then the objection should be, not to what it teaches, but to what conflicts with it. And then the proper question would be, not why the Review is permitted to teach as it does, but why the General Conference permits others to go around teaching contrary to the views which we have always maintained? If these views are wrong, then we have been wrong for the past thirty years, and Seventh-day Adventism has been developed and built up on error. But this I am not prepared to admit. I am not yet prepared to renounce Seventh-day Adventism. If the new views proposed were simply some advance on the light we have already received, as was the sanctuary and third message in 1845, I could accept them as gladly as anyone. I am always ready for light in that direction; but when that which is presented as light obliges us to tear up the past, and consider that that which we have long believed to be light, has been only darkness, that is a very different matter.¹⁵

It is thus apparent that Uriah Smith continued to harbor the same concepts after 1891, the date of his confession, that he held at Minneapolis. In 1888 he considered that Jones and Waggoner were, "with ruthless hands" tearing up the past denominational positions. This magnification of points of theological difference bred the spirit of Minneapolis. In 1892, Smith not only considered that the Galatians issue was a vital matter, but believed that acceptance of the new position would destroy confidence in the ministry of Ellen White. Note his continuation of his argument:

The positions involved are, as I look at it, fundamental and vital to the existence of our faith. For, if the law of which Paul speaks in Galatians is only the moral law, if the added law and the schoolmaster is the Ten Commandments, if this, as it is now taught, can be established, it overthrows the Testimonies and the Sabbath; for no one who really believes that the law which was added only till the Seed should come, is the Ten Commandments, can longer plead for the perpetuity of the Sabbath. . . .

Now, when I see the main pillars of our faith being undermined in this way, Brother Robinson, I cannot accept it, I care not who teaches it, nor by whom nor under what sanction they are sent out. I hold the Review to be the organ of the denomination, and it should represent its principles and views. But the denomination is not those who may at any particular time compose the General Conference Committee, nor is it any particular series of Institutes or Schools. But it is this people, and this system of truth which has grown up during the whole history of this work. . . .

But, if the whole body come to deliberately adopt some of the views which are now being set forth, then they may count me out; for I can not receive them, and still claim to be a Seventh-day Adventist.¹⁶

Ironically, it would be Ellen White who not only accepted the new position on Galatians, but advanced far beyond the theological system embraced by both the pioneers and by Jones and Waggoner and prevented Seventh-day Adventism from marching into rank Pharisaic legalism or Sabbath-keeping Pentecostalism, the path later taken by Jones and Waggoner. In addition to purposely downplaying the particular theological points of dispute regarding Galatians, Mrs White countered the argument that the new position on Galatians destroyed confidence in the Spirit of Prophecy. She likewise disputed the contention that the emphasis upon righteousness as a gift and the moral law as a "schoolmaster"

destroyed the denominational defense of the perpetuity of the law. She emphasized:

 Holding up Christ as our only source of strength, presenting His matchless love in having the guilt of the sins of men charged to His account and His own righteousness imputed to man, in no case does away with the law or detracts from its dignity. Rather, it places it where the correct light shines upon and glorifies it. This is done only through the light reflected from the Cross of Calvary. The law is complete and full in the great plan of salvation, only as it is presented in the light shining from the crucified and risen Saviour. This can be only spiritually discerned. It kindles in the heart of the beholder ardent faith, hope, and joy that Christ is his righteousness. This joy is only for those who love and keep the words of Jesus, which are the words of God. Were my brethren in the light the words that the Lord gave me for them would find a response in the hearts of those for whom I labored.¹⁷

As early as 1890, Mrs White confronted Uriah Smith with his false concept of the role of the Spirit of Prophecy in relating to the theological controversy over Galatians as she wrote him that he had "turned from plain light" because of his fear that the new position in Galatians would "have to be accepted." Ellen White was here clearly hinting that an issue larger than Galatians was involved, as indeed, the question of a new insight on justification by faith did transcend the Galatians controversy. "As to the law in Galatians," wrote Mrs White, "I have no burden and never have had."¹⁸

It seems that Mrs White did not consider that her earlier statement on Galatians, and her writings in Life of Paul and in several other places on that subject should be seen as a hindrance to the Biblical resolution of the points under dispute. Her apparent de-emphasis of the relevance of the theological points at issue must be understood in the context of the spirit of "Phariseeism" that the friction seemed to generate. She consistently emphasized that such an atmosphere inhibited the perception of truth. Her role in 1888 and afterward seemed to be that of creating an atmosphere for truth to flourish, rather than to emphasize the points of difference or to resolve the theological differences herself. Indeed, this might well have been her primary

role in the earlier discussions regarding the Galatians issue in the 1850s. She made that point to both Butler and Smith in 1887:

I am troubled; for the life of me I cannot remember that which I have been shown in reference to the two laws. I cannot remember what the caution and warning referred to were that were given to Elder [J H] Waggoner [in 1856-57]. It may be it was a caution not to make his ideas prominent at that time, for there was great danger of disunion.¹⁹

She also emphasized the importance of a proper forum for truth to flourish as she sent the following warning to Smith and Butler the year prior to the Minneapolis meetings:

I want to see no Pharisaism among us. The [Galatians] matter now has been brought so fully before the people by yourself as well as Dr Waggoner, that it must be met fairly and squarely in open discussion. I see no other way and if this cannot be done without a spirit of Pharisaism then let us stop publishing these matters and learn more fully lessons in the school of Christ. . . . If we have any point that is not fully, clearly defined and can not bear the test of criticism, don't be afraid or too proud to yield it. . . . We see more and greater need of close communion with God and greater need of unity. . . . We want Bible evidence for every point we advance. . . . But let none feel that we know all the truth the Bible proclaims.²⁰

While the church leadership stalled over the controversy regarding Galatians, Mrs White identified with the essential message of the Jones and Waggoner emphasis and affirmed that she could respond so readily to the "message for this time" because "the righteousness of Christ and the entire sacrifice made in behalf of man [had] been imprinted indelibly on [her] mind." She boldly identified the essential aspect of the new message:

The third angel's message is the proclamation of the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus Christ. The commandments of God have been proclaimed, but the faith of Jesus Christ has not been proclaimed by Seventh-day Adventists as of equal importance, the law and gospel going hand in hand. I cannot find language to express this subject in its fulness.²¹

She believed that the new message provided vital insights to prepare God's people to stand during the time of trouble and believed that message of the "pure gospel" should be given to the world. She emphasized that the SDA church "was years behind" in proclaiming that message and "yet men in responsible

positions" were keeping that message from the denomination and that message was "the key of knowledge" that the church desperately needed.²²

As Mrs White looked toward 1889, she became convinced that nothing should be allowed to inhibit the new message since it was desperately needed to correct Adventism's skewed concepts. "A false religion has come in among us, a legal religion," she proclaimed. She resolved: "We will not keep silent. The church must be roused. We will secure halls in the cities and put out handbills and the people shall be enlightened."²³

Mrs White responded to the new message as presented by A T Jones in Chicago in April of 1889 and observed:

Oh, how hard it was to educate the people to look away from themselves to Jesus and to His righteousness. A continuous effort has had to be put forth. . . .

If this message that has been preached here is not present truth for this time, I know not how we can determine what is truth. . . .

All regret that they have been so long ignorant of what constituted true religion. They are sorry that they have not known that it was true religion to depend entirely upon Christ's righteousness, and not upon works of merit.²⁴

Mrs White considered that the message Jones was presenting was not just for Seventh-day Adventists, but was indeed a message that SDAs should have for the world. She urged:

I think that Elder A T Jones should attend our large campmeetings, and give to our people and to outsiders as well the precious subject of faith and the righteousness of Christ. There is a flood of light in this subject. . . .

I think that it is robbing the churches of the light and the message for the present time for him not to attend the campmeetings. Let the outsiders understand that we preach the gospel as well as the law.²⁵

A month later, Jones and Mrs White would spend over three weeks together in Ottawa, Kansas, as he presented the gospel to believers and those outside the church. Of the dozen or so workers' institutes and campmeetings attended by Mrs White in 1889, the institute held in Ottawa, Kansas, serves as a model, partly because it was the longest, lasting from May 2 through 27, but primarily because it was reported in detail in the Topeka Daily Capital, the largest

paper in Kansas. The sermon transcripts that appeared in that paper offer perhaps the most detailed opportunity to understand the nature of the message presented in Minneapolis in 1888 and reiterated during 1889.

Kansas Institute and Campmeeting. The Sunday, May 5, 1889, edition of the Topeka Daily Capital, carried front page features that gave details of the death of Civil War writer John S Edwards, a story of a young mute killed by a train near Columbus, Kansas, a report of a stage coach robbery in Eureka Springs, Arkansas, and a report of U.S.-British opposition to German efforts to control the Samoan Islands. The front page also reported that the Kansas City baseball team beat St Louis, 16 to 9, to move within two games of the American Association league leaders and that the annual state gathering of Seventh-day Adventists was under way at the city-owned Forest Park in Ottawa. Between May 5 and 28, the Capital would give detailed accounts and over 40 transcriptions of the sermons, lectures, and studies presented by the speakers at the ministerial and workers' institute and campmeeting held in Ottawa from May 2 to 27, 1889.²⁶ The day-by-day transcriptions provided by the Capital provide us vital evidence relating to the content of the messages on justification by faith presented at Minneapolis in 1888.

The city of Ottawa granted the denomination free use of their Forest Park. The park, within walking distance of the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe railroad depot, contained an assembly hall accommodating approximately 250 that served as the major meeting place during the institute, and also included a large tabernacle that seated 6,000, a modern structure with sloping seats. Because of the free use of the facilities, the denomination was able to accommodate its visitors at a very low cost. Eight meal tickets to the large dining hall could be obtained for \$1, while stabling and water were furnished free and hay and corn were provided very inexpensively. The beautiful Marias des Cygne River ran through the center of the camp and was offset by a large grove of

trees. Perhaps the only negative feature to Adventists found in the beautiful 60-acre park was its race track.

In addition to the officials of the Kansas Conference who attended the meetings, major denominational leaders in attendance included Ellen White and her son, W C White; O A Olsen, General Conference president; Dan T Jones, GC secretary; Clement Eldridge and F E Belden from the International Tract Society; president of Battle Creek College, W W Prescott. Denominational leaders from Texas, Colorado, Nebraska, Iowa and Missouri were also present. The major speaking role was carried by A T Jones, whose transcribed addresses numbered 33 out of the 41 transcribed by the Capital.

The meetings were divided into three major sections: (1) the institute, lasting from May 2 to 13, was designed as a school of instruction for ministers, licentiates, elders and deacons; (2) the workers' meeting, from May 14 to 20, contained instruction for such field workers as Bible instructors, tract and missionary society workers and local church officers; (3) the campmeeting, during which time local conference matters were decided, was held from May 21 to 27. Some 300-350 workers were present for the first two phases of the meetings, while attendance increased to about 800 for the campmeeting. Even during the early stages of the meetings, however, attendance from the citizens of Ottawa swelled the meetings to over 1,000 and sometimes to 2,000 for the weekend meetings.

The normal daily program consisted of the following:

- 5:00--Rising bell
- 5:30--Prayer and social meeting
- 7:00--Breakfast
- 8:00--Devotional or instruction meetings in various tents
(kindergarten, youth, colporteurs, etc)
- 9:15--Review and discussion of previous night's sermon
- 10:00--Class instruction (courses on transcribing of sermons,
etc)
- 1:00--Dinner
- 2:00--Bible study
- 4:00--Class instruction
- 8:00--Evening sermon

An interesting and typical feature of the institute phase of the meetings was the class offered on shorthand reporting. The Capital reported, "Nearly all carried tablets, pencils and full notes of all class exercises and reports of sermons and lectures" were thus taken. It was obviously through this means that the Capital was able to report full transcriptions of the major sermons.

The instruction and devotional courses were composed of three central areas: religious liberty, church government, and justification by faith. A T Jones took all three series at Ottawa, giving 14 lectures on religious liberty, 13 on church government, and 5 on justification by faith. Jones' sixth sermon on justification was cancelled because of a major rain and hail storm. The Jones' sermons are of surpassing interest since they illustrate, within one individual, two divergent paths that the denomination would confront in the future.

The Jones Sermons on Righteousness.²⁷ A T Jones began his series on justification by faith during his Sabbath morning sermon, 10:30 a.m., May 11, 1889. That sermon was transcribed and published in the May 14 issue of the Topeka Daily Capital. Jones immediately launched into his central point by quoting Matthew 6:33, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness." Jones affirmed that the basis for salvation depended upon reception of God's righteousness, not any righteousness that man is capable of working out by obedience to the commandments. "Nothing else will avail," he proclaimed. Such righteousness is not to be found in the moral law, proclaimed Jones, "We will never find it there." While Jones affirmed that the righteousness of God is in the law, it is there not accessible to us. Since the law demands that "we shall be as good as God is," that same law also requires that "to keep [the commandments] means that man must be like God in character."

It was thus impossible, Jones affirmed, to receive righteousness from the

law, "because we are sinners, and sin has so darkened our mind that we can not see it there." Jones continued:

If I take the highest and most comprehensive view of the law I can, and live up to it, is that a satisfying of the law? No, because it is not a high enough view of it, because the mind is all darkened by sin, and man's comprehension is not broad enough to grasp the height and breadth of it, and so does not meet the requirements of the law.

Jones thus contended that the sinner discovered only his own righteousness in the law since his vision of its demands had been clouded by sin. The righteousness the sinner received from the law was thus his own "filthy rags." In harmony with his Galatians argument, Jones emphasized that the primary function of the law to sinners was to reveal guilt in order that the sinner might be driven to the basis of salvation, the gospel, where God's righteousness was available through faith. "We must then have something more than the law to enable us to understand God's righteousness and to comprehend the law," proclaimed A T Jones. Since sin has darkened our minds, "our vision has to be enlightened by some other means, which is the gospel." While the law contained no provision for "making" the sinner righteous, "when having faith in Christ, a man sees his sins and longs for the righteousness of God, knowing that it is the goodness, purity and righteousness of Christ that makes him so, he will become righteous." Jones' concept of righteousness as a gift harmonized with E J Waggoner's initial presentation on the "Law and the Gospel," on October 15, 1888 at Minneapolis and it was on this point that he was claiming a new position within Adventism. We have seen that Ellen White consistently identified Adventism's new message as "justification by faith and the righteousness of Christ freely given."

The Scriptural base for Jones' "new" message, was precisely that used by Waggoner at Minneapolis: Romans 1:16-17 and Romans 10:4 as was his text illustrating the function of the law, Romans 3:19.²⁸ Notice his argument:

The righteousness of God is made known without the law. How? By faith in Jesus Christ, through the gospel, and not by the law. Now read again Romans 1:16-17, and this will be clear. To show this further, Romans 10:4. . . . We have lost often the real point in this text to use it against those who claim the commandments are abolished, who claim Christ ended the law, and we claiming it means "the purpose of" the law, but the point in this text is that Christ is the purpose of the law "for righteousness" to us, as we can not get it by the law. Romans 8:3.

The law was ordained to life, righteousness, holiness, justification, but because of sin it can not be this to us, so what it can not do Christ does for us.

Jones continued his argument by specifically identifying the "newness" of the message he and Waggoner were proclaiming, by asserting that Seventh-day Adventists had traditionally taught that forgiveness was a free gift based upon the death of Christ, but, he stated, "We have not claimed the same for righteousness as being a gift through Jesus Christ." Clearly distinguishing between the pioneer point of view and that advocated by he and Waggoner and endorsed by Ellen White, Jones pointed out that "If a law could give life," then righteousness could be obtained by obedience to that law, but because of sin, "Christ came to be the purpose of the law to everyone that believeth." Thus, said Jones, "Righteousness is the gift of God as surely as is life, and if we try to get it in any other way we shall fail." The new message centered around the concept that saving righteousness came to the believer as a result of faith, not as a result of his personal obedience to the moral law.

Jones was clearly turning Adventism on a new path for one could read practically any defense of the Sabbath throughout denominational history and quickly conclude that obedience to the moral law had been considered a source of righteousness. The path of Jones and Waggoner seemed to offer a theological rationale for that which Mrs White had consistently offered the church. The message of Jones and Waggoner, however, lacked Ellen White's objective focus and that lack also would be apparent in the Jones sermons at Ottawa. While Jones' lack is apparent even in his initial sermon on righteousness, it became

even more apparent by his concluding sermons. The lack is also revealed in additional lectures by Jones at Ottawa.

While both Jones and Waggoner stressed righteousness as a gift, their failure to see this transaction as an external reality forced them to the conclusion that the righteousness that was a gift was literally infused into the believer. Perhaps their thinking was conditioned by their assumptions about what they considered necessary to sustain God's people through the time of trouble and the future period when they believed Christ would no longer mediate for His people in the heavenly sanctuary. A failure to distinguish between these elements in Jones' theological system, i.e., righteousness as credited to our account in heaven vs righteousness as an infused gift can result in a mistaken concept of the message endorsed by Mrs white and thus a misunderstanding of the essence of the message Adventism should proclaim to the world.

In his initial sermon Jones proclaimed, "righteousness must come to us from the same source as life, and that is Christ." Righteousness had to be a gift, according to Jones, because disobedience to the law caused death. He thus considered that God's righteousness would be literally infused into the believer to enable the believer to render the perfect obedience that the law demanded. Clearly exhibiting the rationale that Jones would explicitly state in his fifth righteousness sermon, he stated that "righteousness must come from the same source as does life." "They are inseparable," Jones proclaimed. Jones' point here was that it was impossible for one to receive "life" through obedience to the law, but "life" was received through imparted righteousness. Notice his thought: "If a law could give life," the necessary righteousness could come by the law, but as that was impossible "it [was] necessary that something was given to have life." Jones alleged: "When having faith in Christ, a man sees his sins and longs for the righteousness of God, knowing

that it is the goodness, purity and righteousness of Christ that makes him so, he will become righteous." He would elaborate upon the ramifications of that premise in his later righteousness sermons.

Jones affirmed that when one recognized that the necessary righteousness was entirely a gift and not dependent upon the law, then all of the sinner's own so-called righteousness would be taken away and Christ would then clothe him with "God's righteousness," and that would be the means by which the sinner would walk in His law. Note Jones' emphasis upon that righteousness:

Righteousness is the gift of life to everyone who believeth, and Jesus Christ will ever be the purpose of the law to everyone who believeth. It is Christ's obedience that avails and not ours that brings righteousness to us. Well then let us stop trying to do the will of God in our own strength. Stop it all. Put it away from you forever. Let Christ's obedience do it all for you and gain the strength to pull the bow so that you can hit the mark. . . .

[Christ] lived as a child and met all the temptations a child meets and never sinned--so that any child can stand in his place and resist in his strength; and he lived also as a youth, a man full grown, weaving for us a robe of righteousness to cover us (not to cover our filthy garments as that would be a mixture), takes the filthy garment away and puts His own in their place, so that all may have it is if they will.

The day is coming when the law will have revealed the last sin and we will stand perfect before Him and be saved with an eternal salvation.²⁹

Jones concluded his initial sermon on righteousness with an appeal that again identified the new perspective he was bringing to Adventism: "Are there not many here who hunger and thirst for righteousness? Do you want to be filled? Look not then at the law, but the cross of Christ."

Ellen White arrived at Forest Park Tuesday evening, May 8, and was on hand to hear Jones' initial sermon on righteousness. She reported that "truths were presented that were new to the majority of the congregation," and identified that "newness":

Truths were revealed which the people were scarcely able to comprehend and appropriate. Light flashed from the oracles of God in relation to the law and the gospel, in relation to the fact that Christ is our righteousness, which seemed to souls who were hungry for truth, as light too precious to be received. . . .

We thank the Lord with all the heart that we have precious light to present before the people, and we rejoice that we have a message for this time which is present truth. The tidings that Christ is our righteousness has brought relief to many, many souls. . . .

In every meeting since the General Conference [at Minneapolis], souls have eagerly accepted the precious message of the righteousness of Christ.³⁰

Because Mrs White possessed the objective understanding of justification that Jones lacked, it seems clear that she is reacting essentially to Jones' stress upon righteousness as an unmerited gift, rather than that part of his theology that would later be mislabeled righteousness by faith by those espousing holy flesh or Living Temple theology. Ellen White's emphasis seemed to stress the fact that Christ is our righteousness in a legal, objective sense, while Jones emphasized that Christ freely gives us righteousness and we assimilate more and more of it until we are as righteous as God and hence reach a state where we cannot die. This would become fully apparent by his later sermons on righteousness.

In his later sermons Jones would use the terms "imputed righteousness" or "accounted righteous" and thus that usage would seem to argue in favor of the idea that he maintained objective views in his theological understanding. It becomes apparent, however, that Jones was using those terms to mean an infused righteousness that was freely given. Note his use of these theological concepts during his second righteousness sermon. Taking Romans 3:24 as his key text, Jones exclaimed, "justified means accounted righteous. How? Freely. By what means? Grace. What is grace? Favor." He continued:

"We are accounted righteous freely by His grace and that not of works. . . . If we believe on Him our faith is counted to us for righteousness. . . . The first thing then to learn is that we are ungodly and confess it, God will count him righteous. . . . You can be counted righteous right now if you will believe it. . . . When we believe it puts Christ in place of the sin and when Satan comes to attack us he finds only Christ, and then we have the victory over Satan, not delivering us from temptation, but giving us power to conquer temptation, and gaining the victory that particular temptation never comes again. We are conquerors there forever.³¹

Jones further elaborated upon that theme in his third sermon. He affirmed that imputed righteousness "is to take the place of all our sins." He then went on to emphasize his concept of the nature of the forgiveness that occurs when sins are confessed. "When we ask to have our sins taken away it is asking to be cleansed," he affirmed. Forgiveness was total; it was a completed, present act since it also embraced the infusion of the actual righteousness of Christ. "What does God promise us in reference to our sins? They shall be white as snow. Then we are righteous." He asked the believers, "How are we to have righteousness," and answered, "By faith."

The righteousness that thus came by faith, according to Jones, was perfect and internal. Once this righteousness was present, sins had to have been blotted out. He continued: "How shall we be good? Have the spirit of God in our hearts." He referred the congregation to his earlier lecture on church government to illustrate his concept of Christ dwelling in His people as "living temples." "We are temples of the Holy Ghost," he affirmed. Since "Christ may dwell with us by our faith," declared Jones, "then we can get from Him all we ask or think" because of "the power working within us." Jones seemed consistently to emphasize an internal power rather than a mediated power. God's power could only be limited by our faith, said Jones. "Let us exercise our faith then, and it will develop power," he declared. He continued:

Our obedience comes in after we have faith, and God's spirit is dwelling within us. Do you not see now that we have to be made good before we can do good? If then you want to do better get more of Jesus Christ in your heart.

Temptations were overcome, according to Jones, by placing Christ "between us and the temptation." He illustrated this by referring to Luke 8:13-18 and the woman who touched Christ in faith. "The touch of the woman was the touch of faith and drew virtue from Him," Jones declared. The same would occur for us: "Touch him by faith and virtue will come to all and make you faithful."

Jones concluded his third righteousness sermon by clearly displaying his infused righteousness concepts:

It is only by his obedience that we are made righteous. Then when I have anything to do let my faith reach out to him and bring faithfulness from him to enable me to do it. . . .

If we want to be good let our faith touch him, and goodness comes to us and makes us good; if we want to be righteous, in answer to our faith, power comes to us and makes us righteous. In answer to our faith as it grows, more and more of his power and goodness will come to us, and just before probation closes we shall be like him indeed, and then we shall be keeping the commandments of God in fact, because there will be so much of him in us that there will be none of ourselves there. That is when we get to the place where we keep the commandments of God. . . . We must reach that place yet. . . .

Faith is actually a something, a reality, and when it touches Jesus Christ, in response to it virtue comes from Him and makes us what we want to be. Get that into your minds, brethren, and let us understand what faith is. Let our faith touch Him and draw from Him virtue, goodness, righteousness, and every good and perfect gift will come to us.³²

In his next righteousness sermon, Jones stressed his belief in the nearness of the end. "We believe that the coming of the Lord is near," he asserted, and his reading of the biblical prophecies indicated that "we are on the brink of the eternal world." The observation that "the just shall live by faith" especially referred to the people living at the close of earth's history, he affirmed and continued:

It is faith that saves, but works come in as the result and fruit of faith. Your faith will be shown by your works. It is the connecting link between God and man. We read the promises of God and become partakers of the divine nature. God speaks, faith claims, and we become possessors of that which God promises, and without it we can not please God.

Jones' last recorded sermon on righteousness was entitled "Keeping the Commandments" and seemed to directly tie with his initial sermon. Here, however, he was speaking of a period when he believed God's people would truly be keeping the commandments in the fullest sense of those terms as outlined in his initial sermon. "Keeping the commandments," Jones asserted, "comes in after we are new creatures, so then we must be made good, be made righteous, before we can do good or do righteousness." Jones sought to depict the

interrelationship between keeping the law and faith by affirming that God's love initially drew us to Him and that love came through faith. As a consequence of that drawing, we seek to please God. Our works, hence, are not the consequence of striving for righteousness, but the result of the infused righteousness of Christ. Jones affirmed:

We are created unto good works; made new creatures in him, his righteousness counting for our unrighteousness. The good works God's creatures are created in Christ to do are the good works we could not do before. So a new creature will aim constantly to keep the commandments.

The converse of this regenerating experience was visible in the fallen churches, observed Jones. He believed that a "willful refusal to accept points of truth presented will cause us to lose all the righteousness we ever had." Such happened to churches that resisted "to comply with the requirements of the message." He drew the lesson from the experience of Abraham:

Abraham was counted righteous when he believed and without works. . . . If he had refused to offer Isaac, his former righteousness would have disappeared, so the obedience of his faith completed his righteousness that he had by faith.

Jones then applied the same lesson to the SDA church: "Then our keeping of the commandments is not to become righteous, but because we are righteous." Jones then asked the question, "How is [Christ's] righteousness imputed to us?" He inquired rhetorically whether our own acts were righteous to a point and then Christ's righteousness was applied to complete the need. "No," he concluded: "Christ's righteousness starts at the beginning and makes the action what it ought to be." A careful reading of Mrs White's statements at Ottawa, would reveal a different concept here. Jones sought to illustrate his meaning by referring to the regenerating experience of the Ottawa meetings:

Is not our faith greater than when we came here? Do we not see more of His righteousness than we did? How is it we have more faith and see more of His righteousness? Why our faith has grown. So it is day by day. We came daily for greater supplies of faith. And we finally have so much of Christ's divine nature in us that we can draw the bow strongly enough to hit the mark, and then we will be keeping the commandments of God. Then is it not Christ's work from the

beginning and all his divine power? Where, then, do our works come in? Nowhere.³³

Jones then took this aspect of his theology to its logical conclusion:

[It is] only through Christ within us that we keep the commandments--it being all by faith in Christ that we do and say these things. When the day comes that we actually keep the commandments of God, we will never die, because keeping the commandments is righteousness, and righteousness and life are inseparable--so, "Here are they that keep the commandments of God and faith of Jesus," and what is the result? These people are translated. Life, then, and keeping the commandments go together. If we die now, Christ's righteousness will be imputed to us and we will be raised, but those who live to the end are made sinless before He comes, having so much of Christ's being in them that they "hit the mark" every time, and stand blameless without an intercessor, because Christ leaves the sanctuary sometime before He comes to earth.³⁴

Jones seems to be saying, in summary: our faith responds to God's love and motivates us to desire to keep His law; He accepts our desire and infuses His righteousness in a constantly increasing manner which eventually makes it possible for us to truly be fulfilling His law in the fullest sense; when this occurs, at some time before His return, His people cannot die since "righteousness and life go together." This theology would grow in the aftermath of the disunity following Minneapolis and the lack of healthful modifications that the pioneers could have offered and would be confronted by Ellen White a decade and a half later during the Living Temple crisis.

Additional Sermons of Jones at Ottawa.³⁵ On Sunday, May 6, Jones commenced his series on both religious liberty and church government. In his series of 13 sermons on church government, Jones seemed to apply on a broad scale his concept of infused righteousness. Jones emphasized that God, in drawing humanity to Himself "bestows upon us His goodness for His Son's sake." This subjectivized righteousness allows us to put Christ "in the place of every temptation" and thus to literally overcome and be faithful as He was faithful. "The same One who made light shine out of darkness in the beginning," affirmed Jones, "has shined into our hearts and changes us into His own image." Jones then applied that concept more broadly to the church: "And a church composed of

such members is what Christ will have soon here," he stated. Just as the glory of God was to shine in the new earth, so was the church to shine prior to that time. Jones concluded:

As a city set on a hill, our light should so shine that it can not be hid any more than the glory of the new city can be in the new earth. And a church composed of such members is what Christ will have soon here, a church which nothing in this world can hide and on which the people will see the glory of God--a church to which all honest people will come as doves do to the windows. There can not be, therefore, brethren, anything more sacred out of heaven, and if we look upon it as anything less than this we fail to appreciate it. Let us, then, never again have a common view of God's building and habitation. . . .

In [Christ] the building is fitly framed together (not being living stones before our coming to Him) groweth unto a holy temple in the Lord. That is what the church is and we builded for a habitation for the dwelling of Christ, so then Christ dwelling in us and we in harmony with Him, Christ dwells among us by His spirit.

In his sermons on church organization and government, Jones seems to emphasize that faith, that brings the infused righteousness of Christ, coupled with the spirit of unity, that brought that righteousness to the church as a body, were the prerequisites to the power that would accompany the last message to be given to the world. And just as Jones seemed to emphasize the subjective righteousness aspect of his theology during his lectures on church government, so he seemed to emphasize the fact that righteousness was a free gift and not a consequence of obedience to the law during his lectures on religious liberty.

Jones proclaimed that even as righteousness came as a gift and not by obedience to the moral law, so in the civil realm, morality comes not by legislation, especially that kind of legislation that would control the day of worship, but could only come as a fruitage of the gospel. At Minneapolis he had asserted:

As all men have, by transgression of the law of God, made themselves immoral, therefore no man can, by obedience to the law, become moral; because it is that very law which declares him to be immoral. The demands, therefore, of the moral law, must be satisfied, before he can ever be accepted as moral by either the law or its Author. But the demands of the moral law can never be satisfied by an immoral person, and this is just what every person

has made himself by transgression. Therefore it is certain that men can never become moral by the moral law. . . .

And this morality of Christ is the morality of God, which is imputed to us for Christ's sake; and we receive it by faith in Him who is both the author and finisher of faith.³⁶

At Ottawa, Jones reiterated that point. He observed that courts were limited in merely being able to gauge the outward actions and thus when they became involved in moral questions the courts did nothing more than lend credence to the premise that God's law could be satisfied "with outward observance only." According to Jones, this nullified consideration of the fullest demands of the moral law and caused the pharisaical attitude present in Christ's time. "By the law no man can be made moral," Jones affirmed. Attempts to legislate morality (or righteousness) were in effect a rejection of the gospel and a repudiation of its principles. The consequences in the civil realm resulted in "religious intolerance," and a degeneration to the system of the dark ages and "the papacy will again rear its head and become supreme, and a living image of it be set up in our own country upon a papal basis," he declared.

Ellen White at Ottawa. Mrs White left Battle Creek Monday, May 6, 1889, and after a brief visit to the SDA mission in Chicago, arrived at Forest Park, Ottawa, 8 p.m., Tuesday, May 7. She remained until May 26 and made at least 12 public addresses. Mrs White seemed unusually aware of her spiritual mission at Ottawa as she proclaimed:

I have to fight many battles with the powers of darkness, that I may not yield to infirmities, and give up aggressive warfare for the cause of truth. I praise God that I have been enabled to look to Jesus, and go forward in my work when my feelings were opposed to the effort. . . . I was never more certain that the Lord strengthened me, than at the Kansas meeting.³⁷

In the early part of her stay at Ottawa, Mrs White received a vision that "laid open" the work that was before her. Although she felt ill physically, she received assurance of divine assistance for the Lord had "a message which must come to this people." Although Mrs White felt the pangs of depression

during the Ottawa experience, as she stood before the congregations, "strength, freedom, and power from God" came to her. She "knew that God alone could accomplish the work that was necessary to be done at this meeting."³⁸

Mrs White's concept of her role at Ottawa seemed to revolve around the following considerations: she detected an "oppressive atmosphere" that was fed by a "Pharisaical pride" that enabled satanic agencies to gain control. This oppressive atmosphere flourished when light that was coming from heaven was rejected and error was thereby strengthened. She saw that the church members "when they should grow strong by accepting light," they were becoming weak by their refusal of it. As she considered the experience after Minneapolis, she seemed discouraged:

Has not the Lord Jesus sent message after message [through the Spirit of Prophecy] of rebuke, or warning, of entreaty to these self-satisfied ones? Have not his counsels been despised and rejected? Have not his delegated messengers [Jones and Waggoner] been treated with scorn, and their words been received as idle tales? . . .

Christ cannot take up the names of those who are satisfied in their own self-sufficiency. He cannot importune in behalf of a people who feel no need of his help, who claim to know and possess everything.³⁹

Mrs White, at Ottawa, considered it her primary function to dispel this oppressive atmosphere, to provide an atmosphere where truth could flourish. She informed the church of that role:

At the Kansas meeting my prayer to God was that the power of the enemy might be broken, and that the people who had been in darkness might open their hearts and minds to the message that God should send them, that they might see the truth, new to many minds, as old truth in new framework. The understanding of the people of God has been blinded; for Satan has misrepresented the character of God. Our good and gracious Lord has been presented before the people clothed in the attributes of Satan, and men and women who have been seeking for truth, have so long regarded God in a false light that it is difficult to dispel the cloud that obscures his glory from their view. Many have been living in an atmosphere of doubt, and it seems almost impossible for them to lay hold on the hope set before them in the gospel of Christ.⁴⁰

Mrs White consistently focused upon God's glory whenever she considered the message of justification that was seeking entrance within Adventism and as

she considered her mission, she plead for physical strength, mental clearness, and spiritual power: "I felt that I needed to be saved, to be healed physically, to be strengthened mentally, to be invigorated spiritually, that I might help those who were assembled to worship God," she proclaimed. Mrs White even used the occasion of a major thunderstorm striking the camp the first Friday evening of her stay to stress the glory of God and the hope for a pure atmosphere where truth could prevail:

We expected that this commotion in the atmosphere would purify the air; and as I listened to the roll of the thunder, my soul earnestly desired that the power of God might be displayed among the people that the moral atmosphere also might be purified.⁴¹

The following day, Sabbath, May 11, 1889, A T Jones presented his first sermon on justification by faith and Mrs White responded as she had in the past by sensing "light" coming directly from heaven. She heard truths "revealed which the people were scarcely able to comprehend and appropriate." Clearly identifying the nature of the new insight, Mrs White proclaimed that "light flashed from the oracles of God in relation to the law and the gospel, in relation to the fact that Christ is our righteousness," and she observed that such a marvelous truth seemed to many "as light too precious to be received."⁴² That message seemed to have a note of assurance that Adventism's past system had not perceived and seemed too good to be true.

By the next day, Mrs White noted that "great changes in the moral and spiritual condition of those assembled" had occurred. On that day she wrote:

I have good news to report this morning. There has been a break in the meeting. Praise the Lord, He is at work for His people. We have felt surely that the enemy of Christ and all righteousness, was upon the ground. There were some ministers from Iowa, who came armed and equipped to leaven the camp with the very same spirit that was so prominent in Minneapolis.⁴³

In this personal communication, she continued in a reflective mood as she analyzed the Minneapolis experience. It seemed inevitable that, as Mrs White again saw light breaking through at Ottawa she would recall the Minneapolis

experience and its failure. She reflected that, despite the fact that she had never been more assured than at Minneapolis that the Lord was directly influencing her, and that Jones and Waggoner had presented special light from heaven, still "prejudice and unbelief, jealousy and evil-surmising barred the door" to counsel from her that would allow truth to flourish and thus the special message went largely unperceived. Since the "light" Mrs White was endorsing did not come "in just the way and manner they wanted it to come," it was rejected. The new message was not perceived, Mrs White observed, because of the "stirring up of human passions which was bitterness of spirit, because some of their brethren had ventured to entertain some ideas contrary to the ideas that some others of their brethren had entertained, which were thought from their understanding to be inroads upon ancient doctrines."⁴⁴

The consequence of this magnification of a "slight difference of opinion" according to Mrs White meant that a "firm, decided, obstinate spirit" took control at Minneapolis "and those who had known of the grace of God and had felt His converting power upon their hearts once, were deluded, infatuated, working under a deception all through that meeting." The end result at Minneapolis of the magnification of points of difference resulted, according to Mrs White, in the creation of a "mob spirit," a "satanic spirit [that] took the control and moved with power upon the human hearts that had been opened to doubts and to bitterness, wrath and hatred." Mrs White urged: "God forbid [that] anything should ever take place again like that which transpired at Minneapolis." She perceived that "all this undue excitement of natural feelings of chagrin and vexation was not the zeal heaven-born to stand in defense of the truth." When she saw that spirit in control, Mrs White determined to leave Minneapolis and refused to speak again to the church leaders.⁴⁵

At that point, however, she received a vision that nullified that decision. Mrs White's role was enunciated to her and she was promised strength to bear the message in the name of the Lord. She was shown the oppressiveness of the Minneapolis spirit, the negative and suspicious attitudes towards herself, A T Jones, E J Waggoner and W C White and it was made plain to her that the central points of friction revolved around the theological interpretations of the law in Galatians and the false understanding that assumed that Mrs White had resolved that theological problem in the past. Mrs White's reaction to this vision given at Minneapolis is of intense interest. She stated:

After hearing what I did my heart sank within me. I had never pictured before my mind what dependence we might place in those who claim to be friends, when the spirit of Satan finds entrance to their hearts. I thought of the future crisis, and feelings that I can never put into words for a little time overcame me. . . .

I was sensible how little trust or dependence could be put in the friendship of men, when human thoughts and human passions bear sway. . . . Human friendship, bonds, and ties of relationship are severed, and why? Because there is a difference of opinion in interpretation of the Scriptures. It is the same spirit which condemned the Lord of life and glory. . . .

The guide which accompanied me gave me the information of the spiritual standing before God of these men, who were passing judgment upon their brethren. They were not keeping their own souls in the love of God. Had they been growing in grace and the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, they would have distinguished light from darkness, and truth from error.⁴⁶

Despite her personal inclinations to the contrary, Mrs White in vision, was urged to "stand at my post [and] that God had given me a message to bear in His name, and if even I had foreseen the consequences I could not be clear before God, and have my peace" if she left Minneapolis at that time. The significance of that counsel would have a long-term relevance because Mrs White claimed a continuing purpose to her ministry:

And my work must not cease here [Minneapolis] for my testimony of this character must continue as God should direct until these wrongs were expelled from the churches. Unless the faithful testimonies are continued to be repeated in the ears of the people of God, the mould which has been left upon the work would not be removed.

There have been, I was informed, misunderstandings not only of the Testimonies, but of the Bible itself. Men have exalted themselves and esteemed themselves too highly, which leads to the denouncing of others and passing judgment upon their brethren. Envy, jealousy, evil speaking, evil surmising, judging one another has been considered a special gift given of God in discernment when it savors more of the spirit of the great accuser, who accused the brethren before God day and night. There has been a spirit of Pharisaism, a hard, unsympathetic spirit towards the erring, a withdrawing from some and leaving them in discouragement, which is leaving the lost sheep to perish in the wilderness. There has been a placing of men where God alone should be.⁴⁷

It was thus at Minneapolis that Mrs White perceived this concept of her ministry. She resolved that she "must work bearing the message God should give me without calculating the consequences whether men would hear or forbear." She determined not to "abate one jot or tittle of the message given me to bear, either for favors or to withhold because of frowns and alienations of any mortal." Again Mrs White reflected about the past and she recalled visions given her during her ministry in Europe in 1886 that evidenced "that there was coming into the ranks of Sabbathkeepers a self-sufficient spirit." The results of false views of justification by faith seemed to be reaching their culminating point within the church as Mrs White observed that "men were almost devoid of love." Indeed, "men were trusting in men. Form and ceremony were taking the place of true piety." The vision at Minneapolis, indeed, seemed to illustrate the failure of the old message. At Minneapolis, Mrs White observed, that her own mission was nullified and she so informed those assembled there:

I told them plainly [that] the position and work God gave me at that conference was disregarded by near all. Rebellion was popular. Their course was an insult to the Spirit of God. . . . Wrong ideas and a spirit not of God had been for years taking control of those who were standing in responsible places. They were lifted up, exalted.

Many things were specified that were being cherished as truth, but which were not in harmony with the message of the truth, and Satan was having things very much his own way. He was taking advantage of human nature. The disposition and strong traits of character which had not been under subjection to the Spirit of God were stirred into activity as worked against Jesus Christ at His first advent, and led to their taking the first steps in the rejection of Christ. And after their feet were once set in a wrong

path, their pride, their jealousy, and self-righteousness would not allow them to acknowledge they had made a mistake.⁴⁸

As Mrs White continued this reflective letter, she again remarked that she "was encouraged to stand firmly against the human impulses that were bearing strongly against [the] light and truth which the Lord had for this time for His people" and observed that she was also told that she would "stand almost alone." Ellen White next identified that "truth for this time" and observed that "Sabbath Brother A T Jones talked upon the subject of justification by faith, and many received it as light and truth."⁴⁹

At Ottawa, Mrs White spoke publicly at least 12 times and details are available in varying degrees of 9 of those talks. They are briefly summarized in chronological order.

May 8, Wednesday. Mrs White, at the 5:30 a.m. meeting urged the workers "not to act over Minneapolis" again. She urged that they not reject the present message and thereby wander as did the Israelites described by Paul in Hebrews 4:2. She sought to create the proper atmosphere for the perception of truth by entreating all "to humble their hearts before God and put away their sins by repentance and confession, and receive the messages God sends them through His delegated servants."⁵⁰

May 9, Thursday. Mrs White again spoke at the early meeting, and this time believed she should be more "explicit" concerning Minneapolis "and the spirit that our brethren brought to that Conference." Because of the danger of such an atmosphere being created at Ottawa, Mrs White believed "that it was not enough to longer deal in general terms" with the "Minneapolis spirit." It was time for "something more than smooth words," affirmed Mrs White since "God would put His rebuke upon anything and everything savoring of the same kind of spirit and influence, that was brought into Minneapolis." She described her Minneapolis vision to those early morning worshipers and informed them that God had revealed to her the spiritual condition of many at the Minneapolis session

and also told them of the focus of the new message that was stifled at Minneapolis:

They came under a delusion, with false impressions upon their minds. That was Satan's work, for the Lord was to revive His people and give them light in clear distinct rays that would lead to the magnifying of Christ.⁵¹

In an evaluation of immense importance, Mrs White revealed that the satanic atmosphere created at Minneapolis was sufficient to withhold those "clear distinct rays" and Mrs White affirmed that Satan's success "was an offense to God," and should not be allowed at the Ottawa meetings.⁵²

While it is not possible to ascertain who attended the initial early morning meets that Mrs White addressed, a talk at the 10 a.m. meeting by Dan T Jones, president of the Missouri Conference and General Conference secretary, indicates that all was not completely harmonious. Dan Jones would consistently openly oppose the Jones-Waggoner theology and would eventually be removed as GC secretary at the suggestion of Mrs White. During this day, Dan Jones seemed to anticipate the position of A T Jones on the law by asserting:

God's law is the basis of His government, and when a people set themselves up in opposition to His law, they are in rebellion. If rebellion is transgression of God's government and if sin is transgression of His law, in order to get back in harmony with God again, it is to render obedience to God's law. God gives the power to render that obedience through Jesus Christ, and I wish to be so understood in speaking of rendering such obedience.⁵³

A reading between the lines of Dan Jones' position would reveal a concept that would again come into conflict during the Rome, New York, campmeeting and would be directly addressed by Mrs White. Mrs White would consistently affirm that "our righteousness" that came from obedience to the law, was inadequate to warrant salvation.

Mrs White spoke a second time that day during the 2:30 afternoon meeting. The afternoon meeting was well attended by local residents and Mrs White spoke in more general terms. While she clearly emphasized the practical, non-theological aspects of righteousness, it is clear that her emphasis was upon a

mediated rather than an infused righteousness. Her key text, Matthew 7:7-12, "Ask, and it shall be given you" was presented throughout the sermon as a constant need. Mrs White joyfully proclaimed, "We can go to God for the things we need" and urged:

Should we not present our case then more frequently than we do, and believe He will help us because He knows our helplessness and our want of righteousness and that He must come in and fill up the lack.⁵⁴

She pointed to the "living chain of mercy He has let down that we must, by faith, cast our whole weight upon, then we can indeed be cured by the blood of Jesus Christ, and his righteousness become our righteousness." This mediated righteousness was possible, according to Mrs White, because Christ clothed His divinity with humanity and battled Satan on our behalf. Through our continual Mediator, "God has given us all that mightiness and power." It was the cross that was the basis for this mediation. "Christ calls you," she told the congregation:

Did he not erect his cross between heaven and earth? Whenever God the Father and the heavenly train look upon it all bow to it and the angels prostrate themselves before it. Why? Because the plan of salvation has been carried out and the Father accepts it. Midway the cross is erected and sinners are to look upon it and be saved. It is this that brings sinners to repentance.⁵⁵

This exhibition of God's love, hanging midway between heaven and earth, becomes God's spark to "constantly" draw men to repentance. "By living faith men grasp Christ and repent that they have transgressed the law of God. As they repent He forgives their transgressions: "It is Christ from first to last." As she dwelt upon that theme, Mrs White seemed to feel inadequate to present such marvelous love and she exclaimed:

I plead with God to show me this so clearly that I may present to others who have so much difficulty to comprehend that Christ is first and last, the Alpha and Omega, and has drawn man, by a love as broad as the world, to him and what then? It leads man to repentance and then comes the forgiveness. We want that the brethren and sisters should take hold of this for themselves.⁵⁶

Our only role in this process, said Mrs White, was to exercise faith. She defined this faith as "entire dependence upon God as though we were little children." It is a faith that accepts that "God has said it, and His word is immutable." Mrs White consistently stressed that that type of faith did not depend upon feelings that were changeable, but that grasped the truth that "Christ is the propitiation for our sins, and that He brought immortality to light." Mrs White pointed to the security and joy possessed by one who embraced this faith:

If you would have this faith you must be the happiest people on earth. Why? Because you have painted your hopes on these promises and you go on your way rejoicing, knowing He will do exactly as He promises. This faith works by love, and our old hearts fall upon Christ and are broken, and He fills us and molds us by His spirit.⁵⁷

As she addressed herself to the practical outworkings of that faith, Mrs White considered the question "does he manifest a proper spirit" as its acid test. She observed that such faith would exhibit itself in home life, attitudes toward others, and in many practical areas of life. In a veiled reference to the Minneapolis spirit, Mrs White told the mixed congregation:

The trouble with us is that we have never fallen upon the rock. We are wrapped up in our own self righteousness. Had we not better believe and mix the truth with faith, having that faith which worked by love? Shall we not, in all our connection with each other see Christ in all, and love one another as Christ loves us?⁵⁸

As she concluded her sermon, Mrs White urged the importance of the message that was given at the Ottawa meeting:

The Lord is coming. There is no time for indolence. There is a message to go to the world. We cannot present it to the world if we do not believe in Him. We are receiving things. Brethren, will you take hold of this truth; will you by work in your family seek to bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord and carry this spirit into your churches, so educating yourself that you can preach Christ to them that know Him not.⁵⁹

May 10, Friday. Mrs White spoke at the 5:30 morning meeting and "read some things" regarding Minneapolis "and the way my brethren treated the servants whom the Lord sent to them with messages of truth." Although several

"bore testimony in regard to their experience at the meeting at Minneapolis," Mrs White believed that the meeting gave no evidence of a change in that spirit.⁶⁰

May 11, Sabbath. A T Jones' initial sermon on righteousness and according to Mrs White, "many received it as light and truth." Mrs White addressed the congregation in the afternoon, but the text was not published. She noted that many testimonies were given in that meeting, "testifying that they appreciated the light and truth presented to them." She also noted that "it seemed difficult for those who had been dwelling in an atmosphere of doubt, to take the position of learners." Instead, she noted, "they would quibble at little points that were of no consequence." That observation no doubt influenced Mrs White to present the message that she did the next day.⁶¹

May 12, Sunday. In her morning address this day, Mrs White again warned against the atmosphere that was generated by those opposing Jones and Waggoner at Minneapolis. The atmosphere of "doubt and unbelief" over the "new light that came from heaven" diverted the truth over what to Mrs White seemed minor matters. While others magnified the points of difference, Mrs White considered it her role to call for a spirit of unity that would minimize the varying positions on relatively minor theological matters. She asserted:

Now brethren I want to tell you when the Spirit of God comes into our midst it will strike the minds that are ready to receive it. But if their minds are not open to receive it they are already to pass judgment upon the messenger and the words spoken, and in the place of coming to God and asking him to give them a new heart and a new mind and that the transforming influence of the grace of God shall be upon them they commence to find fault and pick flaws. It doesn't strike them, and it must harmonize with their ideas and they will stand right there until these things are culled out of the way and they place themselves right there to judge. This is the way it was at Minneapolis. . . .

I know that while the Spirit of God will make impressions upon human minds the enemy will come in and make the most of any little thing that it is possible to make and the leaven will begin to work because the devil wants it so.⁶²

Mrs White pointed out that this magnification of points of difference continued until a spirit of intolerance gained control and was similar to the experience faced by Christ. Such a spirit was fostered by Satan himself, asserted Mrs White, and even though that spirit led to the death of Christ, Mrs White applied its lessons to the SDA church. "We see that we are in no better condition than the Jewish people," she emphasized. In applying the lesson even more closely she warned, "It is because I know the very same Spirit is here and that we should not give place to it for a moment that I say these things." Ellen White again warned the church of such consequences, "When his own Nation rejects him, he turns away."⁶³

In enunciating her concept of her role, Mrs White proclaimed that it was her duty to make such observations. She told the congregation, "We never want this thing acted over again, on God's earth," and vowed that she would raise her standard against the enemy. She had "a work to do and if God gives me strength I will do it." She urged the believers to "open your ears to the truth you have had and put away your doubts, unbelief, and Christless surmisings" that would enable Satan "to shut out the light" by shutting out the "pure atmosphere" and creating instead an atmosphere where error could flourish. Mrs White concluded by again emphasizing that the new focus upon justification was not just for the SDA church, but for the world.⁶⁴

May 13, Monday. Mrs White spoke at both the early morning meeting and the 2:30 afternoon meeting. During the early meeting, Mrs White commented that "there was a precious meeting of confession." Ministers Porter, Washburn, and Wakeham, each of whom had exhibited a negative spirit at Minneapolis, "all have yielded their opposition and surrendered to God." Mrs White observed that Wakeham testified that "he had enjoyed more of the Spirit of God in the last 24 hours than he had done in all his life before." Mrs White rejoiced that those

"who have been enshrouded in an atmosphere of unbelief, [were] now talking faith, now grasping the righteousness of Christ."⁶⁵

The Topeka Daily Capital published a full transcript of Mrs White's afternoon sermon. Using as her key text 1 Peter 1:3-4, Mrs White again emphasized the joy, confidence and assurance that can be experienced because of the resurrection and mediation of Christ. She told the 2,000 people in the congregation that it was the purpose of Satan to convince people that Christ was remote from them. The truth was, she proclaimed, "The gates of heaven are open and the glory of Christ will shine on you if you trust Him." This view of Jesus, Mrs White affirmed, nullified "talking discouragement and gloom." In referring to the experience of Jacob, Mrs White depicted the ladder of his dream as that by which "we can climb to heaven." She continued:

When Adam separated himself from his God it was Christ who bridged the gulf. Suppose the ladder did not connect humanity with divinity by one inch? All would be lost, for of ourselves we can do nothing. But we unite our humanity with Christ's divinity and are drawn up step by step by the cords of God's love. Christ is our substitute as one who will fight our battles for us. The human arm of Christ encircles the fallen race and with His divinity He grasps the throne of the Infinite.⁶⁶

Mrs White contrasted that truth with the common tendency to focus upon our own self-righteousness. It was that focus that created an atmosphere of insecurity and gloom. "Satan has darkened the minds of men and has given them wrong views of God," she told the congregation. It was Satan who "casts his hellish shadow athwart our path, but we are not to look at him." She urged the congregation instead to "gaze on the lovely form of Christ." She urged that such principles be applied in a practical way in the home life. Children should be taught "from their babyhood to love Christ." The absence of such instruction created despair and fear and was her own experience since by the time she was 11 she herself was in a state of despair because her education "in regard to the love of God" had not occurred. "But when I got a view of His love I never forgot it," rejoiced Mrs White. She concluded her sermon by

urging the congregation to "get the simplicity of godliness" and called for sympathy to the children "as Christ sympathizes with us," and looked for the "salvation which is by faith in the arm of infinite love."⁶⁷

May 14, Tuesday. While Ellen White spoke on May 18 and 22, her three sermons given May 14 are the last given at Ottawa on which details are available. In her first message, most likely given at the early morning meeting, Mrs White gave a running commentary on 2 Corinthians 3:18 to 4:7. She again urged a constant beholding of Christ's mediated light. In commenting on 2 Corinthians 3:18, she observed:

Now you see how important it is that we are beholding this. The enemy has come in and his dark shadow has been thrown athwart our pathway, so that we dwell on the dark side and talk of gloom until our way seems almost hopeless, and we stumble along without courage, hope or love; but we do not want this to be so. We want this shadow to be dwept away, and it will be if we look beyond the darkened shadow to the brightness beyond in Christ Jesus.⁶⁸

The path to this "brightness beyond" lay "deep into the valley of humiliation," observed Mrs White. "The most humbly we live before God, the nearer we will come to Him, and the more distinct will be our view of Jesus Christ and His matchless light." She urged the workers to talk and dwell upon God's mercy "every day and every hour." Such views of God's love, she noted, would bring the fruits of the spirit and thus "we will not be under the bondage of the law of God by any means." She informed the congregation, "You are free in Christ Jesus. We shall walk in liberty because our will is in harmony with the will of God and we love all His commandments." As she contemplated Christ's mediatorial work on our behalf, she observed:

Have we received a bright thought? If so we are not to think that it is because of any wonderful smartness of intelligence in ourselves. It is because God is the Author of it. . . .

It is our privilege to go on from strength to strength and from glory to glory. Do not think that because we have a glimmer of the light of God that we have it all.⁶⁹

In a spontaneous repose to an address by O A Olsen to the ministers at the 8 a.m. meeting, Mrs White again enunciated the themes closest to her in 1889:

the nearness of the Lord's return, delay of the message of justification by faith that was designed to go to the world because of a spirit of intolerance, a converse spirit of humility that should come as a consequence of God's great Gift, and the assurance that can be possessed because of Christ's constant mediation for us. Mrs White reacted to Olsen's sermon:

Let us thank God today that we are not yet before the judgment seat of God, but we have an intercessor, one who has loved us so that he gave his own precious life for us individually just as though there was not another soul in the universe. He died for us and we are of infinite value to Jesus Christ. How can we measure the sacrifice he has made for us.⁷⁰

As Mrs White contemplated that sacrifice, however, she saw its benefits largely nullified within the church. "It is not that we come out in words and deny Him," she observed, "but in your actions you deny Christ so that He is ashamed to call you brethren." She urged the ministers to "uproot all this Pharisaism and this self-righteousness" within the church. "Just as soon as you allow your thoughts and feelings to be turned against one another," Mrs White declared, then they were giving heed to the spirit of Satan rather than that of Christ. "Never have an idea that you know more than your brethren," she urged, for that was the spirit "that brought all the weakness into the Jewish nation. As she once more considered Christ's justifying sacrifice, she emotionally exclaimed:

Christ himself has bridged the gulf for us. . . . Oh there is something wonderful about it: He loves us as He loves His Son. Just think of it. Loves us as He does His Son. This is wonderful, wonderful. In Him we have all heaven presented to us, and the more we see in Jesus the less we see that is good in self. . . .

Brethren the more we see in Jesus, the less we will see in self, and the more self-esteem we have the more we are puffed up by the devil.⁷¹

Mrs White gave her last recorded message at Ottawa at 2:30 that same afternoon and drew upon 1 Peter 2:9 to illustrate the principles of behavior that should prevail in the home life and in the church "to correspond to the truth which we profess." She urged, "While we are getting our hearts right at

this meeting let us not forget the foundation and neglect to bring these truths to the hearts of our children." She revealed the implications of a focus upon justifying righteousness:

Now when we have been studying about the righteousness of Christ let the light gained shine into the family circles, and while the truths of God are coming to you in mercy and love, may we not appropriate them to our children.⁷²

She again alluded to Christ's continuing role as our mediator and told the congregation:

We need not trust in our own wisdom or strength, but we can, by faith, lay hold on the infinite arm of God. When you bow your heads about the table and offer thanks for your daily portion of food, call [your children's] minds to the fact that it is Christ who supplies all our necessities. They will then grow up with hearts that will respond in thanks to God for all His gifts and blessings.⁷³

Aftermath. In the years following the Ottawa meetings, Mrs White on numerous occasions identified the essence of the new light concerning justification by faith: righteousness as a gift and not a result of obedience to the law. As she visited the 39-year-old dying brother of O A Olsen, she expressed to him the simple basis upon which his salvation depended. She urged that he "simply trust in God, and not go back to hunt up his mistakes and defections of the past." Mrs White realized that it seemed natural for a person "letting loose his grasp of this life" to have a distinct view of his imperfections, but she was able to assure Andrew Olsen that "his business was to look and live, to take the robe woven by Christ himself in the heavenly loom, and rejoice in the worthiness and righteousness of Christ."⁷⁴

The next year, before beginning her Australia ministry, Mrs White urged the following at a meeting 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.⁷⁵

She wrote her son in 1889 that it was true religion "to depend entirely upon Christ's righteousness, and not upon works of merit." In considering this the "message for the present time," she emphasized, "Let the outsiders understand that we preach the gospel as well as the law, and they will feast upon these truths, and many will take their stand for the truth."⁷⁶

There was something that seemed inexplicable to Ellen White, however. She could not understand why as many as four weeks of her labor should have been spent at the Kansas meeting. While she urged that half of the time allotted to Kansas be given to Iowa, she eventually agreed to spend those four weeks at the Kansas meetings. One of the results of her spending such a lengthy period in Kansas is the extensive coverage given the meetings by the Topeka Daily Capital and the resulting benefits to us today.⁷⁷

Analysis of those meetings allows us not only to identify the nature of the 1888 message, but also to see the elements waiting to develop into the holy flesh and Living Temple apostacies. The nullification of the potential contributions of the pioneers are beyond calculation. By 1892, Uriah Smith had observed:

It would surprise you if you knew what views were being evolved in some quarters. Almost everyone seems to be inclined to go off on a tangent, stretching out after that which is novel and sensational. For instance, it was preached in a certain place not long since that when we receive Christ as we should, he will be just as really incarnated in us as he was in the Virgin Mary!!⁷⁸

During that same year, Mrs White informed Smith that "The many and confused ideas in regard to Christ's righteousness and justification by faith [were] the result of the position [he had] taken toward the men and the message sent of God."⁷⁹ Because the pioneers had created such a spirit of disunity, they had nullified the potential theological contributions they could have made to the new message. Adventists paid an incalculable price for the spirit of Minneapolis.

That development seems to provide important clues to Ellen White's concept of her role from 1888 until her death. From 1888 onwards, Mrs White seemed to sense an ever-increasing responsibility to speak against what she variously terms, "The spirit of Minneapolis," a spirit of oppression, dictatorial control, "Pharisaism." That role was vital to her since that spirit not only nullified light that should come to the church, but also became the breeding ground for grossest error. A cursory look at some of the situations addressed by Mrs White between 1889 and 1913 seems pertinent.

Shortly after Minneapolis, Mrs White met with various leaders in Battle Creek and clearly warned that "unless they were changed in spirit" they would "go into greater deceptions." She observed:

They would stumble and know not at what they were stumbling. I begged them to stop just where they were. But the position of Elder Butler and Elder Smith influenced them to make no change but to stand where they did. . . . Doubt and darkness enveloped some closer than before.⁸⁰

In mid-1889, Mrs White carefully reflected on the potential of apostasy developing within the church as an aftermath of the Minneapolis spirit. She observed that God had given "precious gems of truth to His people" at Minneapolis, but that that light "from heaven" had been treated as stubbornly as the Jews had done when they rejected Christ. Another similarity was observed by Ellen White: at the time that vital truth was rejected, "there was much talk about standing by the old landmarks." Those defenders of the "landmarks," according to Mrs White, evidenced that "they knew not what the old landmarks were." Indeed, "they had perverted ideas of what constituted the old landmarks." She considered that the "cry about changing the old landmarks is imaginary." Mrs White reiterated the point:

Now at the present time God designs a new and fresh impetus shall be given to His work. Satan sees this, and he is determined it shall be hindered. He knows that if he can deceive the people who claim to believe present truth [and make them believe that] the work the Lord designs to do for His people is a removing of the old landmarks, something which they should, with most determined zeal,

resist, then he exults over the deception he has led them to believe. The work for this time has certainly been a surprising work of various hindrances, owing to the false setting of matters before the minds of many of our people. That which is food to the churches is regarded as dangerous, and should not be given them. And this slight difference of ideas is allowed to unsettle the faith, to cause apostasy, to break up unity, to sow discord, all because they do not know what they are striving about themselves. . . .

While in this condition of things, building up barriers, we not only deprive ourselves of great light and precious advantages, but just now, when we so much need it, we place ourselves where light cannot be communicated from heaven that we ought to communicate to others.

The men in responsible positions have disappointed Jesus. They have refused precious blessings, and refused to be channels of light, as He wanted them to be. The knowledge they should receive of God that they might be a light and blessing to others, they refuse to accept, and thus become channels of darkness. The Spirit of God is grieved. Never can the heart be stirred up with envy, with evil-surmising, with evil reports, but the intellect becomes unbalanced, and cannot decide correctly any controverted point. The attributes of Satan which have found entrance to the soul, cannot harmonize with truth.⁸¹

At the 1889 General Conference session, Mrs White warned the delegates that, unless they received "divine enlightenment" Satan would "set up his hellish banner right in your homes, and you will be so blinded to the real nature of his deceptions that you reverence it as the banner of Christ."⁸² Her warnings of the potential of the church following aberrant paths as a result of the spirit of Minneapolis are explicit and numerous. By 1890, Mrs White was drained by her efforts to dispel that spirit. She wrote to the General Conference president:

I have not spared myself, but I have labored, I may say, day and night without periods of rest. I have been so burdened that I could not sleep. The Lord was setting things before me, and he strengthened me to meet the different issues that were arising all last year, and this. . . . I had labored early and late writing out important matters to meet and correct the prejudice, the misconstruing of things, and the misinterpretation of matters. . . .

I have had to vindicate myself before my brethren--press with all my powers against the prejudice and unbelief and false statements and misrepresentations, until it almost gives me a nervous chill to think of the blindness and unreasonable pharisaism that has been adjusted about men in prominent positions as a garment. . . .

If my brethren allow me to carry this burden longer in this way I will certainly know that God does not lead them and me. One of us is moving out of God's order. I think it is time to call a half and see what powers are moving us. . . .

Satan will work with masterly power, not only among unbelievers, but believers, to close the door that the very special light shall not do its work. What am I to do, Bro Olsen? I have no rest day nor night in spirit.⁸³

Two months later, she again warned of the danger of apostasy springing from disunity. In a handwritten, unedited letter written to O A Olsen for use at a campmeeting if Olsen saw fit, Mrs White bemoaned the "spirit of resistance" against the presentation of "the righteousness of Christ as our only hope." It caused her great grief, she affirmed, that the "work to be done for this time to prepare a people to stand in the day of the Lord," was nullified by those who should have "given the trumpet a certain sound." The consequence, she noted, was that "Satan sees it is his time to make a strike and fanaticism and errors will prevail." Because of the leadership opposition, when heresy and fanaticism "really appear and they see the peril and try to avoid it they cannot do it." Mrs White continued:

Satan pieced up the matter according to his own devices. Because the message of Sister White in testimonies given did not harmonize with their ideas the testimonies were made of no account--except it vindicated their ideas.

Persistently have they followed their own ways in this matter that should reproof be given to the evils that will have arisen and will still arise the ones reprovved will say, Sister White's testimonies are no more reliable. Brn Smith and Butler and other leaders no longer have confidence in them. These men have sown the seed and the harvest will surely follow.⁸⁴

Ellen White's worst fears were realized in the decade and a half following Minneapolis. In 1892, she wrote the following to Uriah Smith:

The first thing recorded in Scripture history after the fall was the persecution of Abel. And the last thing in Scripture prophecy is the persecution against those who refuse to receive the mark of the beast. We should be the last people on the earth to indulge in the slightest degree the spirit of persecution against those who are bearing the message of God to the world. This is the most terrible feature of unchristlikeness that has manifested itself among us since the Minneapolis meeting. Sometime it will be seen in its true bearing, with all the burden of woe that has resulted from it.⁸⁵

Near the end of 15 years of apostasy, Mrs White reiterated similar

sentiments as she considered the J H Kellogg and A F Ballenger fanatical teachings:

The one who has exercised masterly power in the medical missionary work has not been given permission to exercise this power. He has taken this power to himself. Heaven is grieved because acts so imperious and unadvised and often so oppressive are done. Christ has looked upon the kingly dictations as to what shall be and what shall not be, and He says . . . "For man to interfere with My heritage, or to harm one of My purchased possession, is to impugn the divine efficacy and efficiency. Those who assume such authoritative power are to be rebuked for their presumption." . . .

Those who would be saved from the wily, deceptive influences of the foe must now break every yoke, and take their position for Christ and for truth. They must reject all fictitious sentiments, which, if accepted, will spoil their faith and their experience. Unless they obtain this freedom, they will go on step by step in the downward path, until they deny Him who has bought them with the price of His blood. . . . The Lord calls upon those who claim to be medical missionaries to free themselves from the control of any human mind.⁸⁶

Speaking of a general movement that seemed to plague the denomination throughout its history, Mrs White warned against "over-strained ideas of sanctification." She urged that "extreme views of sanctification which lead men to criticize and condemn their brethren are to be feared and shunned." Such sentiments, she affirmed, "have been the alpha of a train of deception."⁸⁷

Perhaps recalling her experiences after 1888, Mrs White made significant interlineations on a testimony written during the A F Ballenger apostasy of 1905. She tied Ballenger to an apostasy "similar" to that of J H Kellogg that had "under Satan's special guidance" been growing for years. She further identified the roots of such fanaticism by warning, "Every president of conference will fear to move as some have done, dictating and commanding and forbidding, they drive the sheep away into forbidding paths for many years." [sic]⁸⁸

In 1913, W C White spoke to an Autumn Council meeting of the General Conference Committee. He related an experience that, to his mind, indicated a vital and continuing relevance of the Spirit of Prophecy within the SDA church. He described that relevance in the following terms:

One morning about two months ago when I visited mother in her writing-room, I found her very weak and full of suffering. She told me that she had been very sick in the night, and at times thought she could not long endure the suffering. And then it was impressed upon her mind that if she lived till morning she must give me a charge regarding the work.

Then she told me briefly about the many times that God had restored her to health and strength miraculously and at the same time had given her instruction regarding her work. And because she felt that her life might end suddenly and at any time, she wished to tell me some things which I must bear in mind in my work in connection with the cause of God throughout the field.

Then she told me that she had been instructed by God that she must not give countenance to any form of oppression among brethren, and that it would be her duty to stand against it and speak in reproof of it. She said that spirit of oppression would seek to come in here and there, and that the brethren should be on guard and not give it place in our work. Then she charged me to be faithful in opposing the entrance into our work of any form of unfair dealing or any form of oppression.

Mother spoke at some length regarding the responsibility she had felt in this matter, and with solemn earnestness repeated to me her charge, saying that for aught she knew this was her last opportunity to speak to me about this important matter.⁸⁹

Just as a spirit of Pharisaism became the breeding ground of apostasy, so did Mrs White point to a different atmosphere that would enable truth to flourish. In 1889 she wrote:

If my brethren had sensed their own weakness, their own inability, and had never lost sight of this, they would have humbled their hearts before God, confessed their errors, and come into light and freedom.⁹⁰

She wrote in a similar vein in 1892, during a period of theological friction:

One man may be conversant withu the Scriptures, and some particular portion of the Scripture may be especially appreciated by him; another sees another portion as very important, and thus one may present one point, and another, another point, and both may be of highest value. This is all in the order of God. But if a man makes a mistake in his interpretation of some portion of Scripture, shall this cause diversity and disunion?—God forbid. We cannot then take a position that the unity of the church consists in viewing every text of scripture in the very same light. The church may pass resolution upon resolution to put down all disagreement of opinion, but we cannot force the mind and will, and thus root out disagreement. These resolutions may conceal the discord; but they cannot quench it, and establish perfect agreement. Nothing can perfect unity in the church but the spirit of Christ-like forbearance. . . .

The great truths of the word of God are so clearly stated that none need make a mistake in understanding them.⁹¹

As she continued her appeal for an atmosphere of unity in 1892, Mrs White elaborated upon her last point and urged, "however long men may have entertained certain views, if they are not clearly sustained by the written word, they should be discarded."⁹² Surely Ellen White remains relevant to the Adventist church today.

NOTES

1. O A Olsen to A G Daniells, Dec 4, 1903, RG 11, 1903-0.
2. Ibid.
3. Ellen White, "Decided Action to Be Taken Now," Oct, 1903, Series B, No 7, pp 36-7.
4. Ellen White, "Distressing Experiences of 1888," Ms 21-88 and Remarks at GC Bible School, Feb 3, 1890, Ms 9-90.
5. Ibid.
6. Ellen White, "Experience Following the Minneapolis Conference," [June, 1889], Ms 30-89.
7. Ibid. Some of the implications of the quoted with be considered in chapter [??] on church organization.
8. Ellen White, "Looking Back at Minneapolis," Ms 24-88.
9. Ibid.
10. Ellen White, "Experience Following the Minneapolis Conference," [June, 1889], Ms 30-89.
11. Ibid.
12. Ibid.
13. W C White to P T Magan, July 31, 1910; RG 58: L E Froom Ref Files, "The Daily" fld.
14. Uriah Smith to A T Robinson, Sept 21, 1892; L E Froom Personal Collection, Uriah Smith fld.
15. Ibid.
16. Ibid.
17. Ellen White, "Looking Back at Minneapolis," Ms 24-88.
18. Ellen White to Uriah Smith, March 8, 1890, S59-90.
19. Ellen White to George Butler and Uriah Smith, April 5, 1887, B13-87, emphasis supplied.
20. Ibid.
21. Ellen White, "Looking Back at Minneapolis," Ms 24-88.
22. Ibid, and "Experience Following the Minneapolis Conference," [June, 1889], Ms 30-89.
23. Ibid.
24. Ellen White to W C White, April 7, 1889, W1-89.
25. Ibid.
26. The extensive newspaper treatment was the consequence of the subscription list to the Capital that was solicited from the residents of Ottawa by a corps of some 33 volunteers from the campgrounds.
27. Quotations from the sermons are taken from the transcriptions appearing in the Topeka Daily Capital between May 14 and 18, 1889. The paper erroneously attributed Jones' fifth sermon to W C White. The language is obviously that of Jones and is similar to thoughts expressed in previous sermons in this series and in other campmeeting addresses. W C White consistently denied competency to speak publicly on theological matters during this period. He was ordained by virtue of his gift of administration, not because of theological training or ability.
28. W C White Notes of Minneapolis Meeting, Oct 15, 1888.
29. Emphasis supplied.
30. Ellen White, "Camp-Meeting at Ottawa, Kansas," RH, July 23, 1889.
31. Emphasis supplied.
32. Emphasis supplied.
33. Emphasis supplied.
34. Emphasis supplied.
35. Jones' sermons, presented during his series on religious liberty and church organization are briefly examined here since they throw additional light upon his theology.

36. A T Jones, "Civil Government and Religion, or Christianity and the American Constitution," 1894, pp 19-20, based on Jones' lectures at Minneapolis in 1888.
37. Ellen White, "Camp-meeting at Ottawa, Kansas," RH, July 23, 1889.
38. Ibid.
39. Ibid.
40. Ibid., emphasis supplied.
41. Ibid.
42. Ibid.
43. Ellen White to "Children of the Household," May 12, 1889, C14-89.
44. Ibid.
45. Ibid.
46. Ibid.
47. Ibid.
48. Ibid.
49. Ibid.
50. Ibid.
51. Ibid.
52. Ibid.
53. Dan T Jones, "The Second Angel's Message," Topeka Daily Capital, May 10, 1889.
54. "The Sermon by Mrs E G White," Topeka Daily Capital, May 11, 1889.
55. Ibid.
56. Ibid.
57. Ibid.
58. Ibid.
59. Ibid.
60. Ellen White to Children of the Household, May 12, 1889, C14-89.
61. Ibid.
62. Ellen White, "Picking Flaws," Morning Talk at Ottawa, Kansas, May 12, 1889, Ms 2-89.
63. Ibid.
64. Ibid.
65. Ellen White to Children of the Household, May 12, 1889 [concluded on May 13], C14-89.
66. "Sermon of Mrs E G White," Topeka Daily Capital, May 15, 1889.
67. Ibid.
68. Ellen White, "Morning Talk at Ottawa, Kansas, May 14, 1889, Ms 3-89.
69. Ibid., emphasis supplied.
70. Ellen White, "Preparation for Christ's Coming," May 14, 1889, Ms 4-89.
71. Ibid.
72. "A Sermon by Mrs E G White," Topeka Daily Capital, May 16, 1889.
73. Ibid.
74. Ellen White to O A Olsen, June 9, 1890, RG 11, EGW 1890 incoming letters.
75. Ellen White Statement, March 3, 1891, at Council of President's Meeting," RG 1, Transcript.
76. Ellen White to W C White, April 7, 1889, W1-89.
77. Ibid, and Ellen White to Edson White, [April 7, 1889], W14a-89.
78. Uriah Smith to A T Robinson, Sept 21, 1892; L E Froom Personal Collection, Smith fld.
79. Ellen White to Uriah Smith, Sept 19, 1892, S24-92.
80. Ellen White, "Experience Following the Minneapolis Conference," Ms 30-89.
81. Ellen White, "Standing by the Landmarks," Ms 13-89.
82. Ellen White, "Religious Liberty," Ms 18, 1888 [sic].

83. Ellen White to O A Olsen, June 21, 1890, RG 11, incoming letters, 1890.
84. Ellen White to O A Olsen, Aug 27, 1890; RG 11, incoming letters.
85. Ellen White to Uriah Smith, Aug 30, 1892, S25b-92.
86. Ellen White, "Freedom in Christ," Letters to Physicians and Ministers, Series B, No 2, pp 45-46.
87. Ellen White to A G Daniells, Dec 14, 1903, D269-03.
88. Ellen White, "Building the Waste Places," May, 1905, Ms 75-05.
89. W C White, "A Statement," Aug 26, 1917, DF 250.
90. Ellen White, "Experience Following the Minneapolis Conference," Ms 30-89.
91. Ellen White, "Love the Need of the Church," Ms 24-92.
92. Ellen White, "Search the Scriptures," RH, July 26, 1892.

Appendix

Ellen White, Pharisees and 1888: A Documentary Analysis

As Ellen White ever more carefully analyzed Adventism's immediate pre-1888 spirit and theological perspective, she increasingly applied the term "Pharisee" to that system. The roots to her analysis go far back into her early experience, however. When she was about 22 years of age, Ellen White had a vision that she described as follows:

I saw a throne, and on it sat the Father and the Son. . . . Before the throne I saw the Advent people. . . . I saw two companies, one bowed down before the throne, deeply interested, while the other stood uninterested and careless. Those who were bowed before the throne would offer up their prayers and look to Jesus; then He would look to His Father, and appear to be pleading with Him. A light would come from the Father to the Son and from the Son to the praying company. Then I saw an exceeding bright light come from the Father to the Son, and from the Son it waved over the people before the throne. But few would receive this great light. Many came out from under it and immediately resisted it; others were careless and did not cherish the light, and it moved off from them. Some cherished it, and went and bowed down with the little praying company. This company all received the light and rejoiced in it, and their countenances shone with its glory.

I saw the Father rise from the throne, and in a flaming chariot go into the holy of holies within the veil, and sit down. Then Jesus rose up from the throne, and the most of those who were bowed down arose with Him. I did not see one ray of light pass from Jesus to the careless multitude after He arose, and they were left in perfect darkness. Those who arose when Jesus did, kept their eyes fixed on Him as He left the throne and led them out a little way. . . . He stepped into the chariot and was borne to the holiest, where the Father sat. . . . I turned to look at the company who were still bowed before the throne; they did not know that Jesus had left it. Satan appeared to be by the throne, trying to carry on the work of God. I saw them look up to the throne, and pray, 'Father, give us Thy Spirit.' Satan would then breathe upon them an unholy influence; in it there was light and much power, but no sweet love, joy, and peace.¹

The vision clearly depicts individuals who had become so blinded that they could not perceive the difference between light and darkness, between praying to Christ and praying to Satan. Would could bring about such a condition?

Ellen White first applied such Pharisaical blindness to those Protestant churches whose creedal systems did not allow room for the Advent movement of the 1840s. She, with her own family, were evicted from one of the

denominations because the concept of a soon-returning Saviour conflicted with the assumptions of a pre-Advent millennium. She states: "We were all pushed out of the church because we believed and talked the near coming of our Saviour."²

She also noted, "There were many in the church who waited for the appearing of the Saviour, and this [action] was made for the purpose of frightening them into subjection. In some cases this policy brought about the desired result, and the favor of God was sold for a place in the church."³

Well, if our story ended here, Seventh-day Adventists would look quite good. After all, they had accepted light, had followed Christ into the most holy place and received the truth of the Sabbath, and other light from His word.

As Adventists were beginning to get content with their spiritual and theological development, she applied the Pharisaism illustration ever more forcefully to the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

Ellen White and Her Role in the SDA Church. In November of 1890, Ellen White began a testimony to church leadership with the salutation: "Brethren in responsible positions, you are in danger."⁴

She continued that warning role into the next year as she observed: "The Lord is indeed giving me close and cutting testimonies to bear to His people. . . . Constantly I am passing through scenes of that which will be in the future as the result of the present and future actions of men in high positions of responsibility."⁵

During the General Conference Session of 1888, Ellen White stated that she was more convinced at that time than she had ever been that the Lord was guiding her in the messages she had for the church. It was also a time, however, when the church, in a very dramatic manner, seemed to reject her and her messages.

Such is an amazing development, and can be explained only by the inroads Pharisaism made in the Seventh-day Adventist Church. Shortly after that time Ellen White wrote, "Something in line of decided testimony must be heard in vindication of the testimonies of the Spirit of God in our churches."⁶

One of the difficulties faced by Ellen White, however, came from misunderstandings about the nature of her inspiration. She wrote the following to George Butler because of his misunderstanding of her work:

I tell you the work God has given me to do has not suffered and is not likely to suffer half as much from open opposers as from my apparent friends, those who appear to be defenders of the Testimonies, but are their real assailants. . . . You ask, do you mean this for me? I do, my brother.⁷

When the theological dispute in 1888 was blown out of all proportion, Mrs White again alluded to an important aspect of her mission: "We see the spirit that prevails at this meeting, which is unchristlike, and which we should never see exhibited among brethren. There has been a spirit of Pharisaism coming in among us which I shall lift my voice against wherever it may be revealed."⁸ Mrs White made a solemn pledge as she related to the Phariseeism she perceived within the church and affirmed:

I have pledged myself by a solemn vow to God that wherever this spirit of contempt and unkindness and want of love should exist, I would lay it out in clear lines before my brethren, show them the sinfulness of their course, and with decided testimony turn the current if possible.⁹

In the next year, Mrs White drew lessons from the experience of the Pharisees and warned that SDAs faced the same danger:

Shall there be with the people of God the cropping out of the very same spirit which they have condemned in the [other] denominations, because there was a difference of understanding on some points. . . . A difference in the application of some few scriptural passages makes men forget their religious principles. . . . Satan is doing his utmost to have those who believe present truth deceived on this point, for he has laid his snare to overcome them, that those who have accepted unpopular truth, who have had great light and great privileges, shall have the spirit that will pervade the world. . . . The result is the same as with the Jews fatal hardness of heart.¹⁰

In a most devastating message to the church, Ellen White clearly warned of the potential consequences of the continuation of a spirit of Pharisaism:

A reformation must go through the churches. Reforms must be made, for spiritual weakness and blindness were upon the people who had been blessed with great light and precious opportunities and privileges. As reformers they had come out of the denominational churches, but they now act a part similar to that which the [fallen] churches acted. We hoped that there would not be the necessity for another coming out. While we will endeavor to keep the 'unity of the Spirit' in the bonds of peace, we will not with pen or voice cease to protest against bigotry.¹¹

On January 17, 1890, Mrs White again warned of the inroads Phariseeism was making in the SDA church:

The Jews manner of warfare against Christ was objectionable and condemned. If you pursue the same course that other denominations have pursued in refusing to hear evidence, refusing to investigate anything except that which they believed, you will be in the same position before God as they were. . . . The Priests and Rulers sent me claiming to be just men for the purpose of catching Him in His words or that something would drop from his lips that would justify them in their prejudice, words that they could present clothed in a different way and make Christ appear as a deceiver, a heretic. The Jews were not doing God's work, but the work of the enemy of all righteousness. When I see men passing over the same ground, I recognize it. . . . Are we Christians or bigots? I say in the fear of God, search the Scriptures. The interpretation of some portions of Scripture may not be truth in all points, but let in all the light you can upon these points. . . . As a learner come to the Scriptures. You know but little yet what there is to be learned out of God's Word. We are to set no stakes. . . . Come to the front in simple, conscientious confidence with the Bible in your hands and tell your ideas of what you believe to be the truth. If you think error is being taught . . . your positions make this your duty. And more, it is your duty while the opportunity and privilege is brought within your reach to grasp the blessing eagerly of learning some things you do not know.¹²

Ellen White differed from a basic temptation of Pharisees in that she loved truth so completely that she was willing to follow it wherever it led, even though it seemed to destroy past conceptions. Note the following diary entry of Jan 20, 1891: "Our only safety is to believe that which is truth because it is true, not because it harmonizes with our preconceived opinions and it is pleasant and agreeable to believe that which we want to believe because it harmonizes with our ideas."¹³

Ellen White seemed to perceive of herself as having a central mission of seeking to create an atmosphere for vital truth to be perceived. Her attempts to create such an atmosphere failed during the General Conference Session of 1888, however. In the following statement Ellen White is informed by an angel that because of the spirit of her brethren at the Session, it was impossible there to arrive at a decision concerning theological truth. In recognizing that spirit, Mrs White had resolved to leave Minneapolis, but the angel informed her:

For this work the Lord has raised you up. . . . [He then described the spirit of many of those at the Conference.] They are intoxicated with the spirit of resistance and know not any more than the drunkard what spirit controls their words or their actions. . . . This spirit bears no more the semblance to the Spirit of truth and righteousness than the spirit that actuated the Jews to form a confederacy to doubt, to criticise and become spies upon Christ, the world's Redeemer. . . . I was then informed [continues Mrs White] that at this time it would be useless to make any decision as to positions on doctrinal points, as to what is truth, or to expect any spirit of fair investigation, because there was a confederacy formed to allow of no change of ideas on any point or position they had received any more than did the Jews. . . . I found myself sitting up in bed in a spirit of grief and distress, also with a spirit of firm resolve to stand at my post of duty to the close of the meeting and then wait for the directions of the Spirit of God telling me how to move and what course to pursue.¹⁴

Those directions seemed to point Mrs White toward the camp meeting circuit in 1889 as she sought to uproot Pharisaism from the church in order to provide a forum for the gospel truth that was unperceived at Minneapolis. At the Kansas campmeeting, May 12, 1889, she again reflected on the Minneapolis experience as she observed:

The work to be done demanded something more than smooth words, for God would put His rebuke upon anything and everything savoring of the same kind of spirit and influence, that was brought into Minneapolis. . . . I never labored in my life more directly under the controlling influence of the Spirit of God. God gave me meat in due season for the people, but they refused it for it did not come in just the way and manner they wanted it to come. Elder Jones and Waggoner presented precious light to the people, but prejudice and unbelief, jealousy and evil-surmising barred the door of their hearts that nothing from this source should find entrance to their hearts. . . . I could but have a vivid picture in my mind from day to day of the way reformers were treated, how slight difference of opinion

seemed to create a frenzy of feeling. Thus it was in the betrayal, trial, and crucifixion of Jesus—all this had passed before me point by point and the Satanic spirit took the control and moved with power upon the human hearts that had been opened to doubts and to bitterness, wrath and hatred. All this was prevailing in that meeting. . . . I had never pictured before my mind what dependence we might place in those who claim to be friends, when ties of relationship are severed, and why? Because there is a difference of opinion in interpretation of the Scriptures. It is the same spirit which condemned the Lord of life and glory. The truth that sanctifies the souls produces no briars and thorns. . . . And what created all this stirring up of human passions which was bitterness of spirit, because some of their brethren had ventured to entertain some ideas contrary to the ideas that some others of their brethren had entertained, which were thought from their understanding to be inroads upon ancient doctrines. . . . I had declared my intention of leaving the [Minneapolis] meeting but then I was assured I had a work to do. . . . And my work must not cease here for my testimony of this character must continue as God should direct until these wrongs were expelled from the churches. Unless the faithful testimonies are continued to be repeated in the ears of the people of God, the mold which has been left upon the work would not be removed.¹⁵

Notice that Mrs White is here stressing that the spirit of Minneapolis will prevail in the church that ignores or nullifies her writings. No wonder that one of the last deceptions of Satan will be to make of no effect the writings of the gift of prophecy. Notice also how the gift can be made of no effect:

There have been, I was informed [by the angel] misunderstandings not only of the Testimonies, but of the Bible itself. [Errors in theology and in understanding the nature of Ellen White's role were the explosive factors at Minneapolis.] Men have exalted themselves and esteemed themselves too highly, which leads to the denouncing of others and passing judgment upon their brethren. Envy, jealousy, evil speaking, evil surmising, judging one another has been considered a special gift given of God in discernment when it savors more of the spirit of the great accuser, who accused the brethren before God day and night. There has been a spirit of Pharisaism, . . . a placing of men where God alone should be.¹⁶

By 1890, Mrs White had concluded:

Satan is constantly at work to wound and poison the soul; in order to withstand his efforts we must breathe the atmosphere of heaven. . . . I have been warned that henceforth we shall have a constant contest. . . . There will be those who are unable to perceive the most wonderful and important truths for this time, truths which are essential for their own safety and salvation, while matters that are in comparison as the merest atoms, matters in which there is scarcely a grain of truth, are dwelt upon and are magnified by the power of Satan so that they appear of the utmost importance.

. . . There is only one remedy for the sinful soul, and unless it is received, men will accept one delusion after another until their senses are perverted.¹⁷

"Christ our righteousness," was the remedy proposed by Mrs White.¹⁸

Ellen White Versus SDA Pharisees. In the earlier stage of her ministry, Ellen White seemed to apply the concepts of Pharisaism mainly to those who were attacking the Seventh-day Adventist Church. Many, she believed, were claiming a superior sanctification while they exhibited feelings of opposition and hatred toward those emphasizing God's law. "Such feelings," she said "do not reveal sanctification. . . . It is those who break God's commandments most defiantly who boast most loudly of being without sin."¹⁹

By 1890, however, she was making an additional observation:

There is fully as great an error on the part of those who claim to believe and obey the commandments of God. . . . While one class [i.e., non-SDAs] do not see the wondrous things in the law of God . . . the others [SDAs] cavil over trivialities, and neglect the weightier matters, mercy and the love of God. . . . On the one hand, religionists generally have divorced the law and the gospel, while we have, on the other hand, almost done the same from another standpoint. We have not held up before the people the righteousness of Christ and the full significance of His great plan of redemption. We have left out Christ and His matchless love, brought in theories and reasonings, and preached argumentative discourses.²⁰

Mrs White became more and more pointed in her observation of the spirit of Pharisaism within Adventism:

If God has ever spoken by me some of our leading men are going over the same ground of refusing the message of mercy, as the Jews did in the time of Christ. . . . The character and prospects of the people of God are similar to those of the Jews. . . . They thought that Christ's teaching was counteracting the influence of the old and only religion that had been from the beginning. After they had once rejected the light, their minds were blinded, and they thought Christ's teaching was a deception of the enemy. Christ was bringing out the old religion in its true light, but they had separated themselves from the old paths, from the old truths, and had permitted the customs and traditions of men to take the place of the only vital faith. . . . Thus it is in our day. . . . O that you would have less confidence in your own opinions. . . . Just as long as you maintain this spirit of Pharisaism, God's spirit will not, cannot, work with you, because you do not feel your utter dependence upon Him.²¹

Mrs White penned the following in her diary for March 1, 1890:

I have been shown that love for Christ and for God has well-nigh died out of our churches. And because we do not love God, we are lacking in love for one another. A cold, iron-like spirit separates believers from God and from one another. . . . Men are binding themselves together in unsanctified confederacies. . . . They have united to carry out plans that are not in harmony with the plans of God.²²

Ellen White tackled beloved Seventh-day Adventist traditions when she noted:

All articles of faith, all doctrines and creeds, however sacred they have been regarded, are to be rejected if they contradict the plain statements of the word of God. . . . We need not think that because our fathers did a certain way, and died happy, we may follow in their footsteps, and be accepted in rendering the same service, and doing the same works, that they did. We have had more light than they had in their day. . . . We must accept and improve the light that shines upon our pathway, as faithfully as they accepted and improved the light that fell upon their pathway in their generation.²³

She pointed out the central error of the Pharisees:

Whoever trusts in himself that he is righteous, will despise others. As the Pharisee judges himself by other men, so he judges other men by himself. His righteousness is estimated by theirs, and the worse they are the more righteous by contrast he appears. His self-righteousness leads to accusing. 'Other men' he condemns as transgressors of God's law. Thus he is making manifest the very spirit of Satan, the accuser of the brethren. . . . There is nothing so offensive to God or so dangerous to the human soul as pride and self-sufficiency. Of all sins it is the most hopeless, the most incurable. . . . If we are ever saved, it will not be through our own goodness, but through God's infinite grace.²⁴

As theological controversy raged in the church after 1888, Ellen White observed:

I am forced, by the attitude my brethren have taken and the spirit evidenced, to say, God deliver me from your [theological] ideas . . . if the receiving of these ideas would make me so unchristian in my spirit, words, and works as many who ought to know better have been. I see not the divine credentials accompanying you. I am warned again and again of what will be the result of this warfare you have persistently maintained against the truth.²⁵

She also observed in that same document:

We are, as I have been shown, constantly liable to error in laying too much stress even on sound ideas and proper forms. Those peculiarities which are not required, if allowed to become so distinct, lessen the force of the positions we are compelled to hold

upon sound, essential truths that will distinguish us as God's peculiar people. . . . Faith, love, and holiness are the essentials that give true power to the truth for this time. The manifest absence of these, the little many have known of Christ, and the little we preach Christ's lessons, have been a telling witness against Seventh-day Adventists.

The reproach of Christ is upon His people. The gospel of Christ and His love and Him crucified was a stumblingblock to the Jews, and it has been evidenced that it is a stumblingblock to many who claim to believe present truth.²⁶

Mrs White's relevance continues within the SDA church as her following observation reveals:

May God pity those who are watching, as did the Pharisees, to find something to condemn in their brethren, and who pride themselves on their wonderfully acute discernment. That which they call discernment is cold, Satanic criticism, acuteness in suspecting and charging souls with evil intentions, who are less guilty than themselves. Like the enemy of God, they are accusers of the brethren. Whatever their position and experience, they need to humble themselves before God.²⁷

The solution to Phariseeism proposed by Ellen White is relatively simple. She recommends the publican to us. He "knew that he had no merit to commend him to God, and in utter self-despair he cried, 'God be merciful to me, a sinner.'"²⁸

Issues Causing Friction in 1888. The year began inauspiciously when the president of the General Conference, George Butler, sent a circular letter to the churches affirming that Seventh-day Adventists had never been forced to back down on a point of Biblical exegesis. "On the contrary," he affirmed, "each passing year strengthens our positions."

It looked like the year that would usher in the time of trouble, for, as Seventh-day Adventists had anticipated for years, national Sunday legislation was being proposed in Congress and SDAs were being arrested in some states for doing their farming on Sunday.

As though issues outside the church were not traumatic enough, however, certain theologians had, since 1885 been raising questions about the traditional defense of the Sabbath, affirming that the law spoken of in the

book of Galatians was the moral law, whose purpose was to slay the believer and make him dependent upon Christ's righteousness, not his own. The traditional defenders, who had won many a debate with non-Seventh-day Adventists based upon the premise that Paul in Galatians was speaking of the ceremonial law, claimed that even if the "fledglings," A T Jones and E J Waggoner, aged 38 and 33 respectively, were right, they had no business tampering with traditional theology at such a time. They should instead be strengthening the Sabbath, not weakening it.

And if that wasn't bad enough, the traditional defenders pointed out that Ellen White, in the past had supported the old position, and not only that, but had supported it in various of her writings, and thus Jones and Waggoner were destroying the Spirit of Prophecy, as well as assisting the enemies of the church in attacking the Sabbath.

In contrast to George Butler, Ellen White offered other counsel as 1888 began: "Like Gideon," she wrote, "we must be distrustful of self. Our strength lies in our own conscious weakness."²⁹

In August of 1888 she sought to set the stage for the forthcoming October General Conference Session: "We are impressed, she wrote, "that this gathering will be the most important meeting you have ever attended. This should be a period of earnestly seeking the Lord and humbling your hearts. . . . [You can then] with the spirit of Christ, search the Scriptures carefully to see what is truth. The truth can lose nothing by close investigation. Let the word of God speak for itself, let it be its own interpreter, and the truth will shine like precious gems amid the rubbish." She urged that "every feeling of indifference for one another should be strenuously overcome." With prophetic insight, Ellen White warned:

Be not guilty of listening to reports against our brethren, or imagining evil of our brethren. Our interests must be bound up with our fellow-laborers, and it is nothing but the decided work of the devil to create suspicion. . . . Some who think that they are really

doing the Lord's work are traitors in the cause. . . . We should be learners, first from the living oracles, and second, from God how to treat our fellowmen. This is God's order. The Word of God is the great detector of error; to it we believe everything must be brought. The Bible must be our standard for every doctrine and practice. . . . There is no assurance that our doctrine is right and free from all chaff and error unless we are daily doing the will of God. . . . If self is brought in there will not be an investigation of truth in the spirit of Christ. All Pharisaism is to be put aside. All assumptions and pre-conceived opinions are to be thoroughly tested by the standard of truth. . . . We are to bring into our practice, in our association with our fellowmen, the Spirit of him who gave us the truth.³⁰

Ellen White sought to create an atmosphere where the truth would have a fair forum at the 1888 General Conference session. But what about those that Ellen White called Pharisees? What was their rationale for the positions they took? After all, vital issues were coming to the forefront in 1888. Notice Uriah Smith's defense to Ellen White:

Up to a certain ill-fated move our cause might be called a unit, and it was our boast that Seventh-day Adventists preached the same thing from Maine to California, from Minnesota to the Gulf. But, sad to say, it is not so now.³¹

Worse yet, to Uriah, if the traditional defense of the Sabbath was wrong, "then we have been wrong for the past 30 years, and Seventh-day Adventism has been developed and built up on error. This," he affirmed, "I am not prepared to admit. . . . I am not ready to tear up the past, and consider that that which we have long believed to be light, has been only darkness . . . for the positions involved are . . . fundamental and vital to the existence of our faith." He argued that, if the new position prevailed "it overthrows the Testimonies and the Sabbath."³²

"How are we going to explain the past?" he asked Mrs White. "I often find myself wondering if you are aware of the new views that are being projected," he wrote her.³³

In counteracting the position of Uriah Smith and the others at Minneapolis, Mrs White sought to remove both points of contention, the question of the Spirit of Prophecy and the overriding theological significance

of the point of contention. She told Smith, "You have turned from plain light [on righteousness by faith] because you were afraid that the law question in Galatians would have to be accepted. As to the law in Galatians, I have no burden and never have had. . . . I would not now . . . depend upon your knowledge or interpretation of the Scriptures," she said as she reacted to the spirit exhibited by Smith, "believing you to be under the control of the Spirit of God, unless you should fall upon the Rock and be broken. If you turn from one ray of light fearing it will necessitate an acceptance of positions you do not wish to receive, that light becomes to you darkness, that if you were in error, you would honestly assert it to be truth. I speak the things I know."³⁴

While she sought to remove the Galatians question from the realm of a vital issue, she did not focus upon another vital issue:

But it is a vital question whether we are Christians, whether we have a Christian spirit, and are true, open, and frank with one another. . . . We should not consider that either Elder Butler or Elder Smith are the guardians of the doctrines for Seventh-day Adventists, and that no one may dare to express an idea that differs from theirs. My cry has been: Investigate the scriptures for yourselves, and know for yourselves what saith the Lord. No man is to be authority for us. If he has received his light from the Bible so may we also go to the same source for light and proof to substantiate the doctrines which we believe.³⁵

In 1892, while she was in Australia, Ellen White pointed out to Uriah Smith the consequence of his focus upon nonessentials: "The many and confused ideas in regard to Christ's righteousness and justification by faith are the result of the position you have taken toward the men and the message sent of God."³⁶

Ellen White Identifies the Central Issues of 1888. There were a number of occasions during the Minneapolis session and afterward where Ellen White identified the central issues and proclaimed the new insights that were sounding most fully after 1888.

At Minneapolis she observed, "We are not to be satisfied with our own

righteousness." Indeed, she seemed to there accept the basic Galatians argument of Waggoner when she affirmed, "there is no power in the law to save or to pardon the transgressor. What then does it do? It brings the repentant sinner to Christ."³⁷

December, 1888: "The third angel's message is the proclamation of the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus Christ. The commandments of God have been proclaimed, but the faith of Jesus Christ has not been proclaimed by Seventh-day Adventists as of equal importance, the law and the gospel going hand in hand. I cannot find language to express this subject in its fullness."³⁸

April 7, 1889, Ellen White observations from her experience at the Chicago campmeeting: "How hard it was to educate the people to look away from themselves to Jesus and to His righteousness. The people acknowledge that they were obtaining an education in faith which they had never had before. . . . All regret that they have been so long ignorant of what constituted true religion. They are sorry that they have not known that it was true religion to depend entirely upon Christ's righteousness and not upon works of merit. . . . I think that Elder A T Jones should attend our large camp meetings, and give to our people and to outsiders as well the precious subject of faith and the righteousness of Christ. . . . Let the outsiders understand that we preach the gospel as well as the law and they will feast upon these truths, and many will take their stand for the truth."³⁹

April, 1889: "The religion of Jesus Christ . . . is a clinging to Christ, accepting the righteousness of Christ as a free gift. . . . Through faith in the righteousness of Christ is salvation. . . . [Many] had been clinging closely to their own righteousness."⁴⁰

June, 1889: "The law has its important position but is powerless unless the righteousness of Christ is placed beside the law. . . . A false religion has come in among us, a legal religion. We will not keep silent."⁴¹

July 23, 1889: "It is not because we are righteous, but because we are dependent, faulty, erring, and helpless of ourselves, that we must rely upon Christ's righteousness, and not upon our own. . . . It is not our doings and deservings that will save us."⁴²

September 13, 1889: "Satan has nearly eclipsed the views we should have and must have of Jesus Christ. . . . We have talked the law. This is right. But we have only casually lifted up Christ as the sin-pardoning Saviour. . . . The soul-saving message, the third angel's message, is the message to be given to the world. The commandments of God and the faith of Jesus are both important, immensely important, and must be given with equal force and power. The first part of the message has been dwelt upon mostly, the last part casually. The faith of Jesus is not comprehended. The men who have had a Pharisaical spirit, think if they hold to the good old theories, and have no part in the message sent of God to His people,

they will be in a good and safe position. So thought the Pharisees of old, and their example should warn ministers off that self-satisfied ground."⁴³

December 21, 1889 [Diary]: "Oh, that the sinner might see and understand that if his righteousness is based upon any other than the righteousness of Christ, he has missed his golden opportunity and is lost. . . . [Instead] his faith meets in the righteousness of Christ, which he accepts as a free gift. All that he needs, as a guilty and lost sinner he finds in Jesus Christ. Christ's righteousness fully acquits us from the condemnation of the law."⁴⁴

February 6, 1890: "It is true men will say you are too excited; you are making too much of this matter, and you do not think enough of the law; now you must think more of the law; don't be all the time reaching for this righteousness of Christ, but build up the law. Let the law take care of itself. We have been at work on the law until we got as dry as the hills of Gilboa without dew or rain. Let us trust in the merits of Jesus Christ of Nazareth."⁴⁵

1890 [Mss 36]: "The danger has been presented to me again and again of entertaining as a people, false ideas of justification by faith. . . . Let the subject be made distinct and plain that it is not possible to effect anything in our standing before God or in the gift of God to us through creature merit. . . . It is wholly a free gift. Justification by faith is placed beyond controversy. . . . The light given me of God places this important subject above any question in my mind. Justification is wholly of grace and not procured by any works that fallen man can do. . . . All blessings must come through a Mediator. . . . All must be laid upon the fire of Christ's righteousness to cleanse it from its earthly odor before it rises in a cloud on fragrant incense to the great Jehovah and is accepted as a sweet savor. . . . If you would gather together everything that is good and holy and noble and lovely in man, and then present the subject to the angels of God as acting a part in the salvation of the human soul or in merit, the proposition would be rejected as treason. . . . Any works that man can render to God will be far less than nothingness. My requests are made acceptable only because they are laid upon Christ's righteousness. . . . There is danger in regarding justification by faith as placing merit on faith. When you take the righteousness of Christ as a free gift you are justified freely through the redemption of Christ."⁴⁶

March 3, 1891: "We must look more to the presentation of God's love and mercy to move the hearts of the people. 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."⁴⁷

Was the 1888 message a revolution within Adventism? Butler, Smith and many others claimed that they always believed in justification by faith. Ellen White, however, clearly considered it a revolution. As late as

September of 1889, she was noticing that less than one percent of SDAs even then understood the core of the plan of salvation.⁴⁸ Truly Ellen White longed for this message to be given to the world.

Ellen White at Minneapolis. Ellen White detected the spirit of Pharisaism at the very commencement of the meeting at the Minneapolis 1888 General Conference Session. As she saw the animosity generated by the theological dispute she reflected upon a vision given while she was in Europe in the mid 1880s. An angel told Ellen White at that time:

The church needed the 'energy of Christ'—all must cling close to the Bible for it alone can give a correct knowledge of God's will. A time of trial was before us, and great evils would be the result of the Pharisaism which has in a large degree taken possession of those who occupy important positions in the work of God. . . . [The angel] said that the work of Christ upon the earth was to undo the heavy burdens and let the oppressed go free; to break every yoke, and the work of his people must correspond with the work of Christ. He stretched out his arms toward E J Waggoner and G I Butler and said in substance as follows:—Neither have all the light upon the law, neither position is perfect.⁴⁹

In effect, the angel seems to be emphasizing that each needed the other to perceive the full truth. But note what Ellen White next does, in this letter she writes the General Conference president: She endorses the essence of the message presented by Waggoner, even though an angel had already pointed out that he didn't have the full theological truth. She saw the spirit of Pharisaism in those that opposed Waggoner, however, and feared that more than theological error. She warned Butler:

The churches have been cherishing a spirit which God cannot approve and unless they humble their souls before God and possess a different spirit, they will reject God's light and follow spurious lights to the ruin of their own and many other souls.⁵⁰

We've seen enough of Ellen White to know how strongly she reacts to Pharisaism. Notice, however, how she reacts when someone crosses her theological path:

Some things presented [by Waggoner] in reference to the law in Galatians, if I fully understand his position, do not harmonize with the understanding I have had of this subject; but truth will lose

nothing by investigation, therefore I plead for Christ's sake that you come to the living Oracles, and with prayer and humiliation seek God. Everyone should feel that he has the privilege of searching the Scriptures for himself. . . . I would have humility of mind, and be willing to be instructed as a child. The Lord has been pleased to give me great light, yet I know that He leads other minds, and opens to them the mysteries of His Word, and I want to receive every ray of light that God shall send me, though it should come through the humblest of His servants.

Of one thing I am certain, as Christians you have no right to entertain feelings of enmity, unkindness, and prejudice toward Dr Waggoner, who has presented his views in a plain, straightforward manner, as a Christian should. . . . Some interpretations of Scripture given by Dr Waggoner I do not regard as correct. But I believe him to be perfectly honest in his views, and I would respect his feelings and treat him as a Christian gentleman. . . . The fact that he honestly holds some views of Scripture differing from yours or mine is no reason why we should treat him as an offender, or as a dangerous man, and make him the subject of unjust criticism. . . . No one should feel at liberty to give loose rein to the combative spirit.⁵¹

Ellen White herself was powerless to overcome the spirit of Pharisaism that prevailed during and following the Minneapolis meetings. The results are amazing and can only be summarized by saying that the most erroneous theological concepts came into the Seventh-day Adventist church during the 1890s and only the return of Ellen White from Australia saved the church from great disaster after the turn of the 20th century.

The roots of those gross errors, however, go back to the spirit of Pharisaism that developed within the church during the 1888 experience.

Ellen White and "Our Righteousness." After the Minneapolis meeting, Mrs White decided to bring the message of righteousness as a free gift to the various campmeetings and accompanied Jones and Waggoner on that circuit.

On the way to the Rome, New York, campmeeting in mid-1889, Mrs White witnessed the devastation of the Johnstown flood, where thousands of lives were quickly taken. She seemed vividly aware that final events were transpiring.

Upon her arrival in Rome, however, the issues of Minneapolis again came

vividly before her as she read a recent issue of the Review. Notice why Ellen White reacted to Uriah Smith's editorial, "Our Righteousness." Smith wrote:

The whole object of Christ's work for us is to bring us back to the law, that its righteousness may be fulfilled in us by our obedience to it, and that when at last we stand beside the law, which is the test of the judgment, we may appear as absolutely in harmony with it.⁵²

Smith asserted: "There is a righteousness we must have in order to see the kingdom of heaven, which is called 'our righteousness,' and this righteousness comes from being in harmony with the law of God." He reaffirmed this point: "There is then a righteousness that we must have, to be secured by doing and teaching the commandments."⁵³

We here see beyond the theological conflict sparked by Galatians the real issue of 1888: "Our righteousness," earned by obedience to the moral law versus Christ's righteousness given as a free gift; it is the fundamental difference between the Pharisee and the publican.

Ellen White reacted to Smith: "This morning I have read your article in the Review. . . . A noble personage stood beside me and said, 'Uriah Smith . . . is walking like a blind man into the prepared net of the enemy but he feels no danger because light is becoming darkness to him and darkness light. She urged Smith that:

Man must be clothed with Christ's righteousness. Then he can, through the righteousness of Christ, stand acquitted before God. . . . God has opened to us our strength. . . . Here is our strength, Christ our righteousness. . . . Is not that enough for us? Cannot we cover ourselves all over with it? Do we need any of our own self esteem? . . . It is impossible for us to exalt the law of Jehovah unless we take hold of the righteousness of Jesus Christ.⁵⁴

Notice this next beautiful insight into the plan of salvation:

The cross of Christ is lifted up between heaven and earth. Here comes the Father and the whole train of holy angels; and as they approach that cross, the Father bows to the Cross and the sacrifice is accepted. Then comes sinful man, with his burden of sin, to the cross, and he there looks up to Christ on the cross of Calvary, and he rolls his sins at the foot of the cross. Here mercy and truth have met. . . . There is no power in law to save the transgressor. . . . Christ must appear in that law as our righteousness. . . .

There is nothing that [we] can do that is of any value at all except to believe. . . . We begin to marvel, and [are] abased. . . . We have been revealing Christ our righteousness. If you boast in your own good works, you cannot boast in Christ.⁵⁵

Ellen White and the Spirit of Adventism. In December of 1890, Ellen White addressed a testimony to "Dear Brethren and Sisters" and urged, "I appeal to you as Seventh-day Adventists to be all that this name signifies. There is danger of departing from the spirit of the message."⁵⁶

What is the spirit of our message? A clue comes from one of the pioneers, J N Andrews. He writes this to us: "If the Advent body itself were to furnish the fathers and the saints for the future church, Heaven pity the people that should live hereafter! Reader we entreat you to prize your Bible. It contains all the will of God, and will make you wise unto salvation through faith in Christ Jesus."⁵⁷

Here's what another pioneer, Ellen White, wrote:

Beware lest you read the word of God in the light of erroneous teaching. It was on this very ground that the [Pharisees] made their fatal mistake. They declared that there must be no different interpretation placed upon the Scriptures than that which had been given by the rabbis in former years. . . . We need not think that because our fathers did a certain way, and died happy, we may follow in their footsteps. . . . We have had more light than they had in their day; and if we would be accepted of God, we must be as faithful in obeying the light and walking in it as they were in receiving and obeying the light that God sent to them.⁵⁸

Here's another clue from Ellen White about the spirit of Adventism. She wrote this in February of 1890:

As a people we are certainly in great danger if we are not constantly guarded, of considering our ideas, because long cherished, to be Bible doctrines and on every point infallible, and measuring everyone by the rule of our interpretation of Bible truth. This is our danger, and this would be the greatest evil that could ever come to us as a people. . . . [That] very same course was taken by the denominational churches when we embraced the first and second angels' messages. And as the light was shining forth from the oracles of God upon the messages which were present truth for our time, Satan tried by every means in his power to close the door to shut out the light. We had to meet with prejudice and with ridicule and with sneers and with criticism of the very same character that we have had to meet here in this [Minneapolis] conference. The opposition seemed almost crushing in its influence. What if we had held our peace and been

controlled by the ministers who thought we were heretics, disturbing the peace of churches? Nevertheless, we did move forward, and while many bent beneath the power of opposition and yielded their faith to preserve the unity with their brethren, and retained their place in the churches, many could not conscientiously do this. They held fast their faith. And what was the result? They were turned out of the churches. After the passing of the time, when sorrow and disappointment was weighing us down to the earth, the Lord let His light shine in upon us, giving us the light upon the third angel's message so strikingly clear, which showed us our whereabouts in prophecy and placed our feet in a sure path.⁵⁹

Ellen White was extremely fearful of the spirit of Pharisaism. She saw its results time and again. She pointed out some of its outworking at the Minneapolis meeting:

There was poor Brother Ostrander that went to that [1888] meeting, unbalanced in mind, little less than insane man. His brethren were in so great blindness they were so wrought up over the law in Galatians, they had no sense to discern his true condition and the question was gravely asked me by the committee who visited me for my counsel of Brother Ostrander. Would not he be one whose name should be put on the paper as one to run for the presidency of General Conference? This man was even dangerous in his home in his insanity before he left home, for his wife has told me in regard to it. But this man was fully in the confidence of Elder Butler and in his weak condition strong impressions from this man were made on his mind. . . . They talk through mist, through doubts, through darkness but do not open their hearts to the light that God has sent them to clear away the fog. They close their hearts to knowledge that God would give them but open them to all the doubts that are floating from one to another. . . . The Lord will no more excuse the rejection of light in any one of those who claim to believe in the truth in our day than He excused the Jews for their rejecting light that came from the Lord's appointed agencies. In this our day the refusal to walk in the light leaves men in darkness always.⁶⁰

Note one additional result from that spirit pointed out by Ellen White:

The many and confused ideas in regard to Christ's righteousness and justification by faith are the result of the position you [Uriah Smith] have taken toward the men and the message sent of God.⁶¹

It's important to notice that Ellen White did not attempt to resolve the specifics of the theological conflict of 1888. She did draw some conclusions as to how it could be analyzed, however, as she warned us:

Many things will occur in this day of God's preparation that will be hard to comprehend. I have been shown that the workers will reveal the manner of spirit that moves them to action.⁶²

In December of 1888, after noticing the spirit of those who defended the

old position on Galatians, Ellen White observed:

For the first time I began to think it might be we did not hold correct views after all, upon the law in Galatians, for the truth required no such spirit to sustain it.⁶³

Notice how she explained issues to a group of ministers at an 1890

Ministerial Institute:

I am afraid of you and I am afraid of your interpretation of any scripture which has revealed itself in such an unchristlike spirit as you have manifested and has cost me so much unnecessary labor. . . . I say if your views on the law in Galatians, and the fruits, are of the character I have seen in Minneapolis and ever since up to this time, my prayer is that I may be as far from your understanding and interpretation of the Scriptures as it is possible for me to be. I am afraid of any application of Scripture that needs such a spirit and bears such fruit as you have manifested. One thing is certain, I shall never come into harmony with such a spirit as long as God gives me my reason. . . . You could not have given a better refutation of your own theories than that you have done. Now brethren, I have nothing to say, no burden in regard to the law in Galatians. This matter looks to me of minor consequence in comparison with the spirit you have brought into your faith. It is exactly of the same piece that was manifested by the Jews in reference to the work and mission of Jesus Christ. The most convincing testimony that we can bear to others that we have the truth is the spirit which attends the advocacy of that truth. If it sanctifies the heart of the receiver, if it makes him gentle, kind, forbearing, true and Christlike, then he will give some evidence of the fact that he has the genuine truth. But if he acts as did the Jews when their opinions and ideas were crossed, then we certainly cannot receive such testimony, for it does not produce the fruits of righteousness.⁶⁴

During another crisis in the early part of the 20th century, Mrs White wrote: "Extreme views of sanctification which lead men to suppose they are appointed to criticise and condemn their brethren are to be feared and shunned."⁶⁵

Mrs White illustrated her point again at the 1903 General Conference session:

Do not cut any man's hands. I once read of a drowning man who was making desperate efforts to get into a boat close beside him. But the boat was full, and as he grasped the side, those in the boat cut off one of his hands. Then he grasped the boat with the other hand, and that hand was cut off. Then he grasped it with his teeth, and those inside had mercy on him, and lifted him in. But how much better it would have been if they had taken him in before they had cut off his hands. My brethren, do not cut a man to pieces. . . . We are but little children, and we should ever be learning of [God].⁶⁶

As Ellen White looked toward the future, she seemed to see two possible paths for Adventism:

Those who are so eager to find fault know not what spirit they are of. They think they love the truth, and the cause of God, but their own ideas, their own ways are dearer to them than the advancement of the Lord's work.⁶⁷

Notice her suggestion of an alternate path:

There are glorious truths to come before the people of God. Privileges and duties which they do not even suspect to be in the Bible will be laid open before the followers of Christ. As they follow on in the path of humble obedience, doing God's will, they will know more and more of the oracles of God, and be established in right doctrines. . . . The pulpit, the press, and the church will be more humble, more forbearing, more patient and kind, and the love of Jesus will pervade our hearts.⁶⁸

In her campmeeting circuit of 1889, Mrs White went to South Lancaster, Massachusetts, and saw at that meeting a spirit similar to what she witnessed as a girl in the early 1840s, during the Millerite Movement:

There were many who testified that as the searching truths had been presented, they had been convicted in the light of the law as transgressors. They had been trusting in their own righteousness. Now they saw it as filthy rags, in comparison with the righteousness of Christ, which is alone acceptable to God. While they had not been open transgressors, they saw themselves depraved and degraded in heart. . . . We should go to Jesus just as we are, confess our sins, and cast our helpless souls upon our compassionate Redeemer. This subdues the pride of the heart. . . . Christ came not to call the righteous, but sinners, to repentance.⁶⁹

Conclusion. Shortly after Minneapolis, Ellen White reenunciated the mission of Seventh-day Adventists:

We claim that the angel was flying through the midst of heaven proclaiming the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. . . . Did you hear his voice? Did he speak so you could hear that message? . . . Will any one hear it? Yes, those who have been walking out step by step as Jesus leads the way, and when the position of Christ changed from the holy to the most holy place in the Sanctuary, it is by faith to enter with him, understand his work, and then to present to the world the last message of mercy that is to be given to the world. And what is it? It is a message to prepare the people for the second coming of the Son of Man.⁷⁰

The Lord our righteousness, is the preparation urged by Mrs White.

Here's a personal testimony written by Ellen White, November 15, 1888, and

sent to each of us: "The highest spiritual attainments are reached only when the soul is humbled in view of its great need. Man begins to comprehend himself when he takes his place at the feet of Jesus. When men turn their attention away from earthly things, and look heavenward, when they obtain glimpses of the heavenly glory, they discern more clearly the depths of the human heart, and see the depravity of the soul. Will you heed this testimony," writes Ellen White. "Will you see the depravity of your soul?"⁷¹

She mails it to each of us and urges us to accept the solution to our depravity: Christ our righteousness.

NOTES

1. Ellen White, Early Writings, pp 54-6, emphasis supplied.
2. Ellen White, Spiritual Gifts, Vol 2, p 25.
3. Ellen White, Life Sketches, p 53.
4. Ellen White to Brethren in Responsible Positions, Nov, 1890, B1f-90.
5. Ellen White Diary entry, March 13, 1891, Ms 23-91.
6. Ellen White to O A Olsen, Oct 7, 1890, 020-90.
7. Ellen White to Brother and Sister Butler, Dec 11, 1888, b18-88.
8. Ellen White, "Looking Back at Minneapolis," Dec, 1888, Ms 24-88.
9. Ellen White, "Distressing Experiences of 1888," Ms 21-88.
10. Ellen White, "Experience Following the Minneapolis Conference," [June, 1889], Ms 30-89.
11. Ibid, emphasis supplied.
12. Ellen White to Brethren Ballenger and Leon Smith, Jan 17, 1890, B53-90.
13. Ellen White Diary, Jan, 1891, Ms 40-91.
14. Ellen White to Brethren, April, 1889, B85-89.
15. Ellen White to Children of the Household, May 12, 1889, C14-89.
16. Ibid.
17. Ellen White, "Our Constant Need of Divine Enlightenment," Oct, 1890, Ms 16-90.
18. Ibid.
19. Ellen White, "Sanctification," Morning Talk at Orebro, Sweden, June 20, 1886, Ms 25-86.
20. Ellen White, "Danger of False Ideas on Justification by Faith," Ms 36-90.
21. Ellen White to Elders Madison and Howard Miller, July 23, 1889, M4-89.
22. Ellen White, "Diary," March 1, 1890 entry, Ms 22-90.
23. Ellen White, RH, March 25, 1902.
24. Ellen White, Christ's Object Lessons, pp 150-63.
25. Ellen White, "Peril of Trusting in the Wisdom of Men," Ms 55-90.
26. Ibid.
27. Ellen White, RH, May 7, 1895.
28. Ellen White, Christ's Object Lessons, p 151.
29. Ellen White to Stephen Haskell, Jan 24, 1888, H24-88.
30. Ellen White to Brethren Who Shall Assemble in General Conference, Aug 5, 1888, B20-88.
31. Uriah Smith to Ellen White, Feb 17, 1890; Smith, 1890, WE.
32. Ibid; Smith to A T Robinson, Sept 21, 1892, L E Froom Personal Collection, Uriah Smith fld, GCA.
33. Uriah Smith to Ellen White, Feb 17, 1890, Smith, 1890 WE.
34. Ellen White to Uriah Smith, March 8, 1890, S59-90.
35. Ellen White to William Healey, Dec 9, 1888, H7-88.
36. Ellen White to Uriah Smith, Sept 19, 1892, S24-92.
37. Ellen White Sermons at Minneapolis, Oct 18 and 21, 1888, in RH, Oct 8, 1889 and Ms 17-88.
38. Ellen White, "Looking Back at Minneapolis," [Dec, 1888], Ms24-88.
39. Ellen White to Willie White, April 7, 1889, W1-89.
40. Ellen White to Brethren, [April, 1889], B85-90.
41. Ellen White, "Experience Following the Minneapolis Conference," [June, 1889], Ms 30-89.
42. Ellen White to Elders Madison and Howard Miller, July 23, 1889, M4-89.
43. Ellen White, "The Need of a True Concept of Righteousness by Faith," Sept 13, 1889, Ms 27-89.

44. Ellen White Diary, Ms 24-89.
45. Ellen White, Remarks at GC Bible School, Feb 6, 1890, Ms 10-90.
46. Ellen White, "Danger of False Ideas on Justification by Faith," [1890], Ms 36-90.
47. Ellen White, Remarks Before General Conference Committee and Conference Presidents, March 3, 1891, GCA.
48. Ellen White, "Camp-Meeting at Rome, N.Y.," RH, Sept 3, 1889.
49. Ellen White to George Butler, Oct 14, 1888, B2-88.
50. Ibid.
51. Ellen White, "A Call to a Deeper Study of the Word," Nov 1, 1888, Ms 15-88.
52. Uriah Smith, "Our Righteousness," RH, June 11, 1889.
53. Ibid.
54. Ellen White to Uriah Smith, June 14, 1889, S55-89 and June 17, 1889, Ms 5-89.
55. Ellen White, June 17, 1889, Ms 5-89.
56. Ellen White to Brethren and Sisters, [Dec, 1890], B3-90.
57. J N Andrews, RH, Jan 31, 1854.
58. Ellen White, RH, March 25, 1902.
59. Ellen White, "Light in God's Word," [Feb, 1890], Ms 37-90.
60. Ellen White to J Fargo, May 2, 1889, F50-89.
61. Ellen White to Uriah Smith, Sept 19, 1892, S24-92.
62. Ellen White to S N Haskell, June 1, 1894, H27-94.
63. Ellen White, "Looking Back at Minneapolis," Ms 24-88.
64. Ellen White to Willie and Mary White, March 13, 1890, reporting her talk at the Institute, W83-90.
65. Ellen White to A G Daniells, Dec 14, 1903, D269-03.
66. Ellen White, "The Work Before Us," April 5, 1903, 1903 GCB, pp 105-06.
67. Ellen White to Madison and Howard Miller, July 23, 1889, M4-89.
68. Ellen White to Howard Miller, June [1], 1889, M5-89.
69. Ellen White, "Meetings at South Lancaster, Mass," RH, March 5, 1889.
70. Ellen White Sermon at Des Moines, Iowa, Dec 1, 1888, Ms 13-88.
71. Ellen White to Brother and Sister Carpenter, Nov 15, 1888, C43-88.