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This issue of *Adventist Heritage* appears as the United States celebrates its bicentennial. Accordingly, we present three articles that address in various ways the relationship of Seventh-day Adventists to the American state.

Jonathan Butler opens the journal by examining the evolution of Adventist attitudes toward the American republic in the nineteenth century. His observation that Seventh-day Adventists moved from regarding the republic’s future with skepticism to an acceptance of and identification with the United States deserves attention, for it may help us understand why Seventh-day Adventists tend to be conservative and politically quiescent. At another level, Butler’s article raises questions concerning the relationship of religion and culture, particularly as they affect faith and practice.

Whatever Adventist acceptance of the state, however, a tension still existed as Everett Dick clearly shows in his discussion of how Seventh-day Adventist participation in the armed forces’ chaplaincy program evolved. In writing this piece, Dick has drawn upon personal experience, documentary evidence, and interviews. Unfortunately, William H. Bergherm, one of the two Adventist chaplains who served in World War II, lost his life in an automobile accident. Therefore, little is known of his activities as chaplain. But the larger story is well documented and reveals that the meaning and practice of separation of church and state is not easily understood.

In our third bicentennial piece, James Nix sketches in a lighter vein the way Adventists responded to the Philadelphia Exhibition of 1876. In this case, at least, Adventist interest in the state was subordinate to their religious concerns.

Readers will notice that this issue is shorter than usual and contains no “Heirloom” or book reviews. Cost overruns have necessitated this reduction in size, but we expect to return to normal next issue.

G.L.
SINCE the Puritan migration to the New England wilderness, America has seen itself as God's chosen people, a new Israel. The American dream has been actually a millennial vision. This nation has hoped to lead the world to universal peace and prosperity and to establish a kingdom of God on earth. Politicians along with clergymen have shared in this religious vision of the American republic that early shaped the national optimism and sense of manifest destiny.

Very early in the nation's history, however, the country despaired of its millennial mission. Around the mid-nineteenth century, two obstacles seemed to bar an American millennium, one foreign and one domestic. The heavy influx of European immigration, with a Catholic majority, appeared to subvert the civil and religious institutions of the country. Even more basically, North-South sectionalism and a deepening self-consciousness about slavery loomed as a threat to the republic.

During the Civil War, Abraham Lincoln brooded over the troubled nation as a theologian of the American experience. The President used the Second Inaugural to cast America, as did
his forebears, in the eschatological role of "the last, best hope of earth." He added that Americans "may nobly save or meanly lose" this hope, indicating just how fragile and insecure the republic seemed to him. Sidney Mead admonishes that we must take Lincoln at his word here as at Gettysburg, where he asked "whether that nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure."

In this time of irony and despair, Seventh-day Adventists emerged with their own synthesis of the American dream. They drew upon America's millennial self-understanding and assumed much of it rather than rejecting it out of hand. The Adventist dream of America was made explicit in their interpretation of Revelation 13:11-18, or the prophecy of the "two-horned beast" with horns "like a lamb" but speaking as a dragon. While evangelical Protestants at this time typically saw the "first beast" of verses 1-10 as Catholicism, it was Seventh-day Adventists who took the exclusive position that the two-horned "image" of that beast symbolized Protestant America.

John N. Andrews, a young and prominent Adventist leader, introduced this view in a Review and Herald article in May, 1851. The two horns of the beast, according to Andrews and subsequent Adventist interpreters, represented the separation of church and state in America. More specifically, the two horns signified Protestantism and republicanism. In other words, this political cartoon in the Book of Revelation depicted the "American experiment" in civil and religious freedom.

Like the majority of Americans, Seventh-day Adventists believed the foundation of Americanism was unique and wonderful. They lauded the founding fathers and cherished the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution as ordained of God. They looked back upon a youthful and innocent America as "the noblest and last offspring of time." Her religious freedom had nurtured the Second Great Awakening of the early nineteenth century, out of which came Adventism itself. Her political freedom could benefit the entire world if allowed to spread. The beast was "coming up," according to verse 11,
and John N. Loughborough, another pillar of early Adventism, interpreted this as a figure of American progress. American railroads, steam engines, postal service, population and territorial expansion were the “great wonders” of verse 13. The “fire come down from heaven” was the telegraph. Adventists used to remark that Ben Franklin tamed the lightning and Samuel Morse taught it the English language.

But ironically, the lamb-like appearance of American freedom and progress was an illusion, said these Adventists. For like other Americans, Adventists felt the growing pessimism about America and expressed this darken
ing mood in sharply prophetic terms. The American beast had possessed lamb-like horns from the 1770’s through the 1830’s, according to these pre-millennialists, but in the 1840’s and 50’s it had revealed its dragon nature. Its progress turned out to be a sham, for there were the other “wonders” of spiritualism, infidelity, apostasy and crime. James White enumerated America’s social problems and wrote with acerbity, “If this be the commencement of the temporal millennium, may the Lord save us from the balance.”

To the Seventh-day Adventists in the 1840’s and 50’s America was on the decline in two ways:

First, America was declining because of its Protestantism. The lamb-like profession of Protestantism was that it had no creed but the Bible. In actual fact, Protestantism was a dragon of creedalism and heresy trials and the denial of academic freedom at its seminaries. The banishment of Millerites from the churches for their premillennial preaching was prominent in the Adventist vendetta against Protestants. Even more important was the Protestant attempt at Sunday legislation. Seventh-day Adventists looked with foreboding on evangelical efforts at Sabbath reform, for it seemed to jeopardize the Adventist existence in America and to erode the American experiment in religious freedom. No national Sunday law threatened at the time, but there were state “blue laws,” and the Review and Herald frequently cited instances of hard labor and jail sentences for seventh-day Sabbath-keepers. Catholicism was an apocalyptic “beast” but evangelical Protestantism was an “image of the beast,” insofar as it mimicked Catholic intolerance and oppression.

Second, America was a dragon because of its so-called republicanism. America made the profession, wrote Adventists, that “All men are born free and equal, and endowed with certain inalienable rights, as life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.” And yet Andrews, Loughborough, and the others pointed out that three million slaves were held in bondage in America, and therefore America’s professed equality was a lie.

Joseph Bates, among the founders of Seventh-day Adventism, anticipated this prophetic disillusionment with America in a tract he wrote during the Mexican War, short-titled Second Advent Way Marks and High Heaps. The tract was, on the whole, a pastoral recall of the way God had led His fledgling Advent movement in light of various prophetic “way marks.” And then, while commenting on the “third woe” of Revelation 8, Bates abruptly unleashed a vitriolic attack on the United States government for its present involvement in the Mexican War. Sounding a little like Henry Thoreau, Bates declared, “The third woe has come upon this nation, this boasted land of liberty; this heaven-daring, soul-destroying, slave-holding, neighbor-murdering country!” “Murderers,” said Bates, because this was a presidential war unauthorized by Congress or the people. Like other antislavery Northerners, he saw the war as an expansionist effort to extend slave territory.

In the 1850’s each new event seemed to verify, for Seventh-day Adventists, the dragon-like character of America. The Fugitive Slave Law incensed even moderate Northerners, and Adventists, like others, appealed to a “higher law” than the federal one, refusing to return runaway slaves and in some cases operating underground railroads. Review and Herald editorials condemned the Kansas-Nebraska Act, unpopular legislation among anti-slavery Northerners. Adventists chided Congress for its “gag-rule,” limiting the debate on slavery, as a violation of freedom of speech. At one point M. E. Cornell sent in his evangelistic report to the Review and Herald and referred to the Fourth of July, in closing, as the “celebration of American Slavery, alias Independence and Liberty.” John Brown’s raid on Harper’s Ferry took on mythological significance for many Northerners, and Ellen Harmon White, the Adventist prophetess, regarded Brown’s action as a serious attempt to free the slaves, according to Loughborough some years later, not reckless plunder but a blow for liberty. Mrs. White, by this time, was quite outspoken on the slavery issue and told one Seventh-day Adventist that he would be disfellowshipped if he retained his pro-slavery opinions.

In 1858 she published the first volume of Spiritual Gifts, which in a later amplified form would be The Great Controversy Between Christ and Satan. Here the prophetess couched the slavery issue in terms of “last day” events. Of the three angels in Revelation 14 who hovered above the closing days of history, the second angel trumpeted that Babylon was fallen. That is,
the organized churches, both Catholic and Protestant, were fallen, and the world was therefore on the decline. American slavery, and a complicity of the American churches in slavery, was a chief indication of a decaying world.

Ellen White’s jeremiad on the state of the Union blended apocalypticism with what was termed Radical Republicanism. Like Lincoln, she saw Union setbacks at the First Battle of Bull Run and elsewhere as divine judgments. Unlike Lincoln prior to emancipation, she felt sure of the reason. “God is punishing this nation,” she declared in a testimony to the church of 1862, “for the high crime of slavery. He has the destiny of the nation in His hands. He will punish the South for the sin of slavery, and the North for so long suffering its overbearing influence.” The crux of the problem was that conservative Republicans, like Lincoln, endeavored to save the Union without abolishing slavery.

Ellen White, along with Andrews and Loughborough, could agree with Lincoln in the early 1860’s that the American destiny was eschatological. America was indeed “the last, best hope of earth.” It was the “last” because, for Seventh-day Adventists, there was no time left. It was the “best” because nothing better would follow in this world. It was the “hope of earth” due to right principles of Protestantism and republicanism. But there Mrs. White and other Seventh-day Adventists diverged from Lincoln. For at this last hour of earth’s history, America was forsaking these great principles. Protestantism was mimicking Catholicism; republicanism was dissolving into oppressive totalitarianism. A slave minority and an Adventist minority testified to that. For all Lincoln’s fatalism, he could never opt for so grim an appraisal. America was failing, declared the Adventists, as democracy died a sordid death. As a consequence of the American failure the end of time was imminent. America was “the last, best hope of earth,” the best thing the world had going for it, but America was meanly losing this hope, and thus triggering the apocalypse.

Seventh-day Adventists in general used Radical Republican policies and press and congressional speeches to support their two-horned beast prophecy that the nation was in grave peril. Throughout at least the early part of the war, Adventists were pessimistic that a change to a more radical policy would achieve Northern victories, free the slaves and sustain the Union. They expected the Union to tear in pieces over slavery, regarded the “rebellion” as a “sign of the times,” and used the Radical Republican platform only to the extent that it supported their dour prophecy of the time of the end. So, during the Civil War and, with the necessary adaptations, in Reconstruction, Seventh-day Adventist eschatology was poured into a Radical Republican mold.

Quite consistently, the Radical Republicanism of Adventists remained a “paper radicalism” that evoked more verbiage than action. Political participation in the republic seemed futile. Uriah Smith, editor of the Review and Herald, believed the American two-horned beast would be a dragon at heart ultimately, no
matter how Adventists voted, and he refused to “hasten or retard” the fulfillment of this prophecy. The Adventists who cast ballots in the 1860 election voted for Lincoln, but their political activity extended to little else than voting. They left the great juggernaut of political history in God’s firm hand. The Adventist Radical Republicanism did not represent an investment in the political process, as it did for politicians like Thaddeus Stevens or Charles Sumner, but a rhetoric of utter disenchantment with contemporary politics.

There were dissenters from the evangelical conception of the American mission. Adventists, Holiness and Pentecostal groups, as William McLoughlin writes, “pulled away from the evangelical consensus at the bottom just as the radical Social Gospelers or Christian socialists pulled away at the top.” Both groups found evangelicals “too culture-bound, too willing to compromise with the prevailing order, too much concerned with respectability, conformity, and the status quo.”

The Seventh-day Adventists felt pressures of influence from both evangelicalism and sectarian Adventism in relating to the republic from the mid-1870’s and onward. As sectarians, they retained their view of America as the two-horned beast of Revelation 13, but as evangelicals, they permitted the contours of the beast to soften in a new phase of Adventist development. Pictorial illustrations in Adventist journals and books denote the iconographic metamorphosis. In the 1850’s a Uriah Smith woodcut of the animal unveiled America as a hideous, boar-like beast with a long row of venomous teeth. In the 1870’s and 1880’s the beast gradually lost teeth, pictorially, until by 1905 it had become an affable American buffalo. S. N. Haskell, a prominent Adventist at the turn of the century, referred to the American beast as “lamb-like,” where for earlier interpreters it had possessed only lamb-like horns. Within another generation, the onetime harsh woodcut gargoyle had mollified into the gamboling little lamb of the 1940’s Adventist evangelistic charts.

A post-World War II representation of the United States
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Early twentieth-century symbol of America, appearing a few years before the buffalo nickel was minted

After the stillness at Appomattox, prominent Northern evangelicals voiced the vindication of the Yankee cause. The American postmillennialism that stumbled in the 1850’s and 1860’s regained its footing in such prominent churchmen as Henry Ward Beecher, Lyman Abbott and Josiah Strong. Strong invoked the usual American eschatology, “My plea is not, Save America for America’s sake, but Save America for the world’s sake.”

At the same time, the premillennialism of Dwight L. Moody dominated the revival meetings and prophetic conferences of conservative evangelicalism. Their premillennialism notwithstanding, Moody and the other professional revivalists offered tacit support for the American system, radiated optimism for evangelism and institutional expansion under the umbrella of Americanism, and generally upheld the social order.
What changed the face of America for Seventh-day Adventists?

Of primary importance in this development was their interest, with most evangelicals, in world missionary expansion. The Adventist "shut door" of salvation had cracked open in the 1850's when Adventists learned, empirically, that they could make converts among those who had not passed through the Millerite experience. In the mid-1870's the door swung wide open in both home and foreign missionary endeavor. By 1901, the Seventh-day Adventists numbered approximately 75,000 members and supported 16 colleges and secondary schools, a medical school, 27 hospitals and sanitariums, 13 publishing houses, and 31 other miscellaneous institutions. Such growth prompted the American religious historian, Edwin Gaustad, to say that while Seventh-day Adventists were "expecting a kingdom of God from the heavens, they worked diligently for one on earth."

The sense of a wider gospel commission brought Adventists into a new rapprochement with civil authorities. Ellen White counseled: "The less we make direct charges against authorities and powers, the greater we shall be able to accomplish, both in America and in foreign countries." As the movement spread from its Northern matrix into the South, Adventists met with violent opposition, in the late 1890's, for their work among blacks. Mrs. White, once the lioness on racial issues, encouraged discretion to the point of racial separatism so that the "Gospel" would not be impeded among white Southerners.

In the international sphere, the denomination entered countries less tolerant of the free speech that had marked Adventism throughout the Civil War, and political opinions were necessarily muted. Alonzo T. Jones, editor of The American Sentinel, echoed the political apocalypticism of the earlier Adventism, and provoked an Ellen White testimony on moderation. S. N. Haskell, then a missionary in South Africa, wrote to the General Conference president, O. A. Olsen, "Should we deal in such language as is sometimes in the Sentinel and as it is used in some of the speeches in America, our work would be brought into the greatest straits in a very short time. . . . I sometimes wish some of our American brethren could see the effect of some of their unguarded speeches in these foreign fields."

Equal to the effect of missionary expansion, changes in American politics influenced the Seventh-day Adventist inter-relationship to the republic. Adventist premillennialism could no longer draw upon a Radical Republican reservoir as Civil War and reconstruction politics had passed into a grim memory, perhaps to the embarrassment of Adventists, who never expected as much, short of the Second Coming. The Republican Party realigned itself around new issues that included its attitudes on Rum and Romanism, and Adventists adapted their eschatology accordingly.

The prophetess was midwife for the new eschatology. While still not enamored with the social and political order, nevertheless Ellen White envisioned a less imminent end to the republic. In fact, she urged Adventists to be, in effect, a tiny political cadre doing their part to prolong the American future so the Adventist message could go forth and flourish. With a turn of mind faintly suggestive of Josiah Strong's, Mrs. White, in the 1880's, hoped to save America, a short time at least, for the world's sake. She departed dramatically from earlier interpretations of the two-horned beast in Revelation 13 and wrote that the American beast still branned the lamb-like horns of civil and religious tolerance and only eventually would become a dragon.

If the Lord had delayed His coming, His coming was nonetheless sure. For the eyes that could see, a dark cloud gathered in an inchoate conspiracy that would one day smother the republic. In the broadest terms, Ellen White diagnosed the American "crisis" as Strong did in Our Country, Its Possible Future and Present Crisis, while her prognosis, unlike his, was fundamentally pessimistic. According to Mrs. White, the variegated elements of contempor-
ary politics and society had polarized, as in any apocalypse, between temperate and intemperate, labor and management, country-dweller and urbanite. Seventh-day Adventists were either caught in the middle or forced to take sides on these issues, but finally they would be victimized by them. Catholic, Protestant, and occult spiritualist, which was virtually everyone in the Adventist purview, would form an improbable alliance over against the sectarian Adventists, as first day sabbatarian would oppose seventh-day sabbatarian in a spirit of religious intolerance. In the long counter-tradition of the “suffering church,” Mrs. White expected the abuse, primarily, of an Adventist minority rather than a slave minority to prove the undoing of American republicanism. The blue laws against sabbatarian Adventists, receiving renewed notoriety in the 1880’s, rather than the “black laws” against fugitive slaves, of a generation earlier, would color the ghastly events closing history. Eschatologically, the oppression of an American minority remained crucial, but the particular minority proved transferable.

Seventh-day Adventist apocalypticism had been cast into the mold of a new and complicated era. In the process, the apocalypticism itself had yielded some to a traditional “between the times” eschatology. For Adventists of the post-war generation, there was time to preach their message, more time than Millerites had imagined, as the dragon slumbered inside the American beast.

The Labor on behalf of civil and religious freedom in America would provide an extension of precious time in which to work. The two vital examples of such labor, in this period, were backing prohibition and opposing Sunday legislation. Encouraging Adventists toward the ballot box, petitions, temperance rallies and, on occasion, public office, Mrs. White typified a new phase that brought Seventh-day Adventism within the borders of the political process. The Adventists, as a prophetic people, were to use their voice to sustain the republic as long as possible. The irony of their position, of course, involved them in a particular vocational hazard. They wished to delay the end in order to preach that the end was soon.

Seventh-day Adventist participation in politics would remain highly discriminatory. Adventists were apolitical on most issues, fitting the general stereotype of premillennialists. Yet Mrs. White found even the silver standard of Populism relevant to the Adventist cause and denounced it among more sympathetic Nebraska Adventists as “one of Satan’s masterpieces.”

Seventh-day Adventists had made the trek of disinherition from western New York to southern Michigan but now they were making the return journey. The socio-economic factor of Yankee thrift, industry, education, and budding professionalism doubtless contributed to their return eastward in order to claim a larger share in the American inheritance. By 1905 the General Conference headquarters and the Review and Herald Publishing Association were located in Washington, D.C., and J. S. Washburn, a financial secretary, suggested this was part of a grand new design for the denomination. Washburn remembered Ellen White’s comparison of Jerusalem to Washington, D.C., and her insistence, toward century’s end, to re-enter Eastern centers of influence. America was “the last great nation on earth,” reiterated Washburn. How appropriate it was for Adventists to proclaim the last message at the center of this last great nation.

In 1863, the National Reform Association had been established on the premise that the Civil War tragedy could have been averted by a “Christian America,” or an America of true sabbatarians. It was in the South that Sunday laws were enforced on an explicitly religious basis. In the 1880’s, Seventh-day Adventists were convicted in Arkansas and Tennessee on Sunday violations, and a General Conference Committee on Sunday Arrests advised against paying the fines in order to call public attention to the injustices. In 1884 Adventists began publishing the Sabbath Sentinel, soon re-entitled The American Sentinel, directed toward a non-Adventist public to awaken national concern for problems of civil and religious liberty. In 1888, the year Ellen White’s The Great Controversy was published, Senator Blair submitted his Sunday-Rest bill to the fiftieth Congress and saw it defeated by a lobby that included Seventh-day Adventists. Blair re-submitted the bill to the fifty-first Congress, with an exemption for the Seventh-day Adventists, but again the Adventists helped defeat the bill. In July, 1889, the National Religious Liberty Association was organized by Seventh-day Adventists resolved to preserve the American Constitution against changes threatened by the National Reform Association, and pledged to oppose all religious legislation before Congress, and protect the rights of persecuted people of any race, color, or creed. The real confrontation between Adventists and evangelicals, on the sabbatarian issue, involved the political question of just how to protect the American republic — with a national Sabbath or without it.

Sabbatarianism was overshadowed by another evangelical crusade to save the republic which fared better at the polls: prohibition. After the health visions of Ellen White in the early 1860’s, the Western Health Institute (later Battle Creek Sanitarium) was founded and the Health
Reformer magazine was published. In 1876, John Harvey Kellogg, a surgeon, took over as superintendent of the Battle Creek Sanitarium and implemented the Adventist natural diet of abstinence from alcohol, tea, coffee, tobacco and meat, or at least the “unclean” meats of Leviticus 11. His brother, W. K. Kellogg, business manager at the sanitarium, appropriated John Harvey’s ideas on healthful foods to build a breakfast cereal empire.

It was in the 1880’s that Seventh-day Adventist temperance broadened from an interest in individual hygiene to a concern of national proportions. In 1881, Ellen White inveighed against intemperance as “a cause for the moral paralysis on society.” Life and property were endangered, taxation increased, youth corrupted, families broken, prisons crowded and gallows supplied by intemperance. “The advocates of temperance fail to do their whole duty unless they exert their influence by precept and example — by voice and pen and vote — in favor of prohibition and total abstinence.”

The rank and file Adventist was still squeamish about the political nature of prohibition and at times even balked at voting. Thus it required some explanation in 1882 when an Adventist pastor, William C. Gage, was elected mayor of Battle Creek for the sake of the prohibition cause.

After the turn of the century, Seventh-day Adventists engaged in temperance rallies in the East and then in the Midwest. These featured W.C.T.U. and Y.M.C.A. representatives and prominent Protestant ministers as speakers. The rallies occurred after the close of Adventist camp meetings, and were treated as basically political and not religious. K. C. Russell, as head of the Religious Liberty department, advised Adventists to make clear at the rallies that “we believe in appealing to the civil law for the prohibition of the liquor traffic, not because it is immoral or unchristian; but because it invades the natural rights of the citizen by being a menace to society.” Russell’s logic was that Adventists should not demand prohibition on a religious basis any more than evangelicals should propose a religious Sunday law.

As the prohibition forces gathered momentum, Seventh-day Adventists stepped up their own involvement. Petition forms were published in Liberty magazine. Russell and others presented papers before the House District Committee. S. B. Horton reported, approvingly, of a prohibition march on Washington, D.C., sponsored by the National Temperance Convention, that included members of Washington area churches. C. S. Longacre, editor of Liberty magazine, reviewed the election year successes of prohibition in 1918 and exclaimed, “Let democracy triumph everywhere and in all things pertaining to civil relations, duties, and obligations.”

Since the 1880’s Adventists had abandoned their politics of apocalypticism, as they voted, petitioned, and occasionally held office in the name of temperance, seventh-day sabbatarianism, and other issues. Unlike European millenarians, such as Anabaptists or Mennonites, who built their millenium over against the existing state in either violent hostility or utter withdrawal, American Adventists came to use the republic, in a sense, to fulfill their millennial dream. But Seventh-day Adventists remained only at the edges of the political process and not entirely absorbed by it. They continued to hold reservations about the republic, unlike the Mormons, for example, for they expected the two-horned beast to fail ultimately. If America did not fail the end would never come.
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IN 1876 AMERICA was caught up in celebrating the one hundredth anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence. In that centennial year national interest centered on the big exposition in Philadelphia which ran from May to November. Before its gates closed an estimated one out of every five Americans had come to celebrate the glories of the nation and to view the evidences of its accomplishments on display there.

With that celebration Americans sensed that the end of the nation’s first century was truly the end of an era. The Philadelphia Exhibition, displaying the latest technological advances, showed that industrialization had developed so gradually that one writer characterized it as “more evolution than revolution.”

Some Americans felt that all this progress was also bringing about moral decay. The corruption of the Grant Administration in Washington and the suit for alleged adultery against one of the leading preachers of the time, Henry Ward Beecher, seemed to confirm this view of America in the minds of many. In addition, the financial crisis of 1873 caused an increase in poverty and a rise in unemployment, signaling to some that America was headed for a crisis.

So 1876 came to be a year for taking stock of the past as well as for looking to the future.

Seventh-day Adventists were also aware of the sense of reflection and anticipation that was sweeping the country. As early as August 26, 1875, Uriah Smith inserted a short note in the Review and Herald entitled “1876”:

Next year, the centennial of American independence, is to be the great year thus far in our national history. Immense preparations are being made to mark with appropriate ceremonies the hundredth year of this nation’s existence. If we mistake not, it will mark an important era in our government . . .

Smith then noted that friends of the Religious Amendment were preparing “for a great strike” in 1876. The group, which called themselves the National Reform Association, was promoting an amendment to the constitution designed to explicitly acknowledge and honor God. Behind their efforts was a desire to see stricter observance of Sunday throughout the country.

Smith concluded his article by urging Adventists to rebuff these attempts and to fully use the evangelistic tents during the coming season:

Our work must become known and our views be household words in all the land. This nation must be shaken from center to circumference with the important themes now demanding the attention
of the people. And why not before 1876, with its enterprises, its patriotic movements, its transitions and excitements, shall have drawn to its close? Why not?

Later issues of the Review and Herald carried notes regarding the progress of the work at the Philadelphia Exhibition. One of the first notes appeared in the November 18 issue. It was reprinted in full the description of the physical arrangement of the Exhibition park that was sent out by the Director General of the United States Centennial Exhibition. The Exhibition was to be held in Fairmount Park, the largest in the city of Philadelphia, where 450 of the park’s 3,160 acres had been enclosed for the event. The seven main exhibition buildings themselves covered over 48 acres — ten more acres of buildings than the 1873 Vienna Exhibition, which had held the record for the largest international exhibition until then. Other smaller exhibit buildings brought the total exhibit area under roof to more than 50 acres.

The Review and Herald also reported to its readers on the battle of whether or not the exhibition should be opened on Sunday.

Nothing, perhaps, more plainly shows the widespread interest beginning to be felt upon the Sunday question in this nation than the fact that at this early day, the subject is greatly agitated, whether or not the Centennial Exhibition shall be opened on Sunday. And the friends of that day are jubilant over the assurance given by Gen. J. R. Hawley, President of the Centennial committee, that it will not be open on the first day of the week, and that he would resign if it should be voted to thus open it.

Though there were attempts during the course of the Exhibition to have it opened on Sunday, they were never successful. The Commissioners did forbid the sale of all liquors at the Exhibition except for weak lager beer. Prohibitionists, including the Adventists, would like to have seen the sale of that outlawed also. Because the Exhibition was closed on Sunday and the sale of hard liquor was outlawed, one New York newspaper complained that Puritans had taken over the Centennial.

The opening of the centennial year did afford a special opportunity for Adventists to practice their religious beliefs. January 1, 1876, fell on a Saturday. The General Conference Committee appointed that Sabbath “as a day of humiliation, fasting, and prayer, to be observed as such by all our churches and the scattered brethren and sisters throughout the length and breadth of our land.” They planned to publish an address in pamphlet form to be read by the church members. Entitled An Earnest Appeal From the General Conference Committee Relative to the Dangers and Duties of Our Times, the 47-page tract was delayed and was not available for sale until the end of January. Though the address was late, the fast was observed on January 1 as witnessed by various notes and letters found in the early issues of the Review and Herald and Signs of the Times for 1876.

The Appeal called for a revival of faith and a generous outpouring of means. The denomination needed books in foreign languages for use in America. It also needed funds for the foreign mission program begun in 1874 when J. N. Andrews went to Europe. The new Pacific Press, which had been started in California, and Battle Creek College, both just a little over a year old, needed financial help as well.

The General Conference Committee also reported in the pamphlet:

Elder U. Smith writes that application has been made for room at the Centennial Exhibition for our publications. This is right in itself; but where is the man that can be spared to represent our cause and publications there, and the means to sustain the enterprise? Were it not for the death-like slumbers that have held men and means from the cause, God might be glorified in a proper representation of our cause in that great exhibition, and in the circulation of millions of pages of Tracts. It is a disgrace to our cause and people that we cannot expend at least $5,000 on this great occasion. But as there are many things of equal or greater importance that promise more immediate benefit to the cause, which we fear will fail to be done, simply for want of consecrated men and means, we cannot urge the representation of our cause at the Centennial, though it is a burning shame that it must be given up.

The money for an exhibit did come from somewhere, and on the first of May the twenty-four-year-old editor of the Health Reformer, Dr. John Harvey Kellogg, left Battle Creek for Philadelphia “to represent our publishing work at the Centennial.” Later that year he would become the Medical Superintendent of the Battle Creek Sanitarium.

The Health Reformer, like the Review and Herald, had been giving brief notices in its columns from time to time about the construction of the Exhibition. The young doctor-editor must have been quite impressed with what he saw when he arrived to set up the display, for he ran three lengthy articles on the Exhibition in the Health Reformer for the three summer months. Kellogg’s article for July, 1876, is the only description of the Adventist display at the Exhibition.

... Hastening on a few steps, our eyes meet, displayed in gilt letters, in a conspicuous place, the familiar words, “Health Reform.” Here we find arranged in a glass case, all the publications issued from the Office of the Health Reformer. Health books, pamphlets, tracts, al-
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mancers, the periodicals are displayed in a modest unassuming manner, but in one of the most desirable locations in the building. As this is the only exhibit of the kind to be found in this great show, where tobacco, rum, patent medicines, and nearby all other health-destroying agencies are so gaudily displayed, the publishers of the HEALTH REFORMER have liberally supplied thousands of small tracts and circulars for gratuitous distribution. These are placed in small boxes arranged about the sides of the case, with the invitation, "Take One;" and we notice that a good share of the most intelligent people who pass accept the invitation and help themselves.

In contrast to the Review and Herald, which ran no first-hand reports of the Exhibition once it had opened, Kellogg ran another series of articles in the Health Reformer by Mary L. Clough, Ellen White's niece, during the months of September, November, and December. These also described in detail the many wonders that were on display at the Exhibition.

Although both journals had reported on the development of the Exhibition site and then occasionally gave further reports on attendance or outstanding events at the Exhibition once it had opened, their coverage was different. The Review and Herald occasionally carried a story reporting the progress of the Religious Amendment and the efforts of the National Reform Association to keep the Exhibition closed on Sunday. Dr. Kellogg in the Health Reformer carried reports on the sanitary conditions at the Exhibition.

Kellogg's strongest denunciation came in the June, 1876, issue of the Health Reformer in an article entitled "A Centennial Plague." When the planners designed all the new buildings, bridges, and restaurants for the fair, Kellogg said, they had "forgotten some of the "weightier matters" of a sanitary character." Fortunately, he noted, it had been a cool spring, but still "the stench is intolerable. Such a thing as a breath of pure air is unattainable within a mile or two of the most populous portions of the city." He went on to describe the piles of garbage everywhere, the filth in the streets as well as an open cesspool that he had observed. Of the latter he reported to his readers: "This putrescent pool sends out its volumes of mephitic vapors to mingle with the gutter steams and poisonous gases emanating from the filthy streets."

Kellogg continued by saying, "The surface filth is bad enough; but it does not compare with the sources of death and disease stored beneath the surface." Then followed a detailed description of a sewer system that generated "the most foul and poisonous gases" through leaks in the pipe, places where new pipe was added and through dry water traps. "In many cases, there is actually an overpowering breeze of putrid gas issuing from water-closets and other places connected with the sewers."

The doctor concluded his article by observing, "The stench has already become quite too intolerable for our hygienic nostrils, and we have fled from the city in disgust, to the more quiet, cleanly, and healthful city of Wilmington, Del. We would recommend those of our friends who contemplate visiting the exhibition, to provide themselves with the most approved form of respirators, and a good supply of disinfectants."

Braving the stench and germs that Kellogg had described, James White, who was president of the General Conference that year, and his wife went to see the Exhibition for themselves. Following Kellogg's advice, the Whites stayed in Wilmington, Delaware, about 26 miles from the Exhibition. Kellogg had arranged for them to have a large room with five windows. Mary Clough, who came with her aunt and uncle to...
Some of the health tracts available in 1876
courtesy: Loma Linda University Heritage Room

Contemporary caricatures of visitors to the Centennial Exhibition credit: Charles Scribner’s Sons

Displays in the Main Building from the South Gallery courtesy: Library of Congress

gather information for her articles in the Health Reformer, stayed in a room above the Whites. They spent several days taking in the many exhibits of historical and mechanical interest.

Among the artifacts waiting to be seen was a packet of tea that had been dumped into Boston Harbor in 1773. Also on display was a gaff with which Andrew Jackson had heeled his first chicken at a cockfight in 1785, a looking glass brought over on the Mayflower, a plow actually built by Daniel Webster in 1837, the trunk of the world’s largest grapevine, and a pair of false teeth once used by George Washington.

Some of the new marvels on display included a lamp which burned electricity instead of gas or oil, a wheeled stool in which infants could learn to walk and the new type writing machine. In fact, for fifty cents one could even have a letter typed to a friend back home. Surprisingly, one new invention which aroused little interest was the telephone. It is reported that it actually attracted less notice than the packages of magic
tricks on sale nearby. The largest mechanical wonder was the giant Corliss engine in Machinery Hall which operated some 8,000 additional machines through the 13-acre building.

It is no wonder that after viewing these and thousands of other exhibits James White inserted a short note on the back page of the Review and Herald regarding the fair: “People abroad have just no idea of the greatness, gorgeousness, and perfection of the Centennial Exhibition. The Newspapers can’t tell it.”

Notes also appeared in the Review and Herald telling Adventists visiting the fair where the publishing house display was located:

Those of the readers of the Review who visit the Exhibition at Philadelphia may be interested to notice the exhibit of our denominational and health works, which has been placed there through the liberality of the Publishing Association. It is located in the main building, and can be easily found. Inquiry should be made of any of the door-keepers or guards in the main building, for the American Book Trade Department, in which the case containing our publications is located, together with the publications of most of the large publishing houses of America.

It could well be that after viewing the size of the fair and the number of people in attendance James White realized the necessity of telling where the display was — otherwise it could easily have been missed. All together more than 80 book publishers had exhibits at the Exhibition.

When the Exhibition finally closed on November 10, the Health Reformer noted its closing in a brief news note. The only indication the Review and Herald made that the Exhibition had closed was the summary report that Dr. J. H. Kellogg gave to the special session of the General Conference meeting in Battle Creek on November 12 and 13. His report came in the third session which met at 10:10 p.m. on the first day:

Dr. J. H. Kellogg presented his report of the exhibition of our publications at the Centennial as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRIBUTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denominational Tracts,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Temperance Tracts,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodicals,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almanacs,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird’s Eye Views,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalogues of Health Publications,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of pp. circulated,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Voted, That Eld. S. N. Haskell be a committee to correspond with the several conferences or T. & M. Societies, and apportion to each its share of this expense, and invite them to pay it.

Kellogg’s final report on the Centennial year came in the December issue of the Health Reformer. In that issue he quoted from another newspaper the terrible results that the fair had had upon the lives of many who had attended:

It is estimated that hundreds of those who went to Philadelphia to see the wonders of the Exhibition returned to die as the price of their curiosity, while thousands have suffered and are still suffering from the malarious disorders they contracted there. The New York Sun says: “The management of the drainage on the Exhibition grounds was disgraceful to Philadelphia, and that city will be painfully remembered by thousands who went thither to enjoy a great sight, and returned to suffer from disease, or to mourn the loss of friends sent to their graves by a negligence little short of criminal.”
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Signs of the Times, Vol. 2 (January 37, 1876).
The first five volumes of the Review and Herald are innocent of pictures of any kind— with one interesting exception. In the issue of March 23, 1852, an article entitled “The Law of God Illustrated” by Newell Mead shows three drawings of a tree. Its trunk, labeled LOVE, divides into two branches, one representing love to God, the other love to one’s neighbor. These in turn are subdivided into smaller branches which represent the ten commandments. Two of the trees bear unfurling scrolls with scriptural quotations. The drawing is naive, without grace or refinement. Its intent is simply and clearly utilitarian, to help readers understand and remember the observations made in the text. The work betrays on the draughtsman’s part no least thought of giving visual pleasure to readers of the Review.

Later in the same year, in the very first issue of the Youth’s Instructor, one of those illustrations accompanies another article on the law of God, and the Instructor’s second issue reproduces another of the trees of the law.

Since no other pictorial illustrations appear in the Review or the Instructor for some time, these have unusual interest for us, not only by reason of their uniqueness, but for the evidence they provide us of the priority of the Law and the Sabbath in the early believers’ concern.

But they have another interest for us also; for below the base of the trunk and over to the right, the engraver has signed each of the drawings with the initials “U.S.”, whom we take to be Uriah Smith. That assumption is based partly on his long association with the Review and Herald, partly on reference to him as an engraver by trade, and partly on the fuller identification he used later to sign some more ambitious engravings that appeared in the Youth’s Instructor. Whether Uriah was both draughtsman and
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engraver of these illustrations or whether he simply engraved designs provided him by Newell Mead, we cannot know.

Smith was 19 years old when the illustrations were published. Less than a year earlier he had completed his formal education at Phillips Exeter Academy and had been offered, but declined, a position as teacher in a New Hampshire school, at the handsome salary of $1,000.00 a year besides board and room. Between his leaving Exeter and the appearance of his illustrations in the Review, there was scarcely time enough to develop much skill in a trade. Sometime in 1852, after the death of his father, Uriah is said to have been employed in a business, hoping to accumulate money for study at Harvard. We do not know what the business was, or whether it was in that connection that young Smith had his introduction to wood engraving.

At the time he made the illustrations, emphasizing the importance of God’s law and the Sabbath, Uriah was not himself a Sabbath-keeping Adventist. His sister Annie, however, was at that time working in the Review and Herald office, and it is not improbable that she enlisted her brother’s help to illustrate the article on the law.

In September, 1852, some six months after the appearance of the illustrations on the law of God, Uriah Smith attended meetings that set him earnestly to considering the question of the Sabbath, and before the end of December he had committed himself to the beliefs of Sabbath-keepers. A few months later he was to write in the Review: "In regard to the past, I would say, that though quite young, I was in the messages of 1843-44, and have ever believed they meant something. In all the scattering and dividing which followed the passing of that time, I gave but little attention till after the Washington, N.H., conference last Fall. Since then an examination of the arguments of our position has fully decided me to go with the remnant, who keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus."

In March, 1853, only three months after that decision, there began in the Review a long poem by Uriah Smith, "The Warning Voice of Prophecy, Part I." It ran through four issues of the Review, filling the first page each time and a good share of the second. By the time the last of these installments appeared, Uriah’s formal association with the Review and Herald had begun, a connection that was to continue with only slight interruptions for about 50 years.

Before looking at a number of illustrations by Uriah Smith it might be well to make some observations about woodcuts and wood engraving. A woodcut is typically made by cutting the design with a knife and with gouges on a surface parallel with the grain of a wooden block. A wood engraving, on the other hand, is cut on the end-grain of a hardwood block with engraving tools. Woodcuts have a much longer history, for with the development of printing from movable type in the fifteenth century, they came to be much used in the production of illustrated books, reaching a wonderfully impressive level of achievement in the sixteenth century, especially in Germany, where professional craftsmen who cut the blocks were capable of reproducing in utmost detail the consummate draughtsmanship of such artists as Albrecht Durer and Hans Holbein. Much of the time, however, and particularly in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, woodcuts, often crude in design and workmanship, were used to illustrate the cheapest publications for mass consumption. In the early nineteenth century, the woodcut, by then largely neglected as a medium for quality illustration, was displaced by the wood engraving.

A wood engraving is like a woodcut in that it prints the surface of the block, whatever appears as white in the print having been cut away. A wood engraving is unlike a traditional engraving on copper in that the latter does not
print the surface of the plate. The printer inks the plate then wipes the surface clean. What
prints, then, is the ink remaining in the engraved lines. The printing process requires much greater pressure than for a wood engraving and cannot be printed, as a wood engraving can, along with typeset text.

The middle of the nineteenth century witnessed a remarkable flowering of wood engraving in the United States. In 1838 there were about 20 professional wood engravers in the whole country. By 1870 that number had grown to about 400. It is exciting to page through copies of *Harper’s Monthly* or *Harper’s Weekly* from the '1860's and the 1870's, studying the wood engravings that so generously illustrate them. In the 1870's wood engravers achieved unprecedented levels of virtuosity, but photographic means of illustration were already being developed that in the closing decades of the century would largely replace the remarkably painstaking work of wood engravers.

In that context, then, it seems not surprising to us that young Uriah Smith should have made wood engraving his trade at a time when a few distinguished publishers were beginning to produce magazines and books that were richly illustrated by skillfully executed wood engravings.

I have observed that the trees representing the law of God were the only illustrations in the first five volumes of the *Review and Herald*. In the sixth volume, however, several articles on the prophecies of Daniel and Revelation were illustrated. The image of Nebuchadnezzar's dream and the beasts of Daniel 7 look a good deal like those of the prophetic charts of 1843-44. They are unsigned and we have no clue as to their source, but we know that illustrations of the ram and the he-goat of Daniel 8 were engraved by Uriah Smith, whose initials appear modestly in the lower right. Later in the same volume, engravings of the beast with seven heads and ten horns, described in Revelation 13:1,2, and the two-horned beast of verse 11 display the same initials. Possibly the unsigned engravings were also Uriah Smith's work. There are clear similarities in style, though the signed illustrations seem to show slightly more refinement than the others, but we cannot know whether Uriah's contribution was limited to engraving the block from someone else's original drawing or whether he was designer and engraver both. In any case, the designer was an untrained, or naive artist, whose draughtsmanship was not very secure and whose figures are almost devoid of modeling. They represented, however, conscientious attempts to follow the biblical text and to achieve emotional impact. Those prophetic beasts were used repeatedly in the *Review and Herald* for several years to illustrate articles on prophecy.

The January issue of the *Youth's Instructor* in 1861 and again in 1862 are graced by the two most ambitious and ingratiating illustrations by Uriah Smith that are known to us. He must have
been reasonably proud of them, because the modest signature of his earlier examples, the tiny initials “U.S.,” have been replaced by an unmistakable credit “U. Smith, Battle Creek, Mich.” on one and “U. Smith, B.C., Mich.” on the other.

The first of these portrays the Good Shepherd, who carries a tired or injured sheep in his arms as he leads the rest of his flock along. In the accompanying article, George Amadon’s observations let us know that the picture was not made to illustrate the article, but that the picture came first and that the article constitutes a comment on it. It is the first clear effort in a Seventh-day Adventist publication to employ the emotional impact of art to teach a lesson. The design on which the engraving is based is carefully organized, with the figure of the shepherd and one of the sheep forming a pyramidal structure that dominates the space. The drawing is generally much more competent than in the earlier engravings, though a few disconcerting lapses occur. We feel uncomfortable about the face because the nose is represented almost in profile though otherwise the face presents itself in an almost full frontal view. The drawing of the hand is curiously inept; and a couple of areas of the background seem impatiently or carelessly engraved. But the effect of the whole is engaging, and readers must have enjoyed and admired the picture because it was repeated and used as a cover picture for bound volumes of the Instructor for several years.

In this engraving, the sky and the vegetation in the background seem to be represented more painstakingly than in Smith’s earlier engravings. The pleasant composition of the picture, like that of the Good Shepherd, depends on strong diagonals that cross near the center of interest. The drawing seems least satisfactory in the little boy’s hand and the tiny figures lined up on the horizon. But no doubt the picture contributed a good deal of pathos to Amadon’s word-picture of the plight of American slaves.
I am aware of only two other engravings signed by Uriah Smith. One of these occurred in the same issue of the Youth's Instructor in which the picture of the little black boy was used. It is a very small engraving illustrating an article on the cities of refuge. The other, from Smith's Thoughts on Daniel (1873), is a representation of the great image of Nebuchadnezzar's dream in Daniel 2.

That is the visual evidence we have to support the statement that Uriah Smith was an engraver by trade.

For six months in 1873, when, as a result of differences with James White, he left Battle Creek and the Review and Herald, Uriah Smith went to work in Grand Rapids as a wood engraver. It would be instructive to see examples of his work from that period when as a professional engraver he doubtless would have cut designs drawn by competent artists. We would then know more about his skill as an engraver, but we do not have any engravings by his hand dated after his return to the Review in December of 1873.

Taken as a group, the quaint illustrations he engraved do not have very much to recommend them esthetically. They share with other naive works an earnestness, I would say, a certain childlike directness, and a freedom from self-consciousness that we find attractive. But more than that, we are interested in them because they illustrate an almost forgotten side of a remarkable longtime editor of the Review and Herald and remind us what varied sorts of tasks one may boldly, even brashly undertake when with only the slenderest of financial resources he works for the success of some enterprise he strongly believes in.
Publisher of the GOSPEL:

C.H. Jones and the Pacific Press

Donald R. McAdams
ON JANUARY 16, 1902, C. H. Jones, manager of the Pacific Press Publishing Company in Oakland, California, dictated a letter to the manager and board of directors of the Review and Herald Publishing Company in Battle Creek. They had invited him to become the manager of the Review and Herald, and Jones was refusing.

My health [he wrote] is not as good as it was a few years ago. I find that I am not nearly as strong, and my head troubles me a great deal. For nearly twenty-three years, I have worked here at the Pacific Press very hard, much of the time from twelve to fifteen hours per day. It begins to tell upon me. The fact is, the best of my life has been given to the Pacific Press, and this institution can better afford to bear with my infirmities than any other.

That night Ellen White and her son, W. C. White, stayed at the Jones home. Mrs. White made it clear in the evening and again over breakfast that she saw no light in the move and that if Jones accepted the call, burdens would be placed on him that might kill him. Jones related this conversation to A. G. Daniells, the newly elected chairman of the General Conference Committee, adding:

I have stated that I would rather go to almost any other place on earth than to Battle Creek. I am afraid that city is doomed so far as our work is concerned.

There are other things that Sr. White said in regard to the work in Battle Creek, which I do not feel free to mention, but I am really alarmed at the situation. There still seems to be a desire on the part of some at least, to centralize everything at Battle Creek, and not only that but to run the entire denomination. I do not care to be brought under that influence.

C. H. Jones stayed on at the Pacific Press, with a break of only six months, for another thirty years. In all he gave sixty-six years of service to the publishing work of the Seventh-day Adventist church, forty-three of them as general manager of the Pacific Press. More than any other man he influenced the development of what is today the denomination’s largest publishing house. The two short passages quoted above illustrate three of the guiding principles that governed his conduct during these many years of service: an unwavering devotion to the welfare of the Pacific Press, a fear of the centralizing power of Battle Creek, and a complete confidence in the counsel of Ellen White, a woman he accepted as a messenger of the Lord and dearly loved.

Charles Harriman Jones was born in 1850 in Warner, New Hampshire, the sixth of eight children. When Charles was fourteen, his father died, and he had to take the lead in supporting the members of the family still at home. He found work as a printer, and soon held the job of state printer in Manchester. At eighteen, the young man moved to Battle Creek to work for the Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association, commonly called the Review and Herald. Here he operated the power press, the first such press owned by the denomination, and later became superintendent of the factory.

At Battle Creek Charles met and married Josephine Emerson Lunt, a young lady from Maine. Her father, Noah Norton Lunt, had been one of the first Adventists in Maine to embrace the seventh-day sabbath and had worked with James and Ellen White in those early years. Later Lunt followed his children to California and worked for the Pacific Press until shortly before his death. Josephine shared Charles’ interest in publishing, serving for a while as an editor of the Sabbath School Worker, ran an efficient household, and reared three children, one of whom, Charles Floyd, also worked for many years at the Pacific Press.

While employed in Battle Creek Charles must have become acquainted with the Whites, for during these years James White was president and manager of the Review and Herald office. In 1874 James and Ellen White had traveled to California and started a paper, the Signs of the Times. James’ decision to publish a new paper in Oakland and not just work the new field through an expanded Review and Herald was one of the most important decisions made in the history of the Seventh-day Adventist publishing work. Once White had decided that a local paper
was required to reflect the local field — not a surprising decision for the man who had used the *Review and Herald* for just such a purpose in the East — it was inevitable that a publishing house would soon follow. And follow it did. In 1875 the California leaders formed the Pacific Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association, later called the Pacific Press.

The new publishing association soon printed books as well as *Signs of the Times*, and with the production of books came the inevitable question of the relationship of the Pacific Press to the Review and Herald. Competition would have ruined the smaller house, so the territory was eventually divided, setting a precedent followed throughout the world as new publishing houses sprang up in new fields to publish pioneer periodicals.

Working out the relationship with the Review and Herald was one of the big problems C. H. Jones would have to face during his first three decades at the Pacific Press. But such problems were all in the future when in 1879 Jones answered the call to the Pacific Press to help them for six months in the factory, little realizing that he would work for the Press for over fifty years.

Many years later Jones described the hardships of the trip west:

> I came to the “wild and woolly West” on an emigrant train from Chicago, and nine days were consumed in the journey of the Chicago and Northwestern, the Union Pacific, and the Central Pacific. Five passenger cars were connected with a freight and cattle train. There was no such thing as a Pullman sleeper or a dining car. At Omaha all the passengers got out and filled straw sacks for their beds, from a straw sack furnished by the Union Pacific. We had to bring our own bedding along, and in an open car we made our beds on the board seats. We did our own cooking on a coal range in one end of the car.

The young Jones achieved instant recognition at the Pacific Press. Before the six months expired, the directors had asked him to stay as superintendent of the factory and foreman of the job printing department. With the approval of his wife Jones decided to stay.

Charles was then twenty-nine years old, a handsome man with brown wavy hair and a full moustache. As the years passed both turned a rich silver. The full silver hair, rimless spectacles and square features gave the older Jones a look of stern seriousness, an impression which his letters in no way dispel.

**Jones’ First Decade at the Pacific Press**

Jones’ first decade at the Pacific Press was a period of phenomenal growth for the publishing house. By 1888 a large new building housed nine cylinder presses. A new boiler and steam engine along with the presses made the Pacific Press the most complete publishing plant west of the Rockies. In that year 175 employees did a business of nearly $164,000. Four years later business volume reached $250,000, rivaling that of the *Review and Herald*. At the center of this large operation stood C. H. Jones. In March, 1880, he had declined election to the board of directors because of his inexperience, but in 1882 he became general manager of the plant, and in 1888 president of the board. Henceforth Jones, with one short break of six months, was the chief administrator of the Pacific Press.

One of his biggest problems, a problem not solved for forty years, was debt. To make ends meet, the house was forced to rely on commercial work because denominational publishing did not pay. It was with the church’s publications, however, that Jones had his heart. Though the tract and missionary societies carried the responsibility for retailing *Signs of the Times* and the subscription books, Jones promoted them all he could. The *Signs* subscriptions increased only slightly during the 1880’s, but the book work boomed. More than 100 canvassers appeared to work California alone, while Australia and the islands of the Pacific provided
The end a division was made. In a memorandum White's *The Great Controversy*, a book the Press handled at a loss, incidentally.

Jones' pushing of *The Great Controversy* brought the Pacific Press into conflict with the Review and Herald. Some of the leaders at Battle Creek had not approved of the *Signs* or the Pacific Press in the first place. They thought the *Signs* should be published in Michigan, or that if a press were needed in California it should be made a branch of the Review and Herald. During 1875 the Review and Herald had tried to compete with the *Signs* by publishing a pioneer missionary journal called *Voice of Truth*. Problems appeared again with the Pacific Press's publications of *The Great Controversy*, a book which the Review and Herald at first refused to publish. Would the Review office promote the book in the East at the expense of their own subscription books? Jones believed it would not. A canvasser in New Orleans who had ordered two copies and claimed he could sell one thousand if allowed to stay there through the winter was called home by the Review to work in Michigan. Jones suggested to W. C. White that the Review wanted this man to canvass for Uriah Smith's *Daniel and Revelation* and *United States in the Light of Prophecy*, "their two great hobbies [sic] just now." On November 17, 1885, Jones reported to W. C. White that the Review would not circulate anything that did not emanate from their office.

What could be done? For several years Jones had been urging a division of the territory, but the Review had demurred. In July, 1885, they wrote Jones that they had no objection to the Pacific Press canvassing in the East:

We shall find no cause for complaint if you invade or even absorb our entire territory. We shall rejoice to see you do this, for certainly while this is being done we will have the consolation in knowing that the truth is being scattered throughout the people. Of course there should be a harmony between the two offices in the establishment of prices, paying of freight &c.

What the Review proposed would have to work both ways, and in such open competition the smaller house would undoubtedly suffer. In the end a division was made. In a memorandum of October 9, 1888, signed in Battle Creek by Jones representing the Pacific Press and H. W. Kellogg for the Review and Herald, it was agreed that the Pacific Press would have the exclusive right to sell all subscription books published by either house west of the tier of states, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, and New Mexico; that the Review would furnish book plates of any of its books that the Pacific Press wanted to print; and that in return the Pacific Press would pay the Review the cost of manufacturing the plates and five per cent of the wholesale price for every book sold. The agreement gave the Review the same privileges in its territory of Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Canada. The Eastern, Southern, and Great Plains states were left open to both houses. Subsequently, the two houses divided North America according to the General Conference districts. The Pacific Press took districts 1 (the East), 5 (the Great Plains and Southwest), and 6 (the West); the Review and Herald received districts 2 (the South), 3 (the Midwest), and 4 (the Northern Great Plains).

Just as these relationships were being worked out, the subscription book business, by which books were sold door to door, dropped off. In 1891 sales had reached $819,000, but by 1895 they had dropped to $250,000, where with minor variations they remained for the rest of the decade. A major cause for the decline was the panic of 1893. Jones considered this a serious blow; everywhere canvassers were quitting. "Only the earnest, energetic, self-sacrificing ones remain," he wrote W. C. White in October. Another cause for the decline was that conferences were releasing their canvassing agents. Jones wanted to fill the gap by having the general canvassing agents appointed and paid by the publishing houses. In 1897 this became denominational policy. As the Pacific Press took greater responsibility for the retail sale of its books and periodicals, it came more into conflict with the conference tract societies. The exact relationship between the tract societies and the Press remained a question until 1906.

Meanwhile the Press was threatened from another direction. Battle Creek seemed bent on destroying the independence of the house. As early as 1876 Ellen White had seen in vision that the Pacific Press was never to be controlled by any other institution, and when it had been suggested to her husband that the Review and the Pacific Press be put under one management, she had told him to answer that the Lord did not approve of such plans. But pressure for consolidation did not go away. It seemed sound management to the leaders in Battle Creek that all the denomination's publishing work be coordinated from one place, eliminating competition and duplication.

At the 1889 General Conference the delegates voted, with the full support of the General Conference president, O. A. Olsen, to bring all the publishing interests under one management. There was, however, little implementation of the plan until 1891. At the General Conference of that year a committee set up to study the publishing work recommended that the constitution of the General Conference Association (G.C.A.)
be amended, enabling it to act as a corporation for the management of all Seventh-day Adventist publishing houses. It was envisioned that the Association would become the denomination's publisher and the publishing houses would become merely printing plants under its control. The two houses had their own stockholders and could not be forced into an immediate change, but the new G.C.A. appeared to have future developments firmly in its hands.

From the beginning Jones opposed the consolidation plans. He acknowledged that the publishing work needed some over-all coordination, but he felt that the details should be left to the publishing houses. Very reluctantly he went along with the General Conference decision in February, 1893, that the Pacific Press sell its London branch to the G.C.A. The Press had started the business in England, lost money at first, but was now breaking even. Jones felt, therefore, that the Press deserved $50,000 from the G.C.A. for the branch; they received only $34,000. "This, I believe," he later reflected in a letter to W. C. Sisley, then working in London for the International Tract Society, "was the first step taken by the General Conference Association to gather in all of our publishing interests. The Pacific Press did not desire to sell, but it was simply forced to do so." The next blow against the Press was the request that they turn over to the International Tract Society their profitable "Bible Students" and "Apples of Gold" libraries, two coordinated series of tracts.

The ultimate blow came on March 13, 1895. In order to reduce prices on subscription books, the G.C.A. announced that henceforth it would furnish its subscription books directly to state tract societies through the house which had printed them (the Review in every case) irrespective of any territorial lines or branch offices. If branch offices or other publishing houses desired these books they would have to pay tract society prices.

The Pacific Press responded strongly. On June 5 the directors sent a "Protest and Appeal" to the General Conference Association. This six-page document, undoubtedly written by Jones, asserted that to follow this policy would, in the end, destroy the Pacific Press. Jones argued in the "Protest" and in subsequent letters to Olsen that if the Press did not have a monopoly in its territories, its branch offices in New York (serving district 1) and Kansas City (serving district 5) would go out of business under the present plan these offices were the sole suppliers of the tract societies in their territories. (They ordered books printed at the Review and Herald directly from the Review, but at wholesale prices.) The tract societies prospered because they could have their orders filled quickly from one nearby source, keeping their canvassers happy and their shelves clear; and the branch offices made sufficient profits to keep themselves solvent. Under the new plan the tract societies would suffer, and the branches, cut off from a large share of their business, would go broke. The Pacific Press would either have to bring out their own books and launch into direct competition with the G.C.A. or go out of the subscription book business altogether.

As a final argument Jones appealed to the testimonies of Ellen White. To F. L. Mead, the general canvassing agent, who had supported the new plans in the State Agents' Visitor, No. 28, Jones quoted a portion of a letter Ellen White had written on April 8, 1895, to the General Conference Committee and the two publishing houses:

"The present is a time of special peril. In 1890 and 1891 there was presented to me a view of the dangers that would threaten the work because of a confederacy in the office of publication in Battle Creek. Propositions which to their authors appeared very wise would be introduced, looking to the formation of a confederacy, which would make Battle Creek, like Rome, the great head of the work, and enable the office of publication there to swallow up everything in the publishing work among us. This is not God's wisdom, but human wisdom. . . . God would have his work move firmly and solidly, but no one branch is to interfere with or absorb other branches of the same great work. . . . Plans should be carefully
considered in Battle Creek that they may in no case militate against the work in Oakland.

Jones continued:
Now, Brother Mead, let me inquire if you do not think that the plans which some have in mind, of dispensing with our branch offices do not "militate against the work in Oakland." As before stated, unless we can have territory outside the Pacific Coast it will not pay us to print our subscription books here at this office, and according to the policy adopted by the G.C.A. if they are not printed here then the Pacific Press will not be allowed to handle them, so we might as well withdraw from the publishing work so far as our book business is concerned.

Poor Mead. He responded only seven days later. No one had shown him the testimony, and he had written his article ignorant of Ellen White's views. He apologized profusely. To E. R. Palmer in Australia he wrote the same day expressing his sorrow over his error, adding:
The relations existing or that should exist between the General Conference Association and the Publishing Houses I am unable to define, consequently I propose to leave that to the parties whose duty it is to define them. I cannot express my regrets for the way some things are going. When I say it is abominable it does not half express it.

Jones' fullest explanation of the problem is found in a long letter he wrote to W. C. White in Australia on July 23. From the beginning White had feared that consolidation might mean, in effect, domination by the Review management. In 1890 he had written R. A. Underwood, then superintendent of district 6, expressing his opposition to the way the Review had for years disregarded the rights of authors and subjected them to unnecessary inconvenience and delay in securing their royalties. Now in 1895 with consolidation a reality White inquired of Jones whether he thought the General Conference Association would carry out the policy of A. R. Henry, longtime treasurer of the Review, and others "that authors should receive for their work what the publishers may consider reasonable compensation and then relinquish all claims and rights."

In his reply of July 23, Jones spoke frankly:
You will remember the position the Review & Herald took in regard to your mother's works for fear that there was no money in them; and how we took hold of that work years ago. I remember very well the argument which Eld. Haskell presented — that even though we did not receive any immediate return for our investment, the time would come when your mother's works would have a large sale, and then the Pacific Press would reap the benefit; but we argued at that time that whether this was so or not, the books ought to be published, and therefore we took hold of the work...

After this came up the matter of division of territory, etc. I need not go into all these details; but you know that we finally arranged with the Review & Herald for a division of territory; and this has worked very satisfactorily up to the present time: but now a new factor has come on to the stage of action. The G.C.A. has started out in the publishing work, and now we find ourselves face to face with another serious difficulty in the matter of handling our subscription books. The General Conference Association wants to deal direct with the tract societies: and of course having the headquarters at Battle Creek, and the work done at the Review & Herald, it virtually shuts out the Pacific Press from handling any of the G.C.A. Publications, and the idea has been that all new works should be published by the G.C.A.

The problem, continued Jones, was not Olsen, or the full General Conference Committee. These men meant well; but they were burdened down with other matters and unable to give attention to publishing business. As a result, a handful of men — the Review managers, and especially A. R. Henry and J. N. Nelson, who was both secretary of the G.C.A. and acting manager of the Review — was running the publishing business and consciously trying to ruin the Pacific Press.
Evidently Jones' arguments and Ellen White's testimonies to Olsen and the members of the G.C.A. convinced the Adventist leaders that a mistake had been made, for in late October, 1895, the G.C.A., with Jones present and voting, rescinded its resolution of the previous March. The Pacific Press was confirmed in its monopoly for all subscription books in districts 1, 5 and 6.

One more battle, however, remained to be fought. In March, 1896, the General Conference Association resurrected the issue by claiming that henceforth it would be the sole agent for Dr. John Harvey Kellogg's health books, which the Review and Herald printed for Kellogg's own publishing company, and would deal directly with the tract societies. Jones protested vigorously to Olsen that this violated the agreement of the previous October. Once again the testimonies were called upon to support Jones' position. Throughout the spring and summer he kept Ellen and W. C. White informed of the developments. Finally in September he was able to report that "there is a growing feeling that . . . [the G.C.A.] ought not to have anything to do with the details of the publishing work in this country." And on November 3, at last, he reported that the victory had been won. The G.C.A. had voted to withdraw entirely from the publishing work in the United States. The two publishing houses would once again have full responsibility to publish and distribute their printed material, untrammeled by any outside authority. The independence of the Pacific Press had been preserved.

We should not underestimate the significance of Jones' victory. The dominant position of James and Ellen White had enabled the California leaders to establish the Pacific Press independently of the Review twenty years before. If that independence had been lost in the 1890's the entire pattern of the Seventh-day Adventist publishing enterprise would probably have developed quite differently. One central publishing organization would likely have supervised printing plants throughout the world. Ellen White provided the weapons in the Pacific Press's battle for independence, but she was in far-off Australia; thus, if Jones had not tenaciously resisted, the battle could well have been lost.

Jones' reliance on the testimonies during his struggle to preserve the independence of the Pacific Press illustrates one of the dominant commitments of his life, an unshakable conviction that Ellen White was an inspired messenger of the Lord. And he did not limit his acceptance of the testimonies to circumstances where they obviously supported his own desires. He accepted the testimonies even when he was the object of criticism. Jones was not a minister or a man of education and learning. He was a practical, even hard-headed businessman, a man who had worked closely with the Whites in Battle Creek and then moved west to continue the close relationship at the Pacific Press. In his own experience, in facing day-to-day difficulties, he had observed the Christian influence of Ellen White and had seen her again and again come down on the right side of an issue. W. C. White, four years his junior, had become one of his closest friends. Ellen White, whom his father-in-law had known during her early ministry in Maine, was almost as dear to him as a mother. Unlike many of the Whites' acquaintances who directed most of their letters to W. C. after 1900, Jones
continued to write Ellen White, discussing general church issues, keeping her informed of the progress of her books through the press, and telling her of personal family sorrows and pleasures, like the temporary loss of faith of one of his sons, or the fine fruit his wife was canning.

All this is not to say that Jones never disagreed with Ellen White. In 1885 when Ellen objected that she was not getting enough money for the 1884 edition of The Great Controversy, Jones replied that she had been too hasty in condemning the management of that book. Some people had told her she should get $10,000 for it, but Jones pointed out that the Press had printed only 10,000 copies so far, and after retailing the book at $1.00 per copy there was not enough left over from paying her royalties and the commission to canvassers to cover the cost of production. “I think,” Jones concluded, “that W. C. is doing a good job of handling your books, and I would hate to see you take them out of his hands.”

Jones openly accepted the strong rebuke he received from Ellen White on June 25, 1901. The Pacific Press had allowed its commercial work to absorb too much of its energy, and it was becoming increasingly obvious to everyone that some changes would have to be made. But a clean break with commercial work seemed impossible, for denominational printing continued to lose money and only lucrative commercial contracts kept the Press solvent. Especially profitable was the counter check-book business for the Carter-Crane Company. In 1898 Ellen White said the time had not yet come to divorce all commercial work from the office. Some work, however, did not meet with her approval. In one testimony her anger with the Press for printing novels and story books, works that she said infatuated some workers so they were as “mentally drunk as is the inebriate,” led her to call on typesetters to refuse to set one sentence.

Finally, on June 25, 1901, she directed a testimony to the managers of the Press:

It is not [good] for the spiritual health of men to always remain in one position. They need a change. For a man to have the impression that he will always be a manager injures the religious experience and hinders the formation of correct, sanctified principles. God will raise up men to relieve the situation.

The spirituality of the Pacific Press is not that which God would have it.

Jones responded twelve days later, acknowledging that the message applied to him and offering to resign. A year later, after the annual meeting, he reported to Ellen White that the directors had definitely decided to cease all commercial printing. To get out of the contracts with the Carter-Crane Company, the board proposed to form a new company unconnected in any way with the denomination. The new company would move to another part of the city, taking Jones with it as president. Though Ellen White had given Jones more time, telling the stockholders that he could stay until a replacement was found, Jones felt that with this arrangement he could leave at once.

These plans, however, were not carried through. The Pacific Press had an investment of over $300,000 in Oakland, half of which was used printing check books. Clearly the Press could not give up this business without selling a large part of their plant. A more desirable step would be to sell the entire plant and move to a rural location. Since 1875 Oakland had grown up around the Press. Like so many Adventist institutions that had started in an open setting, the Press now found itself packed into a bustling urban community. If the Press could find a buyer for the check book business and a place to move, the commercial work could be ended. The stockholders accepted this plan, but finding a buyer and a new home took several years.

A commercial publication the Press printed in 1888
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Damage to the new Press from the San Francisco Earthquake of April, 1906

The new location was found in November, 1903. After two years of looking for a site in the San Francisco Bay area, and in the Napa, Sonoma, and San Joaquin Valleys, Jones and the directors decided on Mountain View. The location was ideal, both for business purposes and for living.

The town [Jones wrote to W. C. White] lies west of the railroad and there is a gradual slope from the railroad up to the foothills. It is a rural district and there are beautiful drives in every direction. The scenery is also fine. The Bay is in plain view and also the foothills in Alameda and Costa Counties.

In May, 1904, the Murdoch Company paid $50,000 cash for the counter check-book business and $70,000 for stock, a very good price for the Press. Finally, while making these important changes, the directors decided to follow the recommendations of the General Conference and change the Pacific Press from a stock company to a constituency company. In October of the same year the move to Mountain View was completed.

On January 4, 1906, however, Jones resigned. The year before had been very hard for him. Throughout the year the debts had been unusually heavy, and the workers had split into two factions, some accepting mainly denomination-al work and others wanting a liberal policy on commercial work. Also, Jones had erred in his dealing with the Murdoch Company. When they bought the check-book business, the new company gave Jones and J. B. Greenwood, manager of the counter check book department, 500 shares each of their stock in the expectation that these two men would use their good will and knowledge to help them learn the business. The gift did not influence the terms of the sale, and Jones did not realize that to others the gift might appear to be a bribe. But at the annual stockholders' meeting in January, 1905, Jones was under heavy pressure to resign. He would have done so had not Ellen White informed the stockholders that he should not leave office at that time. Nevertheless she rebuked him strongly.

He responded:
I know what you say concerning myself is too true. I look over my life and see where I have failed so many times that I feel almost discouraged, and that there is no hope for me. I know I am poor and weak and sinful. But God is kind and merciful and I still hope in His mercy...

Now, in January, 1906, Jones was at last free from the burdens of administration. His health nearly ruined, he went to Southern California to visit his son in Santa Barbara and promote the sale of the Signs; even in retirement he could not give up completely the work of the Press. Ellen White, however, was not happy with the turn of events. On January 28, 1906, a few weeks after his resignation, she wrote him:

I have indeed felt sad to learn of your illness. In the night season I was standing by your side with my hand upon your shoulder. I said, "Why are you here? You have no orders to resign your
position. You may leave it for a change, but the Lord has not released you. If your health demands a change, take a change, and then in the name of the Lord return to your position. The Lord has not released you. But be sure to do all in your power to make everything right.”

What should Jones do? He had wanted a year of rest, but freed from the responsibilities of office his health was rapidly recovering. And it seemed that everybody wanted his services. On May 7 the directors invited him to return to Mountain View and assist Asa O. Tait in pushing the circulation of the Signs. Then he received an offer to be general manager of the new Southern Publishing Company, and finally a request by A. G.Daniells, President of the General Conference, to be chairman of the General Conference Publishing Department. But Jones really had no choice, for, he believed, the Lord had spoken through Ellen White.

His return to Mountain View as manager of the Pacific Press needed only to be requested officially by the directors. In his absence they had become more and more aware of how important Jones was to the Press. Then on May 3 they received a long testimony from Ellen White:

I have expected that Brother Jones would be separated from the work. But in the night season his case was presented to me just as it was presented before, that we have no one of his experience to take his place in the work.

The Lord wants that Brother Jones should have courage; that he should walk strictly with God; that his faith should be revived; that he should take hold to help in the publication of the books and pamphlets and the other matter that you are getting out. You need his advice and counsel. You know the understanding that he has in these things, and God wants us to act intelligently in regard to the lack of sympathy shown in the treatment Brother Jones has received.

On June 14 the directors formally requested that C. H. Jones accept a position on the board and assume the duties of general manager. Jones accepted. “In view of the messages that have come to us from the servant of the Lord I dare not refuse,” he replied in a letter read to the board on July 1. He did request that for the present he not be required to put in full time at the office.

My whole time, or at least all that I can stand, will be given to the office, for I shall have no outside interests, but you know I am not in the best of health. When I left the office I expected to be free from all responsibility for a year at least. I am glad to say that I am feeling much better, but in justice to myself and family I must be careful for some time to come. As a general thing I would not want to come to the office before eight or nine o’clock in the morning, but that does not mean that I would be doing no work for the office before that time. A person who accepts the responsibility of manager carries the burden all the time, and some of his best thoughts for advance work come to him outside of office hours — perhaps in the dead of night. At least it has been so with me. For exercise I shall want to spend some time on my place digging in the garden, etc., but not for pecuniary profit. I shall have someone to care for my ranch, and take no particular responsibility myself. I speak plainly about this so there may be no misunderstandings.

Jones’ request was accepted, and at three o’clock that afternoon he commenced his labors as manager of the Pacific Press, a job he would not relinquish for another twenty-six years. These years were by no means free from trials. Jones had barely gotten back into his office when the beautiful new plant at Mountain View, a two-story building of over 60,000 square feet that already had been repaired once from the damage of an earthquake in April, burned to the ground. The fire of July 20 and 21 wiped out the house. Only a few of the presses could be repaired and the insurance company paid only $72,500, though losses were over $200,000. But everyone worked to provide uninterrupted publishing services. With the insurance money and
$66,500 from the sale of the Oakland property, completed in January, 1907, the Pacific Press put up a new building, only one-third as large as the former, and committed itself irrevocably never again to take even one piece of commercial work.

Throughout this period of crisis Jones was a tower of strength. The tragic fire had taught everyone a lesson. Putting past squabbles aside, the employers determined to face the huge debt without profitable commercial contracts and trust in the Lord. The years that followed proved to be the most profitable years in the history of the Press.

At the heart of the new prosperity was the tremendous growth of the subscription book business. Under the leadership of E. R. Palmer the canvassing work had been placed on a solid foundation of local control, and a new scholarship plan was encouraging hundreds of students to spend their summers canvassing.

A reorganized church was reaching out to evangelize the world. In the decade 1895-1904 only $3,144,000 worth of Adventist literature had been sold. In the decade 1904-1914 this figure jumped to the sum of $14,095,000. And in the next decade, 1915-1924, sales nearly tripled to over $38,483,000.

The presses at the Pacific Press could hardly keep up with the demand. These were years of tremendous spirit as the plant expanded and worked overtime to keep denominational literature flowing. The new worth of the Press, which in 1907 had stood at $21,000, increased to $434,500 in 1917 and $711,350 in 1927. And in 1930 the Pacific Press at last paid off the heavy debt that had overburdened it for so many decades.

Presiding over this prosperity was C. H. Jones, approaching the status of senior statesman. Many problems remained, and on occasion Jones had to fight again for the interests of his house. But, in the main, the battles had been won. The Pacific Press, like all other publishing houses, was responsible to its own constituency and had its own territory in which to work, free from outside control or competition.

In 1920, at a dinner marking a half century of service to the Press, 300 guests gathered to honor C. H. Jones, then 78. The centerpiece was a huge, beautifully-decorated cake with fifty glowing candles given to Jones by the employees of the Glendale Sanitarium. The employees of the Press surprised the grand old man with an easy chair. It was an emotionally moving evening. Jones recalled his career in denominational publishing, going all the way back to the early years in Battle Creek. He gave credit to the workers who had built up the Press and been his co-laborers through the years. At the head of the list stood James and Ellen White, S. N. Haskell, and J. H. Waggoner.

Jones served three more years as the manager of the Pacific Press before illness forced him to retire, but he continued as president and president emeritus until his death on April 26, 1936.

From pioneer days in Battle Creek to a golden and active old age in Mountain View, Jones had achieved a record of service to Adventist publishing unmatched in the history of the denomination. He had served long and he had served well, living through the years of trial and of prosperity. He had fought for the independence of the Pacific Press and by so doing helped to settle the pattern for Seventh-day Adventist publishing that remains to the present. And harkening to the counsel of Ellen White, he had committed himself totally to publishing the Gospel.
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The Military Chaplaincy and Seventh-day Adventists: The Evolution of an Attitude
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SEVENTH-DAY Adventists believe that government is ordained of God and that the Christian should fulfill his obligations to his country for conscience sake. Unfortunately, duty to God and obedience to the requirements of country sometimes conflict; in that case, the Christian must obey God rather than man. When a nation goes to war, every effort is made to achieve victory. Obedience is expected from the individual in order that the might of the nation may achieve that end. Although the love of country is strong among Seventh-day Adventists and loyalty is deep, certain peculiar beliefs held by them cause difficulties. One of these, the belief that the Christian should not bear arms, has been recognized by the United States, and Adventists have been classified among those who are not required to bear arms. Observance of the seventh day of the week has also brought its problems. Even in civilian life Sabbath observance has often made it impossible for a Seventh-day Adventist to hold a job or has made promotion difficult since life is geared to a Saturday work day. It is doubly a problem where a man is expected to obey an order without question. Then, too, in the military a man can not quit his job and find one where Sabbath privileges are certain.
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World War I, bringing compulsory military service, came unexpectedly and found the church unprepared. As a result, when asked to perform duties on Sabbath, many boys refused and were subject to court martial and found guilty of disobedience to orders. At the conclusion of the war thirty-five were serving sentences of from five to twenty years in prison. Fortunately, after the cessation of the war they were released and discharged.

The war taught two things: (1) the best area for Adventists to serve was in the medical department; (2) those who took some training in this field were more likely to be assigned to that department. Accordingly, the Autumn Council of 1939 adopted the Medical Cadet training program which had been developed in some of the colleges and local churches beginning as early as five years before. The Autumn Council of 1940 re-established the War Service Commission, which had been organized near the close of World War I in 1918 with Carlyle B. Haynes as secretary, and asked Haynes to again take charge of the work of training Adventist young men for medical service in the approaching World War. By the time of the Pearl Harbor attack several thousand men, as a result of this action, had been given a brief course in medical military training.

In the meantime, there arose the question of whether an Adventist minister should apply for a chaplain’s commission. What seems to have been the first consideration of this matter by the church came up shortly after the draft became operative. At a meeting of General Conference officers on December 1, 1940, the matter of recommending a man for the military chaplaincy came up. The Chief of Chaplains of the Army was asking that the church recommend Virgil Hulse for a chaplains’ commission. This request harked back to an earlier date when Hulse had served a tour as a chaplain in the CCC camps in Northern Michigan. S. E. Wight, president of the Michigan Conference, had favorably reported Hulse’s work in an article in The Ministry for April, 1934, speaking of his having charge of all religious services in seven camps comprising an aggregate of 2,000 men. In addition to his governmental work, Hulse had held services in the Adventist churches in the area. The report suggested that the project offered an opportunity to share one’s faith among young men who were in need of spiritual guidance — something like a branch Sabbath School. Now, the officers agreed to inform the Chief of Chaplains that Hulse was no longer a member of the Adventist church. But this reply, easily arrived at, only postponed the real issue. Accordingly, the officers met the question head on and agreed that they should not recommend chaplains for the army, but in case a minister desired such service the church would give a statement of the man’s standing as a church member, such statement to be secured from the conference of his employment.

A General Conference Officers meeting on February 6, 1941, noted that several ministers had written asking counsel about applying for chaplaincies in the army and navy. Haynes reported that one chaplain was allotted to a denomination for each 100,000 members and that the denomination was entitled to two chaplains. A committee which had been appointed to gather information concerning army chaplains reported on March 24 and the General Conference Committee resolved:

Inasmuch as in religious matters affecting men in army service, the United States Army is dealing with only three organizations which have received official recognition for this purpose; namely the Vicariate for the Catholics, the Jewish Welfare Board for the Jews, and the General Committee on Army and Navy Chaplains for all Protestant bodies; and

Whereas, The acceptance of membership in the General Committee on Army and Navy Chaplains offers advantages to us which otherwise we could not possess in ministering to the spiritual interests of our members in the army; and

Whereas, We have been invited to accept membership in the General Committee on Army and Navy Chaplains,

Voted, That we appoint C. B. Haynes and H. H. Votaw for membership in the General Committee on Army and Navy Chaplains, it being understood that this membership involves a fee of $100.00; and it being further understood that this does not commit us to approval of the policy of the appointment of army chaplains under government pay.

The General Commission on Army and Navy Chaplains, which consisted of members representing the various Protestant denominations, recommended candidates for commissions as chaplains to the Chief of Chaplains of the Army. The Army had established this commission because it did not want to accept a man not adjudged suitable by this church. The Chief of Chaplains first evaluated the candidate’s technical and professional qualifications and then, to insure that the candidate was a minister in good standing with his denomination, required an ecclesiastical endorsement by his church’s member on the Commission. Then and not until then did the Chief of Chaplains make the appointment. Votaw as secretary of the Religious Liberty Department and Haynes as secretary of the War Service Commission became the Adventist spokesmen on the Commission. On the same day denominational officers voted to join the General Commission on Army and Navy Chaplains.
they also “voted that word be sent to the union and local conference presidents, so that they may have it for counsel, that we do not see how we as a denomination can look with favor upon any of our men serving as chaplains.” Adventist membership on the Commission, so far as the chaplaincy was concerned, was merely on an observer basis.

In spite of the frowns of the General Conference leaders against Adventist ministers entering the chaplaincy, the matter simply would not stay settled and the question again came up for consideration in a lengthy session at the 1942 spring meeting of the General Conference Committee. Unfortunately the minutes give only the bare skeleton of the actions as finally passed with no indication of the spirited discussion thoroughly airing both sides of the whole question. I was present as a member of the War Service Commission, and although memories are at best dim after the passing of a third of a century, I use them together with the bare records to portray that day in New York.

The religious liberty representatives most actively opposed the chaplaincy, for they felt it was a denial of Seventh-day Adventism’s position for an Adventist minister to accept a salary from the government for preaching the gospel. Others said that a minister under such circumstances would not be able to preach the peculiar Adventist doctrines and would thus betray the trust of his ordination. Some understood that on occasion, especially where they were serving in isolated areas, chaplains were asked to take charge of recreation to uphold morale which might require supervising prize fights or arranging for dances and other activities objectionable to Adventists. Adventist chaplains, it was also feared, would be asked to perform the rites of another church when a minister of that organization was not present; for example, he might have to conduct burial procedures calling for prayer for the dead, administer extreme unction to a Catholic soldier, or sprinkle an infant. Finally, it was asserted that since the chaplain takes the same oath as other soldiers he could be regarded as a fighting man and in case he found himself in a critical situation he would be expected to seize a gun and defend himself and his comrades.

On the other hand, some felt that Seventh-day Adventist soldiers needed representatives of their own church to minister to them and help to smooth out any misunderstandings with officers such as were bound to surface where noncombatant Sabbatarians were subject to military orders. Others thought that the church should take advantage of the government’s desire to have Adventist chaplains and that the men required the service whether the spiritual advisors were on government or denominational payroll.

In the end they rushed a theoretical compromise which was recorded as an informal action. In part it read: “We reaffirm our historical position on this matter, which is to the effect that we cannot as a religious body counsel or encourage our men to apply for or accept military commissions, but must leave such decisions to be made on the basis of individual convictions.” This seeming compromise effectively closed the door to any ministers becoming chaplains since it was the policy of the army not to accept any candidate for the chaplaincy without the ecclesiastical endorsement of his denomination’s representative on the General Commission on Army and Navy Chaplains.

NOW CAME Floyd E. Bresee into the picture. He had served two terms as a missionary in the Inca Union in South America and in 1942 was heading the Secondary Education Department and teaching history part time at Union College. He made application for a commission, submitting the names of several board and faculty members of the college who agreed to recommend him to the Department of the Army. In time he received a letter from the Chief of Chaplains stating that he should have other recommendations. Bresee apparently was unaware of the necessity for an ecclesiastical endorsement from the Adventist member of the General Commission on Army and Navy Chaplains. Thinking that he needed testimonials from more prestigious persons, he asked and received recommendations from the governor of Nebraska, from an ex-governor, and from the chancellor of the University of Nebraska. When he got no results, Bresee wrote to Haynes urging his aid in securing a commission. Haynes knew Bresee well since they had served in the South American Division at the same time and personally would have been happy to recommend Bresee. He told the General Conference officers at their meeting on the first of July, however, that he was not clear about giving an ecclesiastical endorsement and thought that if a recommendation was given that it should come from Bresee’s employing organization.

When the General Conference Committee took the matter up informally next day, Haynes reported that Bresee felt that he ought at least to have a character recommendation certifying that he was a minister in good standing in the
Chaplain Floyd E. Bresee, first Seventh-day Adventist military chaplain

courtesy: U.S. Army Signal Corps

Seventh-day Adventist Church. Believing that this would be acceptable, the committee agreed that a character recommendation addressed “To Whom It May Concern” could rightfully be given but that it should come from the Central Union Conference, Bresee’s employing and accrediting organization. The committee therefore instructed Haynes to notify Bresee and N. C. Wilson, the president of the Central Union who was also chairman of the Union College Board.

If the General Conference officers expected the army to accept a “To Whom It May Concern” recommendation by an organization of less stature than the General Conference they were mistaken. When Wilson’s “To Whom It May Concern” recommendation reached the Chief of Chaplains he turned it down; but he did want a Seventh-day Adventist chaplain — three of them in fact — at that very time and was willing to stretch a point to match that of the denominational leaders. A conversation similar to the following is reported to have taken place.

Chief of Chaplains: “Is this man all right?”

Haynes: “Yes, he is all right but I can’t endorse him because it is against our denominational policy to endorse ministers of our church to the chaplaincy.” Chief of Chaplains: “Then how would it be if I endorsed him?” Haynes: “That would be all right if you will take the responsibility, for we have an action that we cannot as a church encourage our men to accept a military commission but must leave such decisions to be made on the basis of individual convictions.” Chief of Chaplains: “Well, if he is all right I’ll endorse him then.” And thus the first Seventh-day Adventist chaplain got into the army. Bresee was sworn in on September 28, 1942, and thereby began the military chaplaincy among Seventh-day Adventists.

Bresee got in by the backdoor, so to speak. Nevertheless, the door had been opened a bit and another missionary was knocking for admission. William H. Bergherm had served eleven years in the Philippines, followed by a term as associate secretary of the Home Missionary Department of the General Conference, and a brief assignment as president of the Columbia-Venezuela Union Mission in the Inter-American Division. He could scarcely be regarded as immature and was persistent in his ambition to be a pathbreaker.

At an officers meeting on February 3, 1943, H. T. Elliott, associate secretary of the General Conference, reported correspondence and interviews with Bergherm regarding his desire to enter the chaplaincy. Elliott said that all possible had been done to persuade Bergherm to continue in denominational employment and to “make it clear to him our attitude with regard to his becoming a chaplain in the military service. It is understood that the final decision is now left with Brother Bergherm.” Nevertheless, it was not until six weeks later, on March 14, that the officers agreed to authorize Carlyle B. Haynes to send to the proper authorities a character recommendation. As to how much persuasion Bergherm used on denominational leaders in the meantime, the records are silent, of course, and as to how he received an ecclesiastical endorsement is mysterious. Since the very representative of the General Conference who had the authority to send in ecclesiastical endorsements, however, was in this case sending in the character recommendation, it is probable that the Chief of Chaplains waived a point and accepted the character recommendation as an endorsement or he may have endorsed Bergherm himself. At any rate Bergherm began a seven-year tour of duty as a chaplain about the first of April, 1943.
In the meantime, on February 4, 1943, at an informal meeting of the General Conference Committee it was stated that the Chief of Chaplains had requested twenty-five Adventist ministers for the chaplaincy and that many ministers were inquiring about joining. The Committee agreed to reaffirm the policy against applying for a commission and to send out a letter explaining the denomination’s stand against the chaplaincy.

Bergherm’s persistence brought another discussion of the chaplaincy among the General Conference officers on March 3. Apparently Bergherm had insisted that the duties of a chaplain had not been fully understood by the leaders, for they asked W. H. Branson, chairman of the War Service Commission (of which Haynes was the executive secretary), to have Haynes secure information regarding duties of army chaplains, especially in active service.

At the spring meeting on April 17, 1943, H. H. Votaw reported on a meeting of the Commission on Army and Navy Chaplains which had outlined a plan for training navy chaplains in theological seminaries at government expense. The Committee discussed the subject for a whole evening and until 10:15 the next morning. The men finally adopted a resolution condemning the entrance of the United States Government into the realm of training priests and preachers paid out of general tax funds as a violation of the principles of the separation of church and state. They asked the executive committee to prepare and submit to the proper authorities a protest against “the introduction and maintenance of this unAmerican program, and further, to explore the possibility of other religious organizations submitting similar protests.”

When the committee brought in its report on May 20, the document went far beyond the original question of educating chaplain candidates at government expense, clearly outlining the whole Adventist position against chaplaincies. The statement, for example, argued:

“The teaching of religion is the duty and responsibility of the church, and it is wholly improper for the state to employ individuals for this specific purpose. . . . Seventh-day Adventist ministers as military chaplains, commissioned, supervised and paid by the government, would have to consent to a limitation on the content of their preaching, which would prevent them from preaching the full gospel message for this prophetic hour. As clergy employed by the state they could not preach the important Sabbath message, nor other doctrines recognized by the denomination as vital but looked upon by others as being controversial. Seventh-day Adventist soldiers, because of their Sabbath principles, are often considered a serious problem to military organizations. It is apparent therefore that chaplains could not consistently accept remuneration as military officers and at the same time by their preaching and personal ministry aggravate the problems of military administration by encouraging men to observe the Sabbath ‘according to the commandment.’

The report also stated that it would be embarrassing for the chaplain to defend or explain the noncombatant position of the denomination. Furthermore, even if it were consistent to serve as chaplains, the government permitted only twenty-seven at the time. Therefore, the committee thought that civilian camp pastors would better serve the needs of Adventist boys. It was admitted that such pastors could not follow the boys overseas but, “it is also recognized that there is only the very remotest possibility that even Seventh-day Adventist chaplains would be placed in action where they could be of service to the widely scattered and comparatively few Seventh-day Adventist men at the fronts.” By way of further explanation, the action read: “The General Conference Committee is seeking in these actions to guide Seventh-day Adventist
ministers away from acceptance of military commissions.” After accepting the report, the General Conference Committee asked Branson to write an article against the chaplaincy for the Review and Herald.

Seemingly the matter was settled once and for all, but the action of May, 1943, was only the high watermark of anti-chaplaincy action among Seventh-day Adventists. The question just would not stay settled. The 1944 spring meeting of the General Conference reconsidered the action of the previous spring “by request.” A full and free discussion of the matter brought out that “some of our ministers who have had sincere convictions that they should go into the military service as chaplains, have refrained from applying for a chaplaincy, feeling that if they did so . . . they would be under denominational censure as having violated a principle of the denomination.” After much discussion it was voted “to rescind that portion of the action of 1943 which sets forth the reasons for our attitude on the question of military chaplaincies retaining only the statement of general policy . . .” The action ended with the usual clause that men were neither counselled nor encouraged to seek commissions but the matter was left to “individual convictions.” A softer attitude toward the military chaplaincy had appeared for the first time.

Although much had been said about leaving the decision of whether to apply for a chaplain’s commission to the “individual conviction” it is clear that the denominational leaders were attempting to keep Seventh-day Adventist ministers out of the army. Since the government had not changed its policy of accepting only those who had an ecclesiastical endorsement by the denomination’s member on the General Commission on Army and Navy Chaplains, the matter of exercising the individual conscience was a dead letter. The government did not make any more exceptions and church leaders were adamant. The General Conference records are silent on the chaplaincy during the remainder of World War II, and denominational papers carried no news stories of the activities of the two chaplains in service.

The work of Bresee and Bergherm, however, was to change the entire outlook of the denomination toward the chaplaincy. They had not even finished their initial training when word began to filter back that some of the notions concerning the chaplaincy were unfounded. For example, the army definitely taught the recruit chaplain that he was never to do anything contrary to his convictions and the teaching of his church in the pursuit of his army duties. In addition, when an Adventist chaplain arrived at a camp where there were a number of chaplains, the fact was noised about and should an Adventist soldier have some difficulty over the Sabbath it was customary for the ranking officer to refer the matter to the chaplain. Usually the officer followed the chaplain’s advice since officers were puzzled to know whether the boys were malingering or acting from a responsive conscience. Thus the presence of one Adventist chaplain was a helpful influence far beyond his immediate unit. When the chaplains got over in the South Pacific their coming was known throughout a wide area, and commanders hundreds of miles away in the navy as well as in the army sought advice and recommendations which were helpful to boys who were sincere and conscientious. Of course, some who were hiding from duty under a false cloak of religion were discovered. Fortunately there were not many of these, and the soldiers for the most part appreciated what the government was doing for them and responded accordingly.

Sometimes the past experience of the Adventist minister served him in good stead and made him stand out. Such was the case when the 168th Ordnance Battalion with Bresee the assigned chaplain disembarked on the island of New Caledonia. A big truck drove up with the chapel in the form of several large bundles of canvas. When the commander looked through his list of men with special qualifications he found none qualified to pitch a 60 x 90 circus tent and informed the chaplain of the dilemma. The chaplain, nothing taken aback, remembering the many times when in tent evangelism in South Dakota and at camp meetings he had erected that type of canvas pavilion, said: “Don’t let that bother you. Give me a dozen men and I’ll pitch it.” In a short time the canvas and ropes were taut and the stakes well driven. When this was noised about, Bresee’s reputation rose appreciably among the military men.
Seventh-day Adventist servicemen, many from Australia and New Zealand, for whom Bresee held services on the island of New Caledonia.

Chaplain Bresee befriending a convalescing soldier.

Chaplain Bresee befriending a convalescing soldier.

On this island were several allied installations made up of Australians and New Zealanders. Among the personnel were a number of Seventh-day Adventists. As the chaplain remembers it, about twenty-five or thirty attended Sabbath School and worship services each Sabbath and were very active spiritual leaders. The mingling of Adventist believers from the ends of the earth was heart warming. On Sundays a larger group of non-Adventists met in the commodious tent.

Chapel with the 25th Evacuation Hospital in New Hebrides.
The native chorus of New Hebrides who sang their appreciation to Col. Stevenson, commanding officer, and Lt. Col. Sharer, of the 25th Evacuation Hospital (The picture was clouded by mildew in the South Pacific.)

The strange ways of war caused some incidents which no one could have foreseen. The 25th Evacuation Hospital was more than the small customary mobile installation which follows the battle line treating the wounded and sending them back to the station hospital for longer care. The 25th had been enlarged until it was virtually a station hospital and was treating the thousands of casualties from Bouganville and the Guadalcanal battles. It has been conservatively estimated that at that time the hospital had from thirty-five to forty doctors and other commissioned medical men, sixty-five to seventy-five nurses also commissioned, and three hundred fifty to four hundred enlisted men. The bed capacity varied from seven hundred fifty to one thousand five hundred. Such a large medical unit carried a tremendous inventory of clothing and supplies for women as well as male personnel. This big installation settled down near the Adventist mission headquarters in the New Hebrides. Its sole chaplain was a Seventh-day Adventist, Floyd Bresee, and he made contact with the Adventist missionaries.

Due to transportation difficulties and uncertainties of communication in wartime, these Australian and New Zealand Adventist missionaries had run short of many of the comforts and even necessities on their isolated island station. They needed dental work; some had broken their dentures. Others had spectacles with broken frames or lenses that needed changing. Both men and ladies needed shoes and clothing. Gasoline and oil for their missionary launches were in short supply; medicines were almost nonexistent. The work of the “Fuzzy-Wuzzies,” as the Americans good-naturedly called the islanders, in rescuing and helping downed Allied flyers in the jungles was well known and much appreciated, and when the commander of the 25th Evacuation Hospital was approached in behalf of the beleaguered missionaries he told the chaplain to invite them to bring their wives and secure what they needed from the supplies. The optometrists even supplied the needy with extra pairs of spectacles for use in case the war was prolonged. As a result, missionary medical chests were better filled than they ever had been.

When the hospital packed up for the invasion of the Philippines, quantities of gasoline and other launch supplies were declared surplus and left on the landing where the islanders were told they could “find” them and the missionaries appreciatively loaded their launches for use in the weeks ahead until better contact with their homeland could be re-established.

In appreciation to the hospital commander for his sympathetic attitude toward the missionaries, the chaplain arranged for the islanders to sing at a Sunday morning service which the hospital commander always attended. The mission-
aries cooperated nobly and organized a male chorus which memorized a number of songs in pidgin English and in the native language. On the day of the widely advertised appointment hundreds of soldiers from the hospital and from other units far and wide were there to see and hear the New Hebrides singers. The crowd was so large it overflowed the chapel and filled the area round about. The Adventist chaplain watched with a great deal of pride those stalwart brown men dressed in spotless white, like an exhibition drill team, march to their place and sing in pidgin English and then in their own tongue those familiar hymns reminding the military churchgoers of home and their childhood training. Unable to refrain from putting in a good word for missions, Bresee said something on this wise: Now friends, you have seen today what Adventist missions do. Had it not been for the coming of Christian missionaries these fine people would still live in primitive heathenism. When you get back home, sometime someone will call on you and ask you for a gift for missions. Don't forget what you have seen today and give a liberal offering.

When the hospital arrived in the Philippines there were other opportunities to help Adventist civilians. The Filipino people had suffered much during the Japanese occupation and the Adventist nationals, whose churches were destroyed or in disrepair and the communicants scattered, were in need of leadership. Because of their American sympathies, some had been persecuted. Here was a large opportunity for rehabilitation of the Adventist work. Of course, Bresee could not spare much time from his other activities, but he did preach at Adventist churches on Sabbath and he did encourage the Adventist men in the armed services to mingle with and help the liberated people. Many of the boys spent Sabbaths visiting and even preaching to isolated groups — a blessing to these armed forces missionaries as well as to the Filipinos. Some helped rebuild churches and sent home for Bibles and song books to re-establish the refinements of worship. On one occasion a group of American soldiers took up an offering of nearly five hundred dollars to help rebuild Adventist work on Luzon.

When the army of occupation arrived in Japan, they found the coast and towns deserted since the people had been told that the Americans would kill them on sight. Those who did venture out were given tokens of goodwill such as candy bars and soon learned that there was to be no slaughter. Then General Douglas McArthur opened the quartermaster stores of the occupation forces and gave the near-famished citizens food which won their hearts. There was little for the 25th Evacuation Hospital to do, and Chaplain Bresee made contact with Seventh-day Adventist believers in Japan, gathering them into worship groups and preaching to them each Sabbath. Due to his hospital connection he was able to secure for them needed medicine. Japanese doctors were especially anxious to have some of the new wonder drugs such as sulpha and penicillin, with which they were familiar but had been unable to secure because of war conditions. In other ways, the association and fellowship which had been broken by war and its attendant difficulties in a non-Christian land where Adventists were a small minority was restored. In defeat the Japanese people were more open to Western ideas and receptive to Christianity. The Japanese Adventist leaders took advantage of this situation and on one occasion arranged for a big evangelistic meeting which was advertised with banners, and Chaplain Bresee through an interpreter addressed this audience on the faith of Seventh-day Adventists.
ALTHOUGH the General Conference official records are quiet on the subject following the action of 1944, Liberty, the Seventh-day Adventist religious liberty journal, with H. H. Votaw as editor, from time to time thundered out against chaplaincies. The Navy in particular came in for special condemnation in 1944. The editor referred to an article in the Christian Beacon which presented notorized statements of two ministers concerning the policies of the chief chaplain of the Navy. According to the article the chief "stated that a Protestant chaplain
probably the chief of chaplains was misunderstood or was out of line in his interpretation of duty.

With the coming of peace, Chaplain Bresee went on the active reserve list in August, 1946, but Chaplain Bergherm continued as the lone Seventh-day Adventist chaplain until May, 1948, when Bresee was recalled into active service; now there were two Seventh-day Adventist chaplains once more, but in 1950 Chaplain Bergherm resigned and returned home.

Nearly a decade of limited participation in the army chaplaincy had made its impression on

in the Navy is expected, as a part of his necessary duties to carry a crucifix and rosary for the use of Roman Catholic men to whom he may minister.” He was further quoted as declaring “that in his opinion and in accordance with his administrative policies, a Baptist minister who is unwilling to baptize infants is thereby disqualified as a candidate for the chaplaincy of the United States Navy.” Votaw commented: “If the Navy gets only men who are willing to embrace everything and anything in their teachings, who have no firm convictions that would prevent their refusing to follow practices that they believe unscriptural, then may God pity the Navy.” It is only fair to the Navy to say that

the minds of the denominational leaders. With the coming of the Korean War the question arose again. At the General Conference of 1950 W. H. Branson, a vigorous, aggressive, new president was elected. Whether due to the influence of Chaplain Bergherm or whether Branson had been favorable toward the chaplaincy long before is not known: he probably had favored participation in the chaplaincy but as a good church man had bowed to the will of the majority. In any case, as president he supported the chaplaincy and within five years it had moved from the status of a stepchild to an honored place in the church, but not without a series of
legislative battles. The first occurred at the Autumn Council on October 27, 1950. It was moved to resolve: "That we look with favor upon some of our men of mature experience and ministerial training giving consideration to taking up chaplaincies in the army, navy or other services of the country."

According to the record, "A long and earnest discussion followed, and finally a substitute motion being offered, the following resolution was adopted:

Whereas, There seems to be a field of opportunity for successful spiritual work by men act-

Although this vote was eventually to completely reverse the expressed attitude of the General Conference leaders of a decade before, it indicated a compromise at the time. The phrase, "that we place no barrier in the way" which was substituted for "that we look with favor upon some of our men... giving consideration" indicates a continued opposition to the chaplaincy. It appears that the officers were grudgingly giving ground to the inevitable.

With only Captain Bresee in the service at the beginning of the Korean War, the slate was almost clean for a new beginning in Adventist pol-

icery concerning the chaplaincy, and the reversal like many another revolution was rapid and complete. The first sign came within a year when the General Conference Committee asked for a change of rules for granting a commission so the denomination could get more ministers into the Armed Forces, a far cry from the stated position of a decade before of "seeking to guide Seventh-day Adventist ministers away from acceptance of military commissions." This came with a vote on May 31, 1951, to request the General Commission on Chaplains to cooperate with the General Conference in obtaining an alteration in the requirements for chaplains in the Armed Forces and the Veterans Administration.
which would substitute a year in a pastorate in place of the requirement of three years of seminary education. Since among Seventh-day Adventists the seminary at that time gave only a one-year post-college course as a standard qualification for entering the ministry, this was simply asking that Adventist preparation for the ministry be recognized in admitting an Adventist to the chaplaincy.

A still further increase in warmth toward the chaplain idea by the officers appeared on January 7, 1953, when it was agreed that the General Conference secretary, as standard procedure, would issue the required ecclesiastical endorsement for those who had been duly approved. Now appeared another departure from past usage and recognition that the chaplaincy had been called from the back row to a place of honor. The first Adventist chaplain had received his credentials from the Central Union Conference for all of his years of service, but in the 1953

Seventh-day Adventist Yearbook for the first time the names of the chaplains in the Armed Services appeared in a separate but honored spot as General Conference credentialed.

Now appeared another problem: It had long been Seventh-day Adventist practice that a man spend three or four years in the pastorate following completion of his education before ordination — a sort of testing of the validity of his call to the ministry. On the other hand, many other denominations usually ordained a man upon conferral of the bachelor of divinity degree before he entered upon his ministry — a sort of cap sheaf to his educational qualification. Seventh-day Adventists had to decide whether they would require a seminary student to serve his three years or ordain him upon completion of his course so that he could at once be accepted as a chaplain. The change in attitude toward the chaplaincy is indicated by the vote of the General Conference officers to waive the hitherto indispensable experience required of all others, ordain the young man and send him as a representative into the service. Again we see a tremendous change in sentiment from only four years before when the proposal was offered and turned down "that we look with favor upon some of our men of mature experience and ministerial training giving consideration to taking up chaplaincies . . ." Now the General Conference broke precedent and began to ordain young men without the requisite experience and made them acceptable to the government.

Joseph T. Powell, first Seventh-day Adventist black chaplain

courtesy: U.S. Army
In 1955 appeared another new departure indicating entire approval of the chaplaincy. By this time it was customary for the various conferences to sponsor individuals by paying a portion of their expenses while in the theological seminary with the understanding that they enter the ministry in the sponsoring conference. In November of that year the General Conference voted to sponsor two men who were candidates for the military chaplaincy. Thus the attitude of the denomination as expressed by the General Conference officers had moved full circle between 1944 and 1955, from a decided attempt to keep ordained Adventist ministers from joining the Armed Forces to one of encouraging students to become chaplains by aiding them financially to prepare for that line of work and ordaining them specifically for it.

By 1955 Adventist chaplains had set four firsts for the denomination: first chaplain in the Armed Forces, Floyd Bresee; first black chaplain, Joseph Powell; first Navy chaplain, Robert L. Mole; first Air Force chaplain, Christy M. Taylor. The military chaplaincy no longer caused controversy.

L to R: Robert L. Mole, first S.D.A. Navy Chaplain; Floyd E. Bresee, first S.D.A. Army Chaplain; Christy M. Taylor, first S.D.A. Air Force Chaplain courtesy: F. E. Bresee
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