July 9, 1946.

Rev. Carl Sundin,
4119 Sheridan Boulevard,
Lincoln, Nebraska.

Dear Reverend Sundin:

I am very sorry indeed that I will be unable to attend the funeral of my long time friend, George A. Williams, due to the fact that on Wednesday I will be presiding at an official state board meeting which will keep me in Lincoln all of that day. I wish you would please extend to the family my heartfelt sympathy and very best wishes.

George Williams and I served together in the House of Representatives in 1921 and then later, in 1925, 1927 and 1929, he presided over the State Senate as Lieutenant Governor while I was a member of that body. Because of these connections I had a splendid opportunity to become acquainted with his fine character and his splendid ability. He was a great man, always doing right and wishing to make Nebraska a better state and the United States a better nation. He will be greatly missed by all who knew him well and I consider it a high honor that I was able to call him my friend.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Nebraska Governor Dwight Griswold, long-time friend of Williams, was unable to attend the funeral. He wrote this letter to Carl Sundin, one of the ministers who officiated at the service.
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As the Seventh-day Adventist Church has developed from a small group of rather poor believers to a well-established and prosperous world-wide body it has experienced growing pains. Sociologists describe the process as one of movement from sect to denomination. Whatever the terms one uses, however, the development process itself has been at times difficult. Three of the articles in this issue directly chronicle some of the changes and pains involved.

The early Seventh-day Adventists opposed political activity — at least beyond voting — by church members. They believed they had a more important task than working for earthly kingdoms, and furthermore felt that such involvement would compromise both denominational and personal integrity. Ironically, the strong Adventist temperance position helped push one of the church's ministers into the political arena of Battle Creek, a town where Adventists constituted a significant part of the population. In retrospect, it seems as if entrance of an Adventist into politics on the basis of the temperance issue was inevitable. Whether or not it was, William Gage's term as mayor proved difficult, as John Kearnes shows, thereby confirming the negative view Adventists held of political activity.

A little more than thirty years later, though, another Adventist, George A. Williams of Nebraska, entered politics. Rising to lieutenant governor and candidate for governor, he surprisingly received the support of denominational leadership. In telling this story, William White does not speculate on whether the changed attitude toward politics was simply an aberration of the times or a reflection of a deeper change in the Adventist world view whereby Adventists had become more accepting of their social environment. To answer that question will require wide-ranging research and analysis — work that needs to be done.

Where the controversy over political involvement causes us to examine the relationship of Adventists to the larger society, Raymond Cottrell's memoir of the Biblical Research Fellowship reminds us of the tensions resulting from intellectual development within the church. The Seventh-day Adventist commitment to education has — and again it seems inevitable — produced scholars interested in study and research with the result that sometimes long-held views are re-examined. Such activity has not always sat well with administrators who are primarily concerned with action rather than reflection, nor has it easily fit into the denominational self-image as possessor of "the Truth." Whether Cottrell's story of the Fellowship's rise and fall teaches us how to face such problems is for others to decide, but it certainly carries the message that change, though inescapable, is not dealt with easily.

Perhaps by understanding the process of change as it occurred in the past we can more successfully deal with the present.

G.L.
ETHICAL POLITICS:

ADVENTISM

& THE CASE OF

WILLIAM GAGE

JOHN KEARNES

WITHIN THE CHRISTIAN tradition the moral ambivalence of the state has been cogently summarized by Herbert Butterfield in his Christianity and History:

There has come down in the Christian tradition a profound paradoxical system of teaching on the subject of the origin of government. On the one hand government is regarded as being due to the Fall of Man, a consequence of human sin, while at the same time it is looked upon as being of Divine institution, the creation of Providence. Though government does not cure men of sinfulness any more than the institution of the idea of property eliminates human selfishness, the evil is mitigated by institutions that are a gift of God, and it is brought under regulation by the orderings of society.

Within the Seventh-day Adventist denomination, the development of an ethic on politics presents a unique illustration of this paradox.

Perhaps the earliest statement made for general distribution by Adventists on the subject of political involvement appeared in their church paper, Advent Review and Sabbath Herald, in 1856. David Hewett of Battle Creek, Michigan, in an open letter discussed that year's presidential election. He raised the question whether Adventists should vote for John C. Fremont and the non-extension of slavery. He concluded that his vote would not help the slave—and more importantly, that Bible prophecy had predicted that the United States, as symbolized by the two horned beast (Revelation 13) would make effectual laws for the observance of Sunday (the mark of the beast, verse 17).

"Dear Brethren," Hewett wrote, "it will be a dreadful calamity indeed to be found with any of those parties that break God's holy and immutable law, and make an image to the beast, . . . ."

He further pleaded:

My brethren, shall we spend our time in political campaigns to elect Buchanan or Fremont, when we so soon expect Christ in all the glory of his Father, and all the holy angels with him, when he shall sit upon the throne of his glory? Will not that be far better than a mortal president elected for four years?...Where is the blessed Jesus? He has set down at the right hand of God. O may our treasure and hearts be there.

John Kearnes teaches political science at the University of Minnesota, Morris.
These sentiments were shared in the same issue in an article probably written by the paper’s editor, Uriah Smith. To the direct question as to why Adventists did not with their votes and influence “labor against the evil tendency of the times,” the writer answered, “our views of prophecy lead us to the conclusion that things will not be bettered...we feel it our duty to confine our efforts to preparing ourselves, and others...for the great and final issue pressing upon us—the revelation of the Son of man from heaven...”

Cottrell also felt that he could not vote against slavery because the image would be against the “bond as well as the free.” And he could not be asked to vote against Catholics, because the image would not be the beast, but something that resembles it. This left him only one conclusion. “...I cannot vote for a bad man, for that is against my principles; and, under the present corrupt and corrupting state of politics, I could not wish to elevate a good man to office, for it would ruin him.”

A year later, Joseph Clarke of Portage, Ohio, a school teacher and frequent contributor, wrote an article for the Review to answer a question often asked of him—“You will vote at our spring election won’t you[?]”? Clarke replied that as an ambassador for Christ he prayed for the coming of that heavenly kingdom which would result in the overturn of all earthly kingdoms. Therefore, “it cannot be consistent for Christ’s children to meddle with political affairs.” As if to clinch his point, Clarke went on to state what he thought was wrong with our national government. It legalized swearing by idol gods (a form of paganism), it legalized Sabbath-breaking, sanctioned slavery, and the genocide of the Indian.

What more need be said to condemn this government as anti-Christian, as unholy, unworthy of the fellowship of the elect. If I enter the lists as a voter, I do in fact endorse this government as worthy of fellowship. If my name is entered upon the poll-book I then become part of the body-politic, and must suffer with the body-politic in all its penalties.

Let me “come out and be separate,” and “have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness.”

These early Adventists who published their views on politics consistently agreed that political participation detracted from their evangelical purpose and could even be viewed by some as combining with a future evil.

SIGNIFICANT CHANGE occurred in 1859. It is recorded in the diary of Ellen G. White, who with her husband James was instrumental in founding the Adventist Church. The setting for this diary entry was Battle Creek, Michigan, where the offices of the Review had been established and the early headquarters of the church developed.

It seems that the issue was whether or not to vote for men in the city who stood for the principle of temperance. Ellen White wrote:

Attended meeting in the eve. Had quite a free, interesting meeting. After it was time to close, the subject of voting was considered and dwelt upon. James first talked, then Brother Andrews
Elder George I. Butler, President of the General Conference, had some misgivings about the REVIEW AND HERALD endorsing Gage for mayor of Battle Creek in 1882.

talked, and it was thought by them best to give their influence in favor of...temperance men being in office in our city instead of by their silence running the risk of having intemperate men put in office. Brother Hewett tells his experience of a few days [since] and is settled that [it] is right to cast his vote. Brother Hart talks well. Brother Lyon opposes. No others object to voting, but Brother Kellogg begins to feel that it is right. Pleasant feelings exist among all the brethren. O that they may all act in the fear of God.

Men of intemperance have been in the office today in a flattering manner expressing their approbation of the course of the Sabbathkeepers [in] not voting and expressed hopes that they will stick to their course and like the Quakers, not cast their vote. Satan and his evil angels are busy at this time, and he has workers upon the earth. May Satan be disappointed, is my prayer.

It is probable that the Brother Hewett mentioned here was the same individual who wrote the open letter to the Review in September of 1856 in which he condemned the act of voting in that year’s presidential election. Whatever his experience with the liquor problem in Battle Creek, it was enough to convince him that voting, in itself, was not an intrinsic evil. This also seems to have been the consensus of most of the other members of that group. Adventist leaders were now concluding that voting for temperance was not the same as voting for a president or a non-extension of slavery. This type of voting was not “fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness,” but on the contrary, was a means to disappoint the work of Satan.

James White expanded upon this concept during the 1860 presidential election. In an editorial he counseled:

The political excitement of 1860 will probably run as high as it has for many years, and we would warn our brethren not to be drawn in to it. We are not prepared to prove from the Bible that it would be wrong for a believer in the third message to go in a manner becoming his profession, and cast his vote. We do not recommend this, neither do we oppose. If a brother chooses to vote, we cannot condemn him, and we want the same liberty if we do not.

But we do believe that he who enters into the spirit of the coming contest, loses the spirit of the present truth and endangers his own soul. Our brethren out with the tents will probably see it necessary to move back into small places away from the heat of political strife, or close up the season in holding tent conferences.

Adventists, because of their New England heritage, had consistently been sympathetic to the abolition of slavery. The coming of the Civil War in 1861 forced them to determine what their attitude should be toward participation in the conflict as it related to this worthy objective. James White presented an editorial in August, 1862 that solidified the church’s answer to this question.

White began by reaffirming the anti-slavery position of Adventists. He also revealed that in the last presidential election that “Those of our people who voted at all ... to a man voted for Abraham Lincoln.” He asserted that he did not know of one Seventh-day Adventist who was sympathetic with the secession of the southern states.

One of the reasons that White gave for Adventist non-participation in the civil struggle was an argument that he had first offered in 1856 for not voting in that year’s election. He reasoned that since the prophetic word had revealed the continuation of some form of slavery until the end of the world, it was not for Adventists to cherish the hope that this war would end it. But, even more importantly, the position that Adventists had taken on the “perpetuity and sacredness of the law of God,” was “not in harmony with all the requirements of war.” In particular, this included the fourth commandment, “Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy,” and the sixth, “Thou shalt not kill.”
On the issue of the draft, White wrote:
But in the case of drafting, the government assumed the responsibility of the violation of the law of good and it would be madness to resist. He who would resist until, in the administration of military law, he was shot down, goes too far, we think, in taking the responsibility of suicide.

Adventists must have faith in God to meet these trials, he believed. White felt that those who would be loyal to God would be the last men to ‘‘sneak’ off to Canada, or to Europe, or to stand trembling in their shoes for fear of the military draft.’ The Christian’s responsibility was:

... to honor every good law of our land. Said Jesus, “Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar’s, and unto God the things that are God’s.” (Matthew 22:21) Those who despise evil law, should at once pack up and be off for some spot on God’s foot-stool where there is no civil law.

**White’s Exposition** gave recognition to several important issues. Some Adventists did vote in the presidential election. Adventists should not participate in war even for a laudable objective. There should not, however, be active resistance on the part of Adventists to the draft, even though by this practice government had assumed the violation of the law of God. The only point at which active resistance to the authority of the state should be considered, was when ‘‘civil enactments shall be passed and enforced to drive us from obedience to the law of God, to join those who are living in rebellion against the government of Heaven, see Revelation 13:15-17.’’ Participation in this war was therefore circumscribed by loyalty to God.

The views of James White and others became the official position of the growing church at the Third Annual General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists held in Battle Creek, May, 1865. There it was resolved that the church recognize civil government as ordained of God, but understand that “we are compelled to declare all participation in acts of war and bloodshed as being inconsistent with the duties enjoined upon us by our divine Master toward our enemies and toward all mankind.” On the subject of voting the session resolved:

That in our judgment, the act of voting when exercised in behalf of justice, humanity and right, is in itself blameless, and may be at times highly proper; but that the casting of any vote that shall strengthen the cause of such crimes as intemperance, insurrection, and slavery, we regard as highly criminal in the sight of Heaven. But we would deprecate any participation in the spirit of party strife.

If voting for moral principles was now an accepted norm for the Adventists’ relation to politics, what did this fact intimate about other forms of political participation that emanated from the exercise of the franchise? The spirited and bitter election of 1880 was the next occasion that prompted James White to
write in the *Review* about the dangers for Adventists in being caught up in political campaigns. He admonished them to "stand free from the strife and corruptions of the parties that are striving for the mastery." In the face of White's admonition, what would be the Adventist political ethic if the campaign was based upon a moral issue? Would there be an inescapable logic that if it were ethical to vote on an issue of moral principle, would it also be ethical to support a political candidate in a campaign for a moral principle? The situation for such a development appeared in the Adventist position on the temperance issue.

In 1880 Ellen G. White addressed the relationship between temperance and politics: "Intemperate men should not by vote of the people be placed in positions of trust." In the following year she wrote a major article for the *Review* on the same subject. She began:

> There is a cause for the moral paralysis upon society. Our laws sustain an evil which is sapping their very foundations. Many deplore the wrongs which they know exist, but consider themselves free from all responsibility in the matter. This cannot be. Every individual exerts an influence in society. In our favored land, every voter has some voice in determining what laws shall control the nation. Should not that influence and that vote be cast on the side of temperance and virtue? . . .

> ...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. We need not expect that God will work a miracle to bring about this reform, and thus remove the necessity for our exertion. We ourselves must grapple with this giant foe, our motto, no compromise and cessation of our efforts till the victory is gained.

> These sentiments assumed a strong emotional and moral endorsement for the use of the ballot in the cause of temperance. They also provided a context for an enlarged ethic of political participation by Adventists. If the situation were posited that no temperance candidate could be found for whom Adventists could vote, would it be an acceptable alternative to have an Adventist candidate?

**By 1882 there was a sizeable concentration of Adventists in the West End of Battle Creek, Michigan. The recent history of the city had proven that the elected city officials had betrayed the cause of temperance in the city by not enforcing the liquor control laws on the books and by conniving with liquor interests to prevent further restrictions on the selling of liquor in the city. It was for these reasons that Uriah Smith, editor of the *Review*, explained in an editorial of April 11, 1882, that William C. Gage had been nominated and subsequently elected as mayor of Battle Creek:**

> For years past the question of temperance has been a prominent issue in this city. We have some laws in its favor, but not so many as we would be glad to have, and shall labor to secure. But the friends of temperance have been very solicitous that at least such laws as we have should be faithfully enforced. This has been a question at each annual election, and the dominant party have been profuse in their promise to stand by the temperance reform so far as the law would allow. But the temperance people have found themselves and their cause so often betrayed, especially of late years, that they saw no way to be true to their principles, except to put a ticket of their own into the field. To do otherwise would be to voluntarily surrender to the enemy with their eyes open.

> Then came the question of a candidate for the office of mayor. The minds of those who have the best interests of the temperance reform at heart centered upon Bro. Gage, who has been here, as in the East, an active worker in the temperance cause. He declined. Other possible candidates were considered. The day of election drew on. Suffice it to say that no other candidate was found available; and then the question of acceptance presented itself to Bro. G. and leading brethren in the light of a duty, to the point on which S.D. Adventists are exceedingly vulnerable. When it appeared that to decline absolutely would be to jeopardize the interests of the temperance cause, he accepted, and the people ratified the nomination, giving him a plurality of one hundred and thirty-six over the higher of the two party candidates.

*Unpaved roads and board sidewalks are clearly evident in this scene, as one looks east along Main Street in Battle Creek about 1880. The City Hall is in the right foreground of this photograph.*

courtesy: Willard Library, Battle Creek Michigan
William C. Gage was an employee of the *Review and Herald* and a credentialed minister in the Adventist Church. He was born in Massachusetts in 1842 and reared in New Hampshire where he had been apprenticed to the printing trade. He first came to work for the *Review* in 1867, but soon returned to New Hampshire because of ill health. After an interim of seven years he again returned to work for the *Review*.

Gage was also a member of the Board of Trustees of the Adventist college located in Battle Creek, which at this time was chaired by Uriah Smith. He was active in community affairs as a trustee of the city’s public school and a member of the Board of Public Works.

William C. Gage is apparently the only political candidate the *Review* has ever endorsed. This step was taken, with some misgivings, by the President of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, George I. Butler. Butler expressed these reservations in the same issue of the *Review* in which Smith had endorsed Gage.

Under the auspices of "Politics and Temperance," Butler summarized the accepted Adventist ethic: "There is no question but that there is a feeling quite prevalent among us that it is not safe to dabble much in the pool of politics." According to Butler, getting one’s feet wet in politics was dangerous for two significant reasons. The first was the personal spiritual risk to the individual:

Can a man handle pitch, and not be defiled? It is difficult voluntarily to mingle much with modern political influences without its affecting our interest in religion, and lowering our standards of morality. We are almost sure to partake of the prevailing spirit; and imperceptibly to ourselves,
we find our interest transferred from God’s work to political issues and political successes.

Butler went on to indicate that even if a person overcame the temptations inherent in public life, an Adventist’s religious beliefs, if for no other reason, ought to keep him from holding public office. He referred to the keeping of the seventh day—which was the busiest—as the Sabbath. This would continually bring difficulties to the church members who would almost be forced to compromise their faith. Butler conceded that there might be those who would be able to stand faithful under such circumstances, but that it is far better to keep oneself from temptation. He reminded his readers that “we are commanded to pray, ‘Lead us not into temptation.’ How, then, can we voluntarily place ourselves in it?”

Butler argued that a second major reason for the Adventist to shun participation in politics was the duty of Christian discipleship. Adventists have a message of vast importance to the world. And Butler observed that “we are not doing, as a people, one-twentieth of what we might do and ought to do to carry it forward. We have no time or ability to waste in the arena of politics while the cause of God is languishing.” However, Butler cautioned, this does not mean to say that there is a moral principle, such as temperance, that Adventists could not go to the polls to express their preference and then go quietly about their own business. But he considered it “a sad and mortifying spectacle [sic] to see those who are professing to be God’s peculiar people, preparing for the coming of Jesus, swinging their hats and hurrahing for this or that candidate....”

On the nexus of temperance and politics, Butler suggested that it makes quite a difference as to how the issue is raised. If the temperance issue comes in the form of a proposition before the voters, then there is a clear choice for the Adventists to make. But if it assumes the shape of voting for men, “There are...complications and personal influences which make the question more uncertain....” Even though we ought to vote for men of temperance, Butler cautioned, “We cannot always tell what men will do after they are elected.” On the question of temperance itself, Butler advised the church people about being absorbed and carried away over it or any other moral issue: “...temperance itself is but part of Christianity. Let us not consider a part greater than the whole, or the prohibition of liquor-drinking more important than the eternal salvation of our souls and those of our fellow-men.”

Notwithstanding Butler’s words of caution, Gage had been a successful candidate for mayor. His campaign was very brief. In a letter to the editor of Battle Creek’s Nightly Moon, signed “Temperance,” Gage’s candidacy was defended. It seems that there were those who questioned whether or not Gage could devote the necessary time to the duties of mayor because on Saturday “the cause of Temperance and morality would require special attention.” The writer indicated that the city’s present mayor, who was not an Adventist, did not even help the cause of temperance or morality on any day of the week. His appeal was that “Mr. Gage is not a milk and water man. He won’t undertake to ride both the whiskey and temperance horses at the same time.”

The enthusiasm of the temperance cause was enough to generate an electoral victory. Almost all of the temperance candidates were elected to their

William C. Gage authored more than one work. “Sixteen Short Answers to Sixteen Common Objections to the Adventist Faith” was written about 1860, while he was an Adventist minister.

William C. Gage’s other work, “Chicago to the Sea,” was a travel guide printed in 1883.
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respective offices and Gage led the three-way race for mayor with 613 votes to his nearest rival’s 477 votes. It was a high, dry day for Battle Creek. After the election results were known, a band and a large crowd assembled in front of the mayor-elect’s home where Gage gave a short speech to celebrate the victory. He pledged himself anew to fight for the principles of temperance in his administration, and he also commented on the charge that if he were elected, the city would be without a mayor one day a week. He promised that he would not have all the street and bridge work done on Sunday or allow the saloons to run on that day. And he concluded by saying that he would do his best to see that the laws of the city were “enforced in such a manner that no one will know whether I am an Advent or a Methodist.”

The *Nightly Moon* reported a fissure in the temperance cause over the election of Gage. It appears that Dr. John Harvey Kellogg, a leading temperance advocate, prominent Adventist physician, and director of the world-famous Battle Creek Sanitarium, had actively worked against Gage’s election. The *Moon* indicated that “the Adventist felt greatly exercised over the way Kellogg... went back on the candidate for mayor through his jealousy of that gentleman’s success.” And then the *Moon* quoted Kellogg as saying, “I’m sorry I worked so hard against Gage. I am afraid his being elected will injure my popularity.” Whatever the personal dimension to this infighting, it also had ethical implications. The first election of an Adventist had introduced a party spirit into the membership of the church.

As editor of the *REVIEW AND HERALD*, Uriah Smith endorsed Gage’s candidacy for mayor of Battle Creek.

Gage’s administration pushed through the city’s Common Council a law that banned the sale of alcoholic beverages on Sunday and legal holidays. This Sunday closing law fulfilled a pledge that Gage had made in his campaign. It denoted the seriousness with which the new mayor intended to implement the laws on the regulation of liquor in the city. It was inevitable that Gage’s strict application of the liquor control laws would be defied by local liquor interests.

The first rumblings of their challenge came before the Common Council on August 25 in connection with the question of bonding three gentlemen, one of whom was Adam C. Arnold, a local saloon keeper. Gage forcibly stated that he thought Arnold was neither morally nor financially qualified for such bonding, and that if the Council approved the bond he would refuse to carry it out. The mayor’s adamant no doubt influenced the Council by a vote of four to three to reject the application.

The reason for Gage’s animosity toward Arnold came to light a few weeks later. It seems that Arnold
was selling liquor after hours and Gage, through a fine piece of detective work, had caught Arnold red-handed. Gage detailed the account of his coup in the Battle Creek Journal. The mayor made this public comment in order to clear up false rumors and exaggerated statements about the episode. When he assumed the office of mayor he had issued a notice to all local liquor dealers that the laws regulating the traffic would be strictly enforced under his administration. For a few weeks there was general compliance with the laws. Then it came to his attention that violations were on an increase. In fact, it appeared to Gage that the saloon operators were generally evading the law. The difficulty with this information was that Gage needed legal evidence in order to bring the culprits to justice. Here he decided to employ an outside detective so that there would be an honest presentation of the evidence at the trial. Gage went off to Chicago to obtain some “Fearless Fosdick.”

The weekly reports of the detective cited numerous instances of liquor being sold after hours and gave names of people who patronized these establishments. The detective indicated that some of these patrons were professed temperance people and that they should be summoned to testify in the Court. But Gage knew how treacherous the memory of such unwilling witnesses could be. The problem was how to obtain witnesses who would testify and not be bought or “run out of town.” After much deliberation, Gage decided to be a witness himself.

In order to accomplish this the mayor went incognito. Donning a set of false whiskers and a pair of green glasses, he approached Arnold’s establishment after regular business hours. He found Arnold putting out bottles for the night trade and asked him for a small bottle of whiskey. Then, to quiet any suspicion, Gage told him that he was going off on the train that night—which was correct. For twenty-five cents, Arnold sold the whiskey and himself. It was charged by some that this act by Gage had demeaned the office of mayor and was an entrapment under false pretenses. The mayor replied, “If the voice of the people as manifested in my election last spring meant anything, it meant that there should be radical reform in the method of dealing with the liquor traffic, and as I thus interpret it, I propose to act accordingly.” The Daily Chronicle reported that there was a prospect of general prosecution and that a number of men who identified themselves with the cause of temperance by wearing a red ribbon had urgent business out of town.

Needless to say, the temperance people in Battle Creek were ecstatic at the conclusion of Arnold’s prosecution and conviction. The next day they celebrated with a picnic and a speech by Mayor Gage, where he again detailed his sleuthing activity. It was a high moment for the temperance cause in Battle Creek. As one temperance supporter summarized,

“He [Gage] was elected on a simple issue, and it is evident that the issue developed the right man.”

Despite his apparent success at enforcing the temperance policy, Gage became involved in a denominational controversy that resulted in his departure from politics. A conflict arose at Battle Creek College over the social and educational policies of Alexander McLearn, who had assumed the presidency of the school in 1881, shortly after accepting Seventh-day Adventist beliefs. After several months of argument the College Board, on which Gage served, asked McLearn to resign and Goodloe Harper Bell, Chairman of the English Department and a principal figure in the problem, left the school.

The controversy had done much harm. The faculty, students, community, and local church had been divided over the issue. A letter from Ellen G. White in March, 1882 to Uriah Smith had reproved the way that he and others had handled the affair. Mrs. White intended the letter to be read before the whole church but Smith demurred. There followed a second letter that was read before the church in May, and then a “Special Testimony” that the Battle Creek Church heard in November. This “Special Testimony” criticized not only Smith and the church for their lack of wisdom and forebearance, but it also described in detail Gage’s part in the controversy.

Ellen White related that through her dreams she was present in their meetings and that she was writing what had been revealed to her about the language and spirit of the men involved. She indicated that some had humbled their souls before God but that Smith, McLearn, and Gage seemed to feel no spirit of confession. These were the very men who had brought the church into so much difficulty, she stated, and McLearn and Gage had worked especially against the Spirit of God in her previous testimonies to the church. They had treated these warnings indifferently, as though they were the voice of humans rather than the voice of the Divine. Coming to Gage, Mrs. White was explicit:

Wm. Gage is wholly unfitted to engage in the work of God. He does not see or sense his true condition. He has not an experimental knowledge.
of heart holiness, of communion with God. He talks glibly, poll-parrot like, but the genuine work of grace upon the heart he knows but little about. Oh, how often he catches at Satan's bait, which is presented in various forms. He has not been balanced by the Spirit of God. He has not guarded the first risings of desire to hold every emotion and passion in calm subjection to reason and conscience. He has not been careful to suppress all unsanctified imaginings, and bring into captivity every thought to obedience to Christ. Wm. Gage will prove a snare to the people of God wherever he shall take an active part; for he will lead away from right principles to carelessness and indifference in religious things. He has ever been a curse to the church in Battle Creek, and ever will be unless he is a thoroughly converted man. He will mingle in the company of worldlings, full of wit and mirth, and then rise in the desk and preach a straightforward discourse. "Walk in the light." Such men will do tenfold more harm than good; because their daily life contradicts their teachings. They are destitute of the spirit of truth, unsanctified, unholy. I warn the people of God not to take this man as their pattern. I present such as beacons to warn, and not examples to imitate.

Of no other individual mentioned in this letter was such an extended and cutting appraisal given. And it seems that the impetus for these remarks about Gage was that he, according to Ellen White, was foremost in diluting her previous testimonies about the Bell-McLearn controversy.

Even though he was president of the Adventists' Battle Creek College, Alexander McLearn had never officially become a member of the church. The controversy that subsequently arose over his social and educational policies at the college also resulted in Gage's eventual departure from politics.

In my dream, which seemed a reality, I was listening to these men, and that which the Lord had shown me they would do was enacted in the meeting. Wm. Gage would with his cunning speeches, take off the edge of the Testimonies; and then, with a smile of satisfaction, look around as though he had done a smart thing for which he should be congratulated...

... These cunning speeches serve the purpose of Satan. Self-inflated, self-deceived souls are deceiving others. Eld. Smith has had poor companions and supporters. He sat in silence. God pity these men who are blinded and deceived.

... God despises the flippant, chaffy spirit of Bro. Wm. Gage, for he makes God's people to err, he removes the sacredness of divine things, and brings them on a level with common things. Smart, sharp, and apt he is regarded by many; but I forebear to tell how the Lord regards all such ones.

... Some will go to their graves with their sins unconfessed because Wm. Gage, Bro. McLearn, and several others have thrown themselves as bodies of darkness between God and the people, that the light he has sent them should be of no account.

Of the church at Battle Creek, it was Mrs. White's lament, "you are not a converted people" and "the true condition of the cause of God in Michigan is deplorable." The affair, which was reported in the public press, had no less consequence for Gage. He was dismissed from his job at the Review because he "did not attend to his duties enough." And he lost his ministerial credentials. Gage then decided to begin his own printing company in Battle Creek and refused to run for another term as mayor. As a result there was no temperance ticket in the spring election of 1883, for the temperance backers moved their support over to the regular party candidates. Temperance reform had reached another apogee in Battle Creek and the catharsis for reform had spent itself.

S THE FIRST Adventist political office-holder of whom we have record, William C. Gage presents an ironic picture. He was persuaded by his brethren in the "light of duty" to run for mayor of Battle Creek. And yet, Ellen White later argued a spiritual poverty in his life that, from an Adventist standpoint, ought to have disqualified him for any such moral crusade. Furthermore, when Gage had indicated he would run his office in such a way that no one would know whether he was an Advent or a Methodist, he revealed a secularity of thought that may have relegated his religion into a private sphere.
Long before Gage had been elevated to prominence, George I. Butler had estimated his character in terms similar to those stated by Mrs. White. In a letter to James and Ellen White written in 1874, Butler stated that he had had a long talk with Gage about his faults, lack of conscience and faithfulness. “If Gage only had religion, how useful he might be,” Butler concluded. It was from this personal perspective that Butler wrote the article in the Review that accompanied Smith’s editorial acclaiming Gage’s election for the cause of temperance. Butler’s statement in the Review was a cautious reflection on Gage’s character. He had warned about the dangers of entering into the political thicket: “We have no time or ability to waste in the arena of politics while the cause of God is languishing. And no Seventh-day Adventist who is in the light, and feels the burden of work upon his soul as he ought to feel it, will want to do it or consent to do it.” Butler concluded the article by stating:

The cause of God includes all the good there is. The message is based upon the “commandments of God and the faith of Jesus,” embraces temperance as one of its principles, . . . But the message and its success is greater than this one issue. Let us never forget our specific work and the claims of God upon us.

What Butler seemed to suggest was that if a person has a sensitivity for the whole work of God, he would refuse to enter politics, even for a moral issue. The type of individual who would, in contrast, enter politics had secularized large areas of his life so that the issue was greater than the message.

Butler’s argument sought to resolve questions resulting from the strong Anabaptist flavor of early Adventist views of political activity. The first believers had regarded the church as a community of regenerated Christians whose ultimate purpose was to evangelize the world with the Three Angels’ Messages of Revelation 14. This meant that any other type of association was sub-Christian at best, and that any other mission was to deny the essential vocation of Adventists. Here was a strong emphasis on discipleship as an unconditional corporate response to the key elements of Adventism.

The temperance issue transformed this type of discipleship. The church leadership gave sanctity to the view that God’s purposes can work through the instrument of the state. This meant the use of non-religious institutions under religious norms and reflected a more Lutheran view of the Christian vocation. It tacitly recognized that there could be an equal sanctity between religious and non-religious activities.

As a result, a tension appeared in the Adventist view of discipleship which William Gage’s political and denominational activities brought to a focus. The conflict between the demands of the church’s corporate mission and the validity of the individual believer’s participation in a non-religious group was the product of time. The apparently delayed Advent of Christ had worked its own dialectic on a people who were still in the world but not of the world.
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Various periodicals, including the Advent Review and Sabbath Herald, 1860-57, 1860, 1862, 1866, and 1860-82; Battle Creek Daily Journal; Battle Creek Journal; Daily Chronicle; and The Nightly News.

Ellen G. White’s “Special Testimony to the Battle Creek Church.” Copy from Ellen G. White Estate, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan.

**In several testimonies to the Battle Creek Church Ellen G. White warned against Gage being trusted with responsible positions in the church because he lacked a sincere religious character.**

This 1882 Testimony to the Battle Creek Church contains a warning by Ellen G. White against the influence of Gage and others in the church.
THE SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST Church in Great Britain has produced many leaders, administrators, and missionaries who have significantly contributed to the worldwide expansion of the denomination. Walter Edwin Read (1883-1978) was one of the more important of these British stalwarts. He is the only Britisher to have been appointed President of the Northern European Division, and he later became President of the Caribbean Union and a field secretary of the General Conference as well as one of the denomination's leading Biblical scholars. It is, however, with his earlier career and contribution to the growth of the British Union Conference that we are here concerned.

The first major expansion of the Seventh-day Adventist Church outside of North America began

A member of the history department at Oakwood College, Nigel Barham wrote his dissertation on the history of British Adventism.
when John Andrews left for Europe in 1874. On his way he stopped in England; four years later John Loughborough started the British Mission around Southampton on the south coast. The denominational beliefs spread slowly during the rest of the century and by the time the British Union Conference was organized in 1902 there were only about 850 church believers. The membership increased more than six times in the next thirty-four years, however, and Read was connected in one way or another with most of the significant developments of that period.

Walter Read was born in Southampton on November 17, 1883, just as Loughborough was completing his five-year term as superintendent of the British Mission, having organized its first church there two months earlier. Read’s Baptist parents were not among those first converts, however, and later they moved to Newport on the southeast coast of Wales. There, in 1902, Walter studied part-time for the Baptist ministry while also working in a grocery store. That year proved to be one of the turning points of his life and a period of major significance to the Seventh-Day Adventist Church in Great Britain, for he was attracted to an effort being held there by the dynamic preacher Albion Ballenger, superintendent of the newly-organized Welsh Mission.

As a result of these meetings, Read was baptized and immediately demonstrated the dedication and sincerity which characterized his entire Christian life by giving up his job to become a colporteur. This was at a time when the denomination had only a handful of canvassers in Britain, with no publishing secretary or organized assistance available. Ballenger assigned the best salesman in the area to advise and help the fledgling colporteur. Read later recalled his first day, selling Ellen White’s book Christ Our Savior in the small village of Cwmbran, which:

had one street of 36 houses on each side. He started at one end. I started at the other and we were to meet in the middle. Then we did the other 18 houses on each side, and when we finished we checked up to see how many orders we had. He had sold one outright and had three orders. I had sold three outright and had six orders, so he said, ‘You don’t need me any more.’

Read continued selling denominational literature for the next three years, but his desire to utilize his abilities to spread his new-found faith more fully resulted in his attending the ministerial training college during most of that period, using his canvassing talents to pay the fees.

Duncombe Hall Missionary College was the only educational institution operated by the denomination in Britain and had just been opened in North London in 1902 under the leadership of Homer Salisbury, the future educational secretary of the General Conference. The facilities were very inadequate during that first full school year and Read and the other seventy-odd students had to find lodgings in the city as there were no dormitories available. The next year there were still no science laboratories and only 250 volumes in the library, and the conditions were sometimes so cramped that as many as four different classes were held in the same room at the same time! The course of study for the ministers was fairly thorough, though not leading to a degree. Read studied Hebrew and church history under Salisbury, and Greek and theology under H. Camden Lacey, later the second principal of the college.

After completing his studies in 1905, Read returned to Wales, where he remained for the next six years gaining practical experience as a licensed minister. In many respects this involved real pioneer work, for although the Seventh-day Adventist doctrines had been introduced into the country twenty years earlier they had spread slowly among the one and a half million inhabitants, and there were only about forty believers when the Welsh Mission was organized in 1902. Ballenger had been a very active superintendent, however, and when Read returned in the summer of 1905 the membership had quadrupled, being concentrated in the four small churches at Newport, Cardiff, Pontypidd, and Abertillery.

Elder John N. Andrews stopped in England on his way to the European continent in 1874.
Ballenger in Newport and had attended Duncombe Hall Missionary College, and whose father was on the denomination's Welsh Executive Committee. In 1911 the denomination sent the couple to work in the Irish Mission for four years, during which time their only child—a daughter Eileen—was born in Lisburn near Belfast.

Ireland is a larger country than Wales with about three times as many inhabitants, but an even harder region in which to gain Seventh-day Adventist converts. Though missionaries had first arrived in 1885, there were only about a hundred members when the mission was organized in 1902. Most of these members were in the north where the only two churches were at Belfast and Banbridge. Two more small churches had been formed by the time Read arrived, and another was begun in Dublin in the south while he was there, but by 1915 the membership had reached just over 150. Read had worked hard, holding evangelistic efforts in such places as Belfast, Portadown, Lurgan, and Lisburn, though with little success. In 1914 he had been ordained as a minister and appointed to the Irish Executive Committee, but with only one other minister to help him and three Bible workers, obviously little could be accomplished.

The religious and political situation in Ireland was the basic cause of the denomination's meager progress, however; not the need of more workers and money. The majority of the southern people were Catholic and followed their priest's instructions not to attend other church services or even accept a religious tract. The few Protestant denominations in the south were almost as hostile, and on one occasion in Dublin not one Baptist church would allow the

For the first year Read had the administrative responsibility of being the secretary-treasurer of the young mission in addition to his ministerial duties. This was partly because of his recognized ability to organize efficiently and give attention to detail, but also because of the tremendous shortage of workers. In fact, during his entire six-year ministry in Wales there were never more than eight workers in any one year, and this included the lady Bible workers and usually only one ordained minister. Nevertheless, the membership increased to over 260 by 1911, with new churches established at Blaenarvon, Swansea, and Mountain Ash. Read's tent efforts at such places as Newport and Wrexham had contributed to this growth. The progress was still slow, however, particularly in the north of the country where the lack of a Welsh-speaking worker and Welsh literature was an almost insurmountable barrier.

During his stay in Wales, Read married Emily May Powell, who also had been converted by

Albion Ballenger, superintendent of the newly-organized Welsh Mission, converted Read to Adventism in 1902.
Read attended Duncombe Hall Missionary College in North London. It was the only educational institution operated by the Adventists in Britain at the time, having been opened in 1902.

Seventh-day Adventists the use of its baptistry. The Protestant majority in the north was no more friendly, and opposition was encountered not only from the Presbyterians and Anglicans but also from the Plymouth Brethren who held meetings and distributed literature attacking Adventist doctrines, particularly the Sabbath and the Spirit of Prophecy. The increased desire and campaign for Irish independence from Great Britain was not conducive, either, to missionaries arriving from England with a young and foreign religion. Nor did the political tensions engendered by the outbreak of the first World War help matters.

The end of 1915 Read left Ireland and for the next seven years worked in the vicinity of London, the capital of Great Britain and the headquarters of the denomination. To begin with he was appointed Secretary of the British Union Conference. But as the Seventh-day Adventist membership had not yet reached three thousand and the number of workers was still inadequate to care for over seventy churches, his duties were varied. They included being secretary of the recently-formed Home Missionary, Sabbath School, and Young People’s Departments, as well as carrying out regular ministerial responsibilities. This was a difficult time for the church in the midst of the first World War, with conscription hurting institutional manpower and growth, and air raids and blackouts inevitably affecting evangelistic campaigns.

During the latter part of the war, Read began editing the Missionary Worker, the official monthly church paper of the British Union Conference begun in 1897. It was partly because of this editorial experience, as well as the recognition of his organizational and business abilities, that the denomination chose him in 1918 to manage the only publishing house operated by the Seventh-day Adventist Church in Britain.

The publishing work had started in Grimsby (a northern seaport) in England in 1884 when Milton Wilcox produced the monthly magazine Present Truth. This small publishing plant had moved to London a few years later and eventually found a permanent location in a building erected in 1907 on Stanborough Park, a fifty-five acre estate situated a few miles northwest of London. This particular piece of property had just been chosen as the new headquarters for the denomination in Great Britain. The publishing plant closed in 1916 because of the major loss in sales due to the hardship of the war, particularly the conscription of male workers and canvassers, the paper shortage, and higher prices of other printing materials.

It was hoped that Read’s leadership would enable
the institution to recover from the setback of the war, and it did. During the first of his three years as manager, he served also as secretary of the publishing house, the name of which was legally changed to its present one—The Stanborough Press Limited. Sales rapidly improved when normal production resumed after the lifting of wartime restrictions and the return of male workers and canvassers. Present Truth and Good Health magazines were revised and the introduction of Uriah Smith’s book on the prophecies of Daniel and Revelation proved to be highly successful, so that it was necessary to build an extension to the bindery department.

During his term as manager of the Stanborough Press, Read taught courses in Bible doctrines at the college which had also been relocated on Stanborough Park. Then, as a result of his past experience and success in various areas of denominational activity for almost twenty years, he attained in the summer of 1921 one of the more important administrative positions in the British Union Conference, that of President of the South England Conference.

The South England Conference, whose headquarters had just been moved from Southampton to North London where a major evangelistic thrust was beginning, was larger than the conference in the north of England and more important in so far as it included Stanborough Park. In addition to the college and publishing house, this estate, the administrative center of the denomination, also held a health food factory and sanitarium. When the

Homer R. Salisbury, first principal of Duncombe Hall Missionary College, taught Hebrew and church history to Read.

Under H. Camden Lacey, second principal of the college, Read studied various theological subjects including Greek. During Lacey’s administration the college was moved from Manor Gardens to the Stanborough Park Estate.

In 1904 the college moved to Manor Gardens where two large houses provided both living accommodations and classrooms.
EAD WAS PRESIDENT of the South England Conference for just over a year before receiving even higher denominational recognition of his abilities. For the next ten years he occupied important positions in Europe, first as Foreign Missions Secretary of the European Division, and then as Secretary of the Northern European Division. He was then recalled to England in 1932 to serve as the President of the British Union Conference, only the second Britisher to receive such an appointment.

During Read's absence the membership of the British Union Conference—which consisted of the south and north England conferences and the three missions in Ireland, Scotland, and Wales—had increased by almost one-third to nearly five thousand, and by the end of his four-year term it had gained even more. In 1932 and 1933, however, the growth was very slight due to the effects of probably the worst financial crisis to hit the denomination in Britain.

The Wall Street crash of October, 1929, in the United States had spread economic chaos in Britain and the resultant Depression deeply affected the church there in 1931. On January 1, all travel expenses had been cut by twenty percent and general expenses by five percent. Several workers were laid off or told to canvass part-time, and by October the remaining employees received a five percent salary cut. On January 1, 1932, a further salary reduction of seven percent was implemented and many more workers were asked to go canvassing. Another five percent salary cut came on May 1. This one was

In this 1906 student group at Manor Gardens College, Read is pictured in the third row from the top, fourth person from the left (with glasses and moustache).

Walter E. Read married Emily May Powell. In 1911, their only child, Elleene, was born in Belfast.
During his term as manager of Stanborough Press, Read taught courses in Bible doctrines at the college which had also been relocated on Stanborough Park.

due to a further eight percent reduction in the appropriation from the Northern European Division; forced, in turn, because the General Conference, faced with a decline in tithes and offerings during the Depression (despite the continued membership growth), had reduced its allocation of funds to the divisions.
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By then the church school at Chiswick in London, one of only five in Britain, had been forced to close and the one at Stanborough Park almost followed suit. To help alleviate this acute financial problem, the British Union Conference Executive Committee, under the firm supervision of Read, finally decided to raise more money by selling ten acres of woodland in the southwest corner of Stanborough Park estate. The sale brought 5,000 pounds. The Committee decreed another eight percent salary cut for workers in 1933, but from then on conditions gradually improved.

Changing the name of the denomination’s legal corporation in Britain from Seventh-day Adventist Union Limited, to British Advent Missions, Limited, also helped the economic situation. After the High Court of Justice on July 10, 1933 formally approved the change, the following day the Charity Claims Department of the Internal Revenue of Great Britain admitted the corporation as a body established for charitable purposes only. The Department also extended this classification to the Stanborough Park Sanitarium, the Stanborough Press Limited, Newbold Missionary College, and the local conferences and missions. This meant an annual savings of about 1,000 pounds in income and property taxes, but more important for the present crisis was a rebate of over 4,000 pounds from the past few years’ taxes.

This sum—with the sale of part of the estate, and the salary cuts—eased the financial problems. In fact, that same year some institutions began to expand. The health food factory installed new machinery to modernize its cereal plant, and the sanitarium made plans to widen the scope of its activities.

The British publishing plant had been established on Stanborough Park in 1907. Due to loss of sales during World War I, it had to be closed. However, it was reopened under Read’s leadership and was able to recover from the setbacks of the war.
Through the years Read held several administrative positions in the British Union. In 1932 he was asked to serve as President of the Union, and was only the second Britisher to serve in that capacity.

Some 2,000 pounds was spent in converting the old college building into a small twenty-six bed hospital, which opened in January, 1934. The next year a baby clinic began, and in 1936 the Stanborough Maternity Home was dedicated.

The recovery from such an acute financial condition was probably the greatest contribution that Read rendered to the British Union Conference during his term as president. It was not just his business and organizational talents which helped the denomination, however, but also his orderly supervision and sound advice. Although the appropriations received from the General Conference for 1932-35 were down about thirty percent, still a total of 107 public evangelistic campaigns were held during that period, most of them in the last two years when more money was available. This resulted in a membership gain of 615—with thirteen new churches and five companies (the first stage before forming a local church) being organized. British Adventism now had a total membership of 5,358; eighty-two churches; and forty-one companies.

Read then left the British Union Conference in 1936 to become President of the Northern European Division. Selected chiefly because he had successfully guided the British church during a critical period, his earlier experience in various areas of denominational work had also significantly contributed to the growth and success of the Seventh-day Adventist Church in Great Britain, and prepared him for his many future years of service abroad.
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The Honorable George Arthur Williams was the first Seventh-day Adventist to serve as lieutenant governor of a state.
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LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR
GEORGE A. WILLIAMS
AN ADVENTIST IN POLITICS

William G. White

GEORGE ARTHUR WILLIAMS was nearly a year old when his father Charles first saw him. Charles, a direct descendant of Oliver Cromwell, had joined the Union Army shortly after emigrating with his family from England to La Fayette, Illinois. George was born there in August, 1864, while his father was using his professional blacksmithing skills in the army. George attended school in Galva, Illinois, but never graduated from high school. In 1888 he married Mabel L. Grubb. Two years later, they moved to Fairmont, Nebraska, where they broke sod on 320 acres of virgin prairie land the Grubb family owned.

George’s parents were Baptists, and George and Mabel followed their example. In 1893, however,
Mabel Grubb became the wife of George Williams two years after this photograph was taken.

George Arthur Williams as he appeared shortly before his marriage in 1888.

William White serves as assistant principal of the Andrews University Academy.

they attended meetings held by William Byington White, President of the Nebraska Conference. Much to the regret of both their families, George and Mabel became convinced of the correctness of Seventh-day Adventist teachings and were baptized into church membership at the conclusion of those meetings.

Two years after joining the Adventist church, the Williams family moved to Alabama as self-supporting missionaries. Under Williams' leadership, a church was organized at Citronelle and a building erected. Williams found that he could not support his expanding family, eventually to become seven children. Concerned about Adventist educational opportunities for his children, he moved the family to Battle Creek, Michigan, in 1901, where he opened and operated a successful mercantile business. After

the college and the publishing association moved, and the sanitarium was destroyed by fire, Williams moved to Franklin, Kentucky, and opened a mercantile business there. Less than a year later, in December, 1903, he assumed the management of the Southern Training School store in Graysville, Tennessee. While at Graysville, Williams completed a business course at the school and concluded his formal education.

Having demonstrated his business abilities at Graysville, Williams was called to Atlanta in 1908 to serve as manager of the Atlanta Sanitarium. In December, 1909, he took his family back to Nebraska where they settled in Harlan County. After two years of farming he became business manager of the Nebraska Sanitarium in Hastings. He operated a farm north of Hastings and while there served as elder of the Hastings church. After twenty years away from the Fairmont farm, Williams returned there in 1914 and once again took up full-time farming.
ILLIAMS WAS well-liked and respected by his neighbors and fellow farmers. During World War I he served on the Fillmore County Council of Defense and managed the county’s second American Red Cross fund drive. He was also a longtime member of the Sons of Union Veterans. During the spring and summer of 1918, his friends convinced him to run for a seat in the state House of Representatives. Before filing for the Republican nomination from the Forty-first District, Williams sought counsel from Nebraska Conference officials. Receiving their blessings, he entered the August Republican primary, was nominated, and then elected in the November general election. His record apparently pleased his constituents, for in the 1920 primary he ran unopposed for the Republican nomination.

Endorsing Williams for a second term, the Nebraska Signal said:

The same integrity and high sense of morality that has always characterized his home life and his business relations marked his course in the legislature. He was always found on the right side of questions involving morality, clean citizenship and that have to do with the rights of the people.

George and Mabel Williams are pictured with five of their eight children. This portrait was taken about 1902 in Battle Creek, Michigan.

William Byington White, president of the Nebraska Conference, converted Williams and his wife to Seventh-day Adventism in 1893.
more committees and only five members of the 100 served on as many committees as did Mr. Williams. He was chairman of the railroad committee, secretary of the road and bridge committee and a member also of the committee on school lands and funds, conference committee, code committee and sifting committee. Membership on the sifting committee, appointed near the close of each session, is always eagerly sought. At various times Mr. Williams was chosen to preside over the house while in committee of the whole and not even in the heat of debate were any of his rulings ever questioned. Mr. Williams alone or in connection with other members introduced thirteen bills, ten of which became laws.

The Signal also endorsed Williams for the speakership of the House which he had indicated his willingness to accept, but which he was not actively seeking. The paper said,

No doubt there is considerable excellent material in the house for the speakership, but probably no member is better qualified by education and wide experience than Mr. Williams. He is a man of fine education. He is a good parliamentarian and an able public speaker. His ability as a presiding officer was demonstrated on several occasions during the session two years ago. He has had a wide experience in business as a farmer. He is a real dirt farmer and has been such for a number of years and he is an intelligent student of the many trying problems that now confront the farmer and the stock raiser. An element not always considered in the selection of men for public place is Christian character and the study of manhood that puts their possessor
above petty suspicion, even though his constituents may not always agree with him on every detail of legislation and every element of public policy.

In November, 1920 he was elected for a second term as a state representative. While in the legislature he introduced the glaring headlight bill, was a strong leader in the framing and passage of highway legislation, and was singularly responsible for the passage of a sound, workable cooperative hail insurance law. He ardently supported ratification of the Eighteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution and led in the development of the civil administration code and many other measures. One of his most pleasant tasks was co-sponsoring the Nebraska Capitol Bill, at the request of Governor Samuel R. McKelvie, which initiated construction of Nebraska's third capitol. One newspaper in reporting Williams' second term, said,

Representative George A. Williams of Fillmore, chairman of the house committee on committees, and prominent among the several floor leaders, is generally considered gubernatorial material on the Republican side. Mr. Williams did not make political hay, although it is probable that he indulged in more work and worry than any other member of the lower house. He is classified as level-headed, a clean hard fighter, a conscientious, diplomatic leader in the cause of his party even though sometimes singed by his own diplomacy, and of analytic mind. As chairman of the committee on revenue and taxation and several conference groups, his duties were at all times difficult. The fact became known early in the session to new members as already it was known to old members that Mr. Williams was close to the governor. This made him the target of the anti-administration crowd, of which the four Democrats were not the ring leaders.

Williams, however, did not run for governor. Instead he sought the Republican nomination for Secretary of State in the 1922 primary—and lost. Even though out of office, Williams lost none of his interest in state and local politics. He corresponded with his friend, United States Senator George W. Norris of Nebraska, and supported Norris' proposed constitutional amendment to replace the electoral college with direct election of the president. Williams also favored Norris' unicameral legislative plan for Nebraska.

After a three-year absence from state politics, Williams ran successfully for the Republican nomination for lieutenant governor in the spring of 1924 and was elected in the November general election. Re-elected twice more in succession, he served as lieutenant governor from 1925 to 1931, four years with Governor Adam McMullen, and two years with Governor Arthur J. Weaver.

The primary function of the lieutenant governor was to serve as presiding officer of the state Senate. While no longer involved in the formulation of bills, he was highly respected by both parties as a fair and talented parliamentarian. It was reported that during his six years as presiding officer of the Senate he never made a parliamentary mistake.

Much of Williams' time away from the four-month legislative sessions was spent in traveling and speaking in all parts of the state at gatherings such as the state fair, homecomings, church meetings, and patriotic and historical events. Williams was a good public speaker and always left his audiences with something serious about which to think, and with some humor as well. Always popular with the ladies, Williams would sometimes begin an address by saying something like "I understood this was to be a gathering of husbands and wives, but I see you men have brought your daughters with you."

During his six years as lieutenant governor he witnessed the fruition of the capitol bill, which he had co-sponsored; he was the first man to occupy the lieutenant governor's office in the new building and the first to preside over the state Senate in the new capitol building.

Throughout the 1920's the Ku Klux Klan had considerable popularity in Nebraska, claiming 15,000 members by the early 1930's. Common among state officials, membership was viewed as an asset in most Republican circles, because it stood for things seen as the major issues of that period and region: pro-
Williams was elected to the Nebraska legislature while it was meeting in the second state capitol building.

hibition, antipornography, separation of church and state, prayer in public schools, antisexural promiscuity, and law and order. It is apparent that Williams had ties with the organization, though records are nonexistent. Long before the upsurge of human rights issues, however, Lieutenant Governor Williams demonstrated his personal concern on these matters that would seize national attention in the 60's and 70's. Indeed, his own Republicanism and his Christian conscience would not have permitted him to adopt stances such as identified the Klan later in the century—as his life and his 1932 statements attest:

My father, a Civil War veteran, taught me the principles of Lincoln republicanism when a boy. For more than forty years I have by vote and voice supported those principles. All thru [sic] the years I have never waivered in the belief that those principles enunciated by Lincoln and exemplified in the lives of McKinley, [Theodore] Roosevelt, and a host of others have been the chief factor in the wonderful progress and prosperity of our country.... Lincoln's great concern was for the welfare of the people; for the preservation of the rights and privileges. His great heart was touched and his indignation aroused as he marked the evidences of oppression and inequality. He stood for equal opportunity for all, high or low, rich or poor, but his chief concern was for the common people who could not protect themselves.

Williams also believed in economy in government. In remarks to the state Senate in 1929, he informed the senators that the 1927 session of the legislature cost the taxpayers $184,328 and the cost per day for each branch was $1,152. He broke this down to the point that a five-minute speech cost the people $24 and a one-minute speech cost $4.80. He concluded, "True economy is the economy of time. Are your speeches in harmony with this principle?"

S LIEUTENANT governor, Williams rendered valuable assistance in preparing Union College, the Seventh-day Adventist school located in Lincoln, for accreditation by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. He approached the chancellor of the University of Nebraska and persuaded him to give Union College whatever moral and professional support possible. The University was of some help to the college and even offered President Milian Lauritz Andreasen an honorary doctorate if he could secure accreditation for the school, thus insuring Lincoln of one of its three collegiate institutions. Andreasen accepted the offer of help but turned down the honorary degree. Union College finally achieved accreditation as a degree-granting liberal arts college in 1937.

Sensing the impending disaster of the Republican Party in the 1930 election, Williams did not enter the primary. His third term as lieutenant governor ended in January, 1931. Shortly after leaving office, his advice was sought by his Democratic successor, Lieutenant Governor Theodore W. Metcalfe. It seems that Governor Charles W. Bryan (who along with his brother William Jennings Bryan were friends of Williams) left the state without notifying the lieutenant governor. Metcalfe discovered his absence and assumed his duties as acting governor. Bryan was outraged. Williams' advice to Metcalfe on how to handle the unpleasant situation is unknown, for he kept no copy of his reply.

In late 1931 Williams began working to secure the release of an inmate at the Nebraska State Penitentiary. James Hickman (fictitious name) had murdered two women in Valentine, Nebraska, in 1916. The eighteen-year-old youth had been found guilty and sentenced to be executed on June 23, 1916. On June 22, the state Supreme Court stayed the execution. In August the court commuted the sentence to life imprisonment. Jimmy was a good prisoner and by 1931 had apparently been converted from Roman Catholicism to Seventh-day Adventism as a result of the prison ministry of Lincoln businessman Charles McWilliams. By 1931 Williams and Elder Sherman E. Wight, formerly of Lincoln and then president of the West Michigan Conference, were trying to secure Jimmy's release and remove him to his home state of Michigan. Hickman was released in February, 1935 and audited classes at Emmanuel Missionary College in Berrien Springs, Michigan, that spring. During the summer he worked at a lumber camp in Hastings, Michigan. Elder Wight had become president of the Indiana Conference and put Hickman to work that fall on the construction crew at Indiana Academy. He also arranged a job for him as engineer in an Adventist-owned mine at Lafayette, Indiana. Hickman hoped to earn enough money by the following September to enroll at Emmanuel Missionary College. However, he never
During Williams' terms as lieutenant governor of Nebraska, the third state capitol was constructed around the second building. The original one was eventually demolished as work on the new building progressed.

returned to college and there is no further record of James Hickman.

Williams was missed in Lincoln and by 1931 supporters from all over the state were urging him to run for governor in 1932. With the support of ministers, judges, farmers, state legislators and others, he entered the Republican primary in the spring of 1932. Unfortunately, the Republican primary elicited comparatively little press coverage. Williams' staunch support of prohibition seems to have weighed against him, and he saw that his chance of winning was poor because of American Legion support for his two opponents.

During the campaign Williams was commissioned by Lieutenant Governor Metcalfe as an admiral in the Great Navy of the State of Nebraska. Writing to Metcalfe, a Democrat, Williams said, "I understand the chief responsibility resting upon the Great Navy of the State of Nebraska at this time is to see to it that the coming election shall result in every position in the Ship of State being filled with worthy republicans [sic] and that the democrats [sic] be cast into the depths of the sea to the end that Nebraska may again resume her rightful place as the greatest state...."

Williams' primary campaign was characterized by extensive traveling and speech-making. Some of his efforts were undermined, though, by a self-appointed, well-meaning campaigner who irritated some influential voters. Williams proposed a reduction in automobile license fees and reform of the property tax system. Despite his efforts and his spotless personal and public record, he decided to withdraw from the primary. Between April and November, Williams campaigned for Republican nominee Dwight Griswold and for the national ticket at the request of the Republican National Committee. Ultimately, 1932 was a disastrous year for the Republicans both nationally and in Nebraska. Charles W. Bryan was reelected governor.

By 1934 the Democrats exercised such control over state politics that Williams gave little thought to running for public office. However, by 1936 he contemplated running for Secretary of State. Many of his friends in government urged him to run for lieutenant governor. They felt his experience and abilities would be valuable as Nebraska launched its unicameral legislature in 1937. He sought and obtained the lieutenant gubernatorial nomination, and in the campaign that followed pledged himself to support a revision of the tax system, a teacher retirement plan, an increase in teaching credential requirements, and the ratification of the child labor amendment.

The Nebraska State Capitol Building as it appeared after completion. Having sowed seed by hand in his youth, Williams questioned the correctness of the stance of the sower.
George A. Williams served as lieutenant governor of Nebraska from 1925 to 1931.

**Geo. A. Williams**

Republican Candidate for

**LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR**

Farmer, Business Man, Legislator, Civic Worker. Not a politician. Made a clean, able and efficient legislator and will give the same honest, faithful service as Lieutenant Governor. Widely known and respected throughout the state because of his integrity and earnest work for right and justice. He will appreciate the support of his home people and seeks to merit same.

Williams ran successfully for lieutenant governor in 1924. Re-elected twice, he served six years in that capacity.
During the time Williams presided over it, the Senate was meeting temporarily in the Supreme Court Chamber until the rest of the new State Capitol Building could be completed.

A 1928 Republican campaign advertisement lists George A. Williams as candidate for lieutenant governor of Nebraska. Courtesy: William G. White
Williams' membership in the Anti-Saloon League proved to be a problem. One advisor warned him that if he could not convince the liquor faction that he was not a fanatic or if he maintained the attitude of the Anti-Saloon League as he had in 1932, it would spell defeat for the ticket. Whether he was able to mellow his stand on liquor may never be known, for the 1936 Democratic landslide buried the Nebraska Republicans in defeat. George Williams was 72 and never ran for public office again.

During the 1930's and early 1940's, Williams also authored a number of articles for Liberty, the Adventist religious liberty journal, receiving three dollars for each.

At the 1936 General Conference session in San Francisco, Williams presented a paper at the request of Charles S. Longacre, Secretary of the Religious Liberty Department. Longacre was unashamedly Republican and was pleased that Williams was at that time the Republican candidate for lieutenant governor of Nebraska, and that a California Adventist, Alonzo L. Baker, Associate Editor of Signs of the Times, was a Republican candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives. Longacre had asked Williams to become his associate secretary. He was sure, however, that Williams would be elected. It was decided to offer the position to Baker in the unlikely event that he was not elected. Baker, however, lost the election and refused Longacre's offer.

As noted earlier, Williams was an ardent prohibitionist. While campaigning for lieutenant governor in 1928, he paid nearly $900 for 50,000 copies of a special "prohibition" issue of Signs of the Times, another Adventist publication, which were distributed in Nebraska. During his years in office, he continued his prohibition efforts and spoke frequently before Woman's Christian Temperance Union groups and others. He joined the Anti-Saloon League of Nebraska and was elected president for 1936. He resigned his position when he was running for the Republican gubernatorial nomination in the spring of that year, but stubbornly refused to surrender his convictions. This may well have cost him the election in November.

In the 1940's Williams served as a member and eventually vice-president of the Allied Dry Forces of Nebraska. Even when his health began to fail in 1945, the organization refused to accept his resignation as vice-president.

Soon after his "retirement" from politics, Williams was appointed a member of the Central Union Conference and Nebraska Conference Committees, the Shelton Academy (now Platte Valley Academy) Board of Trustees, the Union College Board of Trustees, and the boards of management of Boulder Sanitarium and Porter Memorial Hospital in Colorado. His advice was always sought and his presence lent prestige to each of the groups in which he served.

IS RETIREMENT from politics did not mark an end to his interest in good government. He carried on active correspondence with public officials, including Nebraska's congressional representatives. Not surprisingly, Williams strongly opposed Franklin D. Roosevelt and his New Deal programs. United States Senator Kenneth S. Wherry
When the SIGNS OF THE TIMES published this special "Prohibition Issue" on September 25, 1928, Williams paid nearly $900 for 50,000 copies which were distributed throughout Nebraska.
The farm near Fairmont, Nebraska, to which Williams brought his family after an absence of some twenty years, appeared like this before the remodeling and modernizing began.

During the years that he served in elective office, and even afterwards, Williams was a faithful reader of the newspaper and the Congressional Record.

asked Williams to keep him informed of his opinions on political matters. In 1944, at Senator Wherry's request, Senator Hugh Butler placed a letter from Williams concerning agricultural legislation in The Congressional Record. Williams also corresponded with his good friend, Representative Carl T. Curtis, whom he had early encouraged to run for public office.

Williams came out of retirement in the spring of 1942 to serve for about four months as interim pastor of the Lincoln City (now Capitol View) Seventh-day Adventist Church. He had attended this church while serving in the legislature and as lieutenant governor. During his brief pastorate there in 1942, he led the congregation in paying off the church mortgage. Called upon to help solve a war-time visa problem for an Adventist minister, Williams called on Senator Butler for assistance. In working out this problem, Senator Butler wrote to a State Department official, "...former Lieutenant Governor George Williams of Fairmont, Nebraska,...is one of the outstanding citizens of the state, known perhaps to more people individually than any other man in the state. No one has a better reputation than Mr. Williams...."

Williams' health had begun to fail during the early 1940's. After several hospitalizations and surgeries, George A. Williams died at Boulder Sanitarium in
July, 1946. Funeral services were held in Fairmont with Elders Neal C. Wilson, Carl Sundin, and Daniel E. Venden officiating.

EW SEVENTH-DAY Adventists have ever been elected to public office, and most of the exceptions have been in recent years. Yet George A. Williams—a devout Seventh-day Adventist, and a dirt farmer with little formal education—was prominent in Nebraska politics for nearly twenty years. His political successes and failures can probably be attributed to the same characteristic—devotion to principle. His unswerving support for economy in government and for prohibition cost him votes in his later campaigns. But while losing his last two election bids, he never lost the respect of the leaders of both parties. Writing to Williams in late 1944, Senator Wherry’s chief aide said, “You little know, George, how much all of us appreciate hearing from

In October, 1938 the Williamses celebrated their 50th wedding anniversary.

An informal portrait shows George and Mabel Williams relaxing on vacation at Laguna Beach, California.

Williams came out of retirement in the spring of 1942 to serve for about four months as interim pastor of the Lincoln City (now Capitol View) Seventh-day Adventist Church.
you because every [sic] since my first contact with you in 1936 I have realized how fundamentally sound and sincere you are. Frankly, you're my ideal of a real public servant and a real American.” A Nebraska state official once wrote “[you are]...one politician who never trimmed his religious ideals one particle for popularity or votes. Such men are all too few....”

Perhaps a Republican Party leader said it best in 1932 when discussing with Williams his primary campaign possibilities. He concluded by saying, “George, you're just too honest to be elected governor.” Among the letters, speeches, sermons, and other materials left behind by Williams, there is a yellowed and worn carbon copy of a quotation, now well-known among Adventists, from a book which at the time had not yet been printed. It reads in part,

...Are you ambitious for education that you may have a name and a position in the world? Have you thoughts that you dare not express that you may one day stand upon the summit of intellectual greatness, that you may sit in deliberative and legislative councils and help to enact laws for the nation? There is nothing wrong in these aspirations... You should be content with no mean attainments. Aim high and spare no pains to reach the standard.

George Arthur Williams aimed high and reached the standard.

Mabel Grubb Williams was born in 1870 and died in 1959.
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OR MANY YEARS, the Seventh-day Adventist college Bible teachers of North America have met following the quadrennial/quinquennial session of the General Conference, under General Conference auspices, to counsel together on matters of mutual interest and concern. The agenda has consisted of topics relating to principles, methodology, and procedures in religious education, and to various aspects of Biblical hermeneutics, interpretation, and theology.

At the close of the 1940 Bible Teachers' Council in Takoma Park, Maryland, consideration was given to means by which the college Bible teachers could share with one another their individual endeavors to understand the Bible more perfectly, in order that all might benefit from the labors of each, and that each might benefit from the constructive criticism of all. The minutes of the 1940 Council conclude by reporting:

At the conclusion of a very wonderful convention all expressed their delight at having been present, and a fellowship was organized called the "College Bible Teachers' Fellowship." Elder Andreason was unanimously elected as the organizing secretary. An annual fee of $2.00 for each member was agreed upon, this money to be used in providing a monthly report from the secretary, as a kind of exchange medium between

Formerly an associate editor of the REVIEW AND HERALD, Raymond Cottrell is now retired and living in California.
the Bible teachers, and it was emphasized that when any one of the group found something of particular interest that he would pass it on to the others through this Fellowship. The Seminary was asked to become the treasury for the Fellowship and inasmuch as by our vote we had pledged ourselves to stand behind the Seminary, with our prayers and our support, the Seminary thus becoming the graduate school of our colleges, it seemed the normal course for us to look to the Seminary as the center of such an organization.

The thirty-five or so Bible teachers present paid the stipulated annual dues to Milton Earl Kern, first president of the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary. Elder Milian L. Andreasen, a teacher at the Seminary and chairman of the Council, never implemented the planned College Bible Teachers’ Seminary. Elder Rebok proposed returning the dues, but the teachers reaffirmed their intention with respect to the proposed Fellowship. Some suggested that the General Conference Ministerial Association be asked to operate the proposed medium of communication; others averred that such an arrangement would give it too “official” a “flavor.”

At this point Dr. Leon L. Caviness, Biblical languages teacher at Pacific Union College, told of the monthly Sabbath afternoon meetings of the Bible teachers there. On the last Sabbath afternoon of March, 1943, they had met informally with a few other teachers at his invitation. The afternoon was devoted to reading and discussing a Bible research paper I had recently completed summarizing one of my personal study projects. At the close of the discussion those present agreed to meet on Sabbath afternoon each month to consider a paper to be presented by some member of the group. Over the next fifteen months others joined the study group and a few elsewhere in California became “corresponding members.”

In the years leading up to, and including World War II, international events concentrated the attention of Seventh-day Adventists on last-day prophecies, particularly the identity of the king of the north in Daniel 11 and the battle of Armageddon in Revelation 16. In the decade prior to Pearl Harbor, Adventist evangelists and publications, notably the Signs of the Times, were confidently identifying Armageddon as a political battle in Palestine; Japan and the other nations of the Orient as the kings of the east; and Turkey as the king of the north, a pattern of interpretation to which not a few of the Bible teachers took increasing exception. The extension of hostilities to the Pacific led some Adventist ministers—William R. French, the Bible teachers, and it was emphasized that when any one of the group found something of particular interest that he would pass it on to the others through this Fellowship. The Seminary was asked to become the treasury for the Fellowship and inasmuch as by our vote we had pledged ourselves to stand behind the Seminary, with our prayers and our support, the Seminary thus becoming the graduate school of our colleges, it seemed the normal course for us to look to the Seminary as the center of such an organization.

In the years leading up to, and including World War II, international events concentrated the attention of Seventh-day Adventists on last-day prophecies, particularly the identity of the king of the north in Daniel 11 and the battle of Armageddon in Revelation 16. In the decade prior to Pearl Harbor, Adventist evangelists and publications, notably the Signs of the Times, were confidently identifying Armageddon as a political battle in Palestine; Japan and the other nations of the Orient as the kings of the east; and Turkey as the king of the north, a pattern of interpretation to which not a few of the Bible teachers took increasing exception. The extension of hostilities to the Pacific led some Adventist ministers—William R. French at Pacific Union College, for example—to assure their congregations that the entry of the Sunrise Kingdom into the conflict made certain that World War II would climax in the Biblical Armageddon.

In response to these confident assertions from Adventist pulpits and in the Adventist press, and with a view to ascertaining their true import, Bible teachers gave these prophecies careful study. In this setting, the local study group at Angwin chose the name “Eschatology Society,” and at its first meeting read and discussed my contextual-linguistic study on “The Kings of the East.”

After listening to Dr. Caviness’ account of the monthly meetings at Angwin over the preceding year and a half, the college Bible teachers asked Elder Rebok to transfer their dues from the custody of the Seminary to Dr. Caviness, requesting that they be accepted as corresponding members of his study group at Angwin. Returning home, Dr. Caviness reorganized the Eschatology Society as the Bible Research Fellowship, with the Bible teachers of the colleges in North America as members.

Over the next six years the Bible Research Fellowship grew rapidly. All but six of the sixty-six Bible teachers at the Seminary and in all Adventist English-language colleges around the world became members. Several colleges reimbursed their Bible teachers for membership dues in the Fellowship, on the basis that it was a professional organization. Most of the 190 or so Bible research papers contributed to the Fellowship during its lifetime of ten years were written by these members. A number of pastors, evangelists, editors, and administrators also requested membership and were accepted. Dues, originally $2 per year, were later raised to $4. Principal expenses of the Fellowship were the duplication and mailing of papers, and correspondence. Dues and other funds were deposited jointly in the names of Leon L. Caviness and Raymond F. Cottrell in the St. Helena branch of the Bank of America.

Although the Bible Research Fellowship was brought into being by the college Bible teachers of North America specifically to meet their own felt need for an organized way in which to make cooperative Bible study possible, the organization was never more than quasi-official. Initiated at one of their official quadrennial councils with the tacit blessing of the General Conference, under whose auspices these councils met, it was in the strict sense of the word always unofficial.

In keeping with the request of the college Bible teachers for membership in the Pacific Union College study group, and by common consent, Dr. Caviness continued to serve as paterfamilias of the organization. He motivated the formation of the original nucleus around which the Eschatology Society, and later the Bible Research Fellowship, grew. His qualifications for this assignment were his
competence in Biblical languages, teaching experience, a sound concept of Biblical hermeneutics, and skill in personal relations and group dynamics. His personal interest in research-level Bible study was reflected in the considerable clerical work required in evaluating, processing, duplicating, and distributing the many papers; in extensive correspondence with individual members and the several chapters; in his faithfulness to the trust the college Bible teachers reposed in him; in his initiative in counseling with the Ministerial Association, the Ellen G. White Estate, the Theological Seminary, and other agencies of the church; and in his loyalty to the church and its leaders in everything and at all times. The church is deeply indebted to him for pioneering what proved to be a highly successful program of cooperative Biblical research and study. Throughout the lifetime of the Fellowship he continued to serve as chairman, and I served as secretary.

As time passed, additional chapters began meeting regularly on seven other campuses, and one conference president organized the pastors of his conference into a Fellowship chapter. In my official secretary’s report to the college Bible teachers at the 1950 Council at Angwin, I reported a membership of 157 in the Fellowship. Of these, sixty-five were college teachers and another twenty-eight resided outside of North America. Seven (eventually seventeen) were from the General Conference, and the remaining eighty-five were conference presidents, departmental leaders, doctors, editors, pastors, and evangelists. In response to the secretary’s report, the Bible teachers in attendance at the 1950 Council:

VOTED, that we extend an expression of appreciation to the officers of the Bible Research Fellowship for the splendid work they have done in bringing into existence such a valuable organization, and for the service it offers ministers and Bible teachers in the exchange of ideas and interpretations of difficult passages of Scripture.

In 1951 membership stood at 204, and finally in 1952 at 256. Ninety-one percent of all Bible teachers in all sixteen English-language colleges around the world were members. Basically, the Bible Research Fellowship remained their organization and served the purpose for which they designed it, but persons interested in serious Bible study serving the church in many different capacities eventually made up the majority of its membership.

As an unofficial organization, the Bible Research Fellowship functioned with a minimum of organizational structure. It had no elected officers. Dr. Caviness continued to lead in its activities, having been asked to do so by the college Bible teachers of North America, who appreciated his approach to Bible research, the principles on which he succeeded in getting thinking men of diverse minds to cooperate on sensitive matters, and the demon-

Participants in the 1940 Bible Teachers Council in Takoma Park, Maryland, voted to organize the College Bible Teachers Fellowship.
At the 1944 Bible Conference, the teachers present reaffirmed their interest in a Bible teachers fellowship. Elder Denton E. Rebok, second president of the Theological Seminary from 1943 to 1951, transferred dues from the Eschatology Society to Dr. Leon L. Caviness for the proposed Bible Research Fellowship.

The proposed Bible Research Fellowship demonstrated success of the Fellowship’s predecessor, the Eschatology Society of Angwin.

In all of the Fellowship deliberations and exchanges of opinions over its ten years of life, mutual respect prevailed for the sometimes diverse views of its members. No vote was ever taken for or against any particular point of view, or on any paper presented for consideration. It never adopted or advocated any particular interpretation of Scripture. It made no attempt to decide between alternative views. It never expressed an opinion on any subject, nor did it attempt to disseminate the findings of any of its members. Papers were never supposed to be given, loaned, or sold to non-members by anyone other than the author. The sole purpose of the Fellowship was to provide a means of communication and interaction among its members in their individual research, for their own edification, in order that all might benefit from the labors of each and that each might benefit from the comments and constructive criticism of his peers.

Research papers considered by the Fellowship were sometimes requested, but usually were submitted voluntarily by members as reports of their personal study projects. Of approximately 190 papers evaluated during its lifetime, about 120 were accepted for formal consideration. At first the chairman and the secretary evaluated papers submitted. Later, two other resident members of the Angwin chapter participated in the evaluation process, and eventually a panel of six non-resident members was set up to assist in the evaluation and to give counsel when requested. These non-resident members were appointed by Dr. Caviness from a list prepared at his request by the General Conference Ministerial Association. This panel included an evangelist, a pastor, two administrators, and two Bible teachers. From time to time lists of papers awaiting evaluation were sent to the nine organized chapters for an opinion as to which should be accepted for consideration, and the priority to be assigned various papers.

As might be expected, manuscripts varied in quality. They were judged on the basis of their intrinsic quality as research papers and their potential value for study, irrespective of their point of view. As a rule, research-type papers only were accepted. Occasionally several papers dealing with the same topic, and perhaps expressing diverse points of view, were grouped together for consideration at the same meeting.

Once a paper was accepted, preliminary suggestions to strengthen the author’s presentation—which he was free to accept or reject—were often forwarded to him prior to duplication. The duplicated paper was then sent out to all members and a date was set for reading and discussing it. Later, papers accepted for consideration were duplicated in their original form and sent out to all chapters. Suggestions from the chapters were collated and sent to each author, who might choose to revise his paper before it was duplicated in final form and sent to all members.

At the Angwin chapter meetings the author, if present, would read the paper and members would ask questions and make comments. If the author were not present, one of the resident members was appointed in advance to read it for him, to represent his point of view as accurately as possible, and to answer questions for him as best he could. The reading was followed by general discussion of the subject. The secretary recorded, collated, and summarized the comments for the record and for passing on to the author to use as he saw fit.

Each Fellowship paper bore this notation immediately below the title:

Presented to the Bible Research Fellowship

Though presented to the Bible Research Fellowship, like all other papers it represents no pronouncement of the Fellowship.

Members were requested to hold Fellowship papers in confidence. They were considered the personal property of their respective authors, who retained full control of them. An author might secure additional copies of his paper for personal use, with the above notation and mention of the Fellowship deleted, and was free to use them as he deemed appropriate.
The broad scope of Fellowship research is evident from this sampling of titles:
"The Soul-Winning Motive"
"The Two Covenants"
"The Shut Door"
"The King of the Lombards"
"Har-Mageddon"
"The Jubilee Calendar"
"Before the Veil"
"Melchisedec"
"This Generation"
"The Divorce Question"
"The Deity of Christ"
"The Sealing of the Saints"
"The Three Angels' Messages"
"Development of the Mystery of Iniquity"
"The Place of Christ in Spiritualism"
"Spiritual Significance of the Sanctuary"
"The Four Divisions of Alexander's Empire"
"The Eternal Priesthood of Christ"
"The Chronology of the Hebrew Monarchies"
"How Long Shall Be the Vision?"
"The Prohibition of Unclean Meats"
"The Glory That Lightens the Earth"
"Pioneer Views on Daniel and Armageddon"
"The Privileges and Conditions of Stewardship"
"Historical Setting and Background of the Term 'Daily'"
"Meteoric Showers Seen as Heralds of the Advent"

Among the authors were:

Wilfred J. Airey
Albert W. Anderson
Henry F. Brown
Leon L. Caviness
Raymond F. Cottrell
LeRoy E. Froom
Edward Heppenstall
R. E. Hoen
George D. Keough
Stewart Kime
A. F. J. Kranz
Herbert C. Lacey
Roland E. Loasby
Charles S. Longacre
Meade MacGuire
Andrew Nelson
Walter A. Nelson
Albert V. Olson
H. O. Olson
George McCready Price
Paul E. Quimby
William A. Spicer
Edwin R. Thiele
Jean Vuilleumier
Guy F. Wolfkill
Alonzo J. Wearner
C. L. Woods

Dr. Leon L. Caviness, a Bible languages teacher at Pacific Union College, was chairman of the Bible Research Fellowship during the entire ten years of its existence.

During the period of its existence, approximately 140 papers were evaluated by the Bible Research Fellowship and about 120 were accepted for formal consideration. The Fellowship never adopted or advocated any particular interpretation of Scripture; its sole purpose was to provide a means of communication and interaction among its members in their individual research.
HE BIBLE Research Fellowship subscribed to the great fundamentals of the Christian faith on which there is general agreement among Seventh-day Adventists. Its primary attention was devoted to aspects of these fundamentals and to passages of Scripture with respect to which there was not yet substantial concensus, with a view to clearer understanding of Scripture at these points. Such matters obviously required the attention of those in the church who, by training and experience, were best qualified to investigate them on the basis of sound principles of exegesis, in an environment conducive to such study. The Bible Research Fellowship was the corporate response of the college Bible teachers of the church to the emphatic counsel of Ellen White:

There are mines of truth yet to be discovered by the earnest seeker.

[We should enter into] a diligent study of the Scriptures and a most critical examination of the positions which we hold. God would have all the bearings and positions of truth thoroughly and perseveringly searched, with prayer and fasting. Believers are not to rest in suppositions and ill-defined ideas of what constitutes truth.

When no new questions are started by investigation of the Scriptures, when no difference of opinion arises which will set men to searching the Bible for themselves, to make sure that they have the truth, there will be many now, as in ancient time, who hold to tradition, and worship they know not what.

The initiators of the Bible Research Fellowship believed that a full and fair investigation of all the evidence is essential to genuine research, and promotes unity.

Fellowship members respected each other's personal integrity as dedicated Seventh-day Adventists. Each was left free to form his own opinions and to draw his own conclusions. The Fellowship's role was to provide an environment in which effective group study could take place. As Proverbs states, "In an abundance of counselors there is safety."

Paradoxically, the Bible Research Fellowship, voluntarily but under pressure, terminated its activities at the height of its success, in December, 1952, and initiated the transfer of its role to the General Conference. From an original membership of thirty-five in 1940-44, it had grown to more than 250 by 1952. Two fundamental reasons were responsible for its demise.

First, there existed a deep-seated difference of opinion in the church with respect to the value and importance of research-type Bible study. In favor of the Fellowship and its approach to collective Bible study on the research level were the college Bible teachers in all sixteen Adventist English-language colleges around the world, other college teachers, editors, and many pastors and administrators in local conferences and in the General Conference. Many of their individual expressions of appreciation are on record in the Bible Research Fellowship correspondence file. The collective expression of the Bible teachers is on record in the minutes of the 1950 College Bible Teachers' Council. To my knowledge, no member of the Fellowship ever questioned its objectives, its spirit, or its modus operandi.

On the other hand, some non-members who knew little, if anything, about the Fellowship or about research-level Bible study objected to its existence. They found its detailed analysis of Bible passages and the investigation of alternative possible interpretations of these passages—with a view to providing the church with a firmer Scripture basis for the proc-
William H. Branson, president of the General Conference, are also a matter of record.

Secondly, for an unofficial organization such as the Fellowship to function across administrative and institutional lines, throughout North America and around the world, without administrative supervision and control of the General Conference, was considered by some administrators—including the president of the General Conference—to be in violation of generally accepted denominational protocol. Several individuals held this position irrespective of the fact that the Fellowship was in every respect completely loyal to the church, to its leaders, and to its fundamental teachings. To my knowledge, no member had ever criticized or questioned church leadership at any level. It never occurred to us to do so; our quest and concern was for truth of value to the church.

Neither of these two factors seems to have been sufficient in and of itself, however, to compromise the viability of the Fellowship. But a situation that developed in Australia brought these two elements together in a lethal combination that precipitated action on the part of Elder Branson. The catena of events deserves narration at some length as a case study of the problems serious Biblical research and study continues to encounter.

Dr. Vernon Hendershot, president of the Theological Seminary from 1951-1952, chaired the 1950 Bible Teachers' Council held at Pacific Union College.

At the 1952 Bible Conference, Walter E. Read was asked to direct the newly-established Office of Bible Research at the General Conference and to set up a permanent committee for Biblical study and research.
Hendershot, president of the Theological Seminary and chairman of the Council, that it might be interesting to poll the teachers present on their views with respect to a number of subjects that had occasioned controversy over the past half century. He concurred, and I prepared a form on which each of the Bible teachers could indicate his own understanding with respect to the various points of controversy. This was done immediately following the reading of the paper on controversial views. Among the items listed in the poll were various interpretations that had been given the king of the north and Armageddon.

The poll revealed general unanimity on all of the formerly controverted points, and complete agreement with respect to the king of the north and Armageddon. A chorus of fervent “amens” greeted my announcement of the results, and someone proposed that we sing the Doxology—which we did. The Bible teachers voted that the poll results be included in the official minutes of the Council.

The Bible teachers’ agreement on the identity of the king of the north and the nature of the battle of Armageddon coincided with that for which Louis Were had been severely criticized in Australia. He returned to Australia, wrote K. J. Reynolds of the General Conference Department of Education, with the “report that the best theological brains among the Adventists in America were giving full support to the things he had been teaching for years in Australia against the opposition of the leading brethren. So you see, he has stirred up quite a tempest.” As a result Neal C. Wilson, Sr., president of the Division, appealed to Elder Branson of the General Conference Department of Education, with the situation. Elder Branson responded by issuing a letter warning church administrators against the Bible Research Fellowship, setting up an ad hoc committee to study the king of the north and Armageddon, and scheduling a large ecumenical Bible Conference for September, 1952, that would lay down the official line on these and other subjects.

CONFUSING THE 1950 quadrennial council of the college Bible teachers at Angwin with the Angwin-based Bible Research Fellowship, Elder Branson’s presidential letter, issued to church administrators around the world, warned them against the Bible Research Fellowship—which was in no way involved with the situation in Australia that precipitated his correspondence.

In this letter, dated October 7, 1951 (immediately preceding the Fall Council), Elder Branson acknowledged that he had “received very little of the material being sent out by the Fellowship, so I actually know little about its activities except as I receive repercussions from the field [Australia].” Some of these, he wrote, “give to those of us here at head-quarters some cause for concern.” The Fellowship had become “a major denominational problem,” he continued, because of its “chapters or branches in the various Divisions,” and “the General Conference Officers, who recently gave considerable study to reactions from the field, expressed considerable concern over the situation that is developing.” He lamented that:

A very wrong impression is being given to the world field as to the loyalty of many of the Fellowship members to the old fundamentals of the Advent message [Uriah Smith’s view of the king of the north and Armageddon], and that scores of our workers and college students are becoming confused as to many points of denominational faith and teaching.

He specifically objected to inclusion of the poll on controversial subjects in the official report of the 1950 College Bible Teachers’ Council, and identified the unanimity of the Bible teachers with respect to Armageddon and the kings of the east (counter to Uriah Smith’s view) as the theological crux of his objection.

Curiously, Elder Branson addressed this four-page letter to “L.L. Caviness, Ph.D.,” and “Prof. Raymond F. Cottrell” but sent it to administrators around the world and not to either of us. Puzzled inquiries from Fellowship members around the world a few weeks later provided our first intimation of such a letter. Our first copy came from a personal friend of Dr. Caviness, a Bible teacher at Helderberg College in South Africa, who was a member of the Fellowship. As Elder Branson stated frankly in his letter, he himself knew little about the Fellowship and what little he did know had come to him in the form of “repercussions from the field”—from people who evidently did not know much more about it than he did. Neither he nor they had sought first-hand information about it from any of the Bible teachers or from the officers of the Fellowship before taking action.

As chairman and secretary of the Fellowship, Dr. Caviness and I both wrote Elder Branson requesting information about the letter and an explanation of his reason for sending it out. It was clear to us that he and his informers were unwitting victims of misinformation which none had made an attempt to verify. Two months later Roger Altman, administrative secretary to Elder Branson, sent each of us a copy of the letter with an apology for the omission of our names from the list of recipients. For some months Dr. Caviness and I sought unsuccessfully to clarify matters with Elder Branson, explaining the role of the Fellowship as a study group initiated by the college Bible teachers and assuring him of our individual and collective, complete and undivided loyalty to the church and its leaders. But he had evidently decided that the Fellowship posed a grave threat to the church, and that settled the matter. All
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efforts to clarify the situation proved futile. The immediate effect of his letter was to create an even greater interest in the Fellowship than had existed before. Twice as many membership applications were received during the year after his letter as during any comparable period prior to it.

After some months of correspondence with Elder Branson, I reluctantly concluded that further attempts to clarify matters would be futile and that more harm would result from defending the Fellowship than from discontinuing it in deference to the well-being of the church as a whole. The key factor in my decision was reluctant acceptance of his opinion that denominational protocol precluded its existence. The Fellowship was serving the Bible teachers of all sixteen Adventist English-language colleges around the world and had members in every world division of the General Conference except one, and in every union conference except one.

Accordingly, upon three occasions during the winter of 1951-52 I proposed to Dr. Caviness that we return the Fellowship to the college Bible teachers at the proposed 1952 Bible Conference in Takoma Park, Maryland, with the recommendation that it be disbanded. I also proposed that we request the General Conference to make provision for Bible research within the framework of the General Conference. He reluctantly agreed that that would be the best course of action.

But it was nevertheless, a deep disappointment to all of the Bible teachers, to be so misunderstood and misrepresented around the world—for what was intended to be sincere and dedicated service to the church—and to see the effective ministry of the Fellowship brought to a close. The impasse to which we had come was a modern version, in a religious setting, of the age-long difficulty town and gown have always experienced in trying to understand and cooperate with each other. However, attempts to resolve this particular difference of opinion—between the college Bible teachers and the General Conference administration—were marked on both sides, from beginning to end, by goodwill and mutual respect; relations never deteriorated to the personality level.

Simultaneously with my proposal that the Fellowship be disbanded, I drew up a formal recommendation that the General Conference establish an office of Bible research and appoint a Bible research committee. I sent copies of this recommendation to several persons at the General Conference and to other persons of influence in church affairs with whom I was personally acquainted. I then arranged with Clifford L. Bauer, president of the Pacific Union Conference, for Dr. Caviness to attend the Bible Conference as a delegate of the Pacific Union, specifically that he might work out, with the Bible teachers and the General Conference, the transfer of Fellowship activities to the General Conference. A few days later, Elder Branson personally invited him to attend the Autumn Council and to participate in arrangements for establishing the office of Bible research and the new Bible Research Committee.

Walter E. Read of the General Conference secretariat was appointed chairman of the ad hoc committee set up to make an in-depth study of the king of the north and Armageddon, and to present this subject at the 1952 Bible Conference. On behalf of the committee and in preparation for the conference, he corresponded with me at length over a period of several months. Among other things, he requested copies of a number of papers I had written on various aspects of the subject for the Fellowship. The ad hoc committee was eventually merged into the Bible Research Committee, which presented a formal report in the March, 1954 Ministry. This report listed several of these papers, among others, accepted their conclusions, and gave the papers appropriate credit. The report consisted essentially of a resume of my paper, “Pioneer Views on Daniel 11 and Armageddon.”

N ORDER TO counteract what he felt to be the objectionable influence of the Bible Research Fellowship (all of the Bible teachers of the church, collectively), Elder Branson, as previously noted, decided to convene a large ecumenical Bible Conference to reaffirm the historic position of the church on important points of Biblical interpretation as he understood them. That conference met in the Sligo Church in Takoma Park from September 1 to 13, 1952, a few days before the 1952 Autumn Council. Most of the delegates to this conference were from North America, but many from overseas came early to attend both gatherings. Major attention was given to certain points of interpretation listed in the questionnaire at the Bible Teachers’ Council two years before, to which Elder Branson had taken particular exception, and especially to the king of the north, the battle of Armageddon, and related events. The Bible Conference was so structured that only what might be called the “official position” was to be mentioned publicly, and no provision was made for discussion on the floor—though there was considerable “locker room” discussion. To this end all papers were carefully screened in advance, as were written questions from the floor. In his lengthy, two-part presentation of Armageddon and related subjects, Elder Read took the same position as that reflected by the college Bible teachers in the 1950 poll.

Bible teachers attending the 1952 Bible Conference agreed to disband the Fellowship, and the Autumn Council a few days later (September 17 to 27) appointed Walter E. Read to direct the office of Bible research and set up a permanent “Committee for Biblical Study and Research.” Dr. Caviness
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thereupon laid plans to disband the Fellowship as of December, 1952, when membership dues already received would expire. In November the new committee met for the first time under the chairmanship of Elder Read. The guidelines drawn for it by the General Conference officers specified the objectives and procedures pioneered by the Bible Research Fellowship. With the approval of their authors, some thirty research papers awaiting consideration by the Fellowship were turned over to the new committee, and Dr. Caviness wrote to the nine local chapters inviting them to deal directly with Elder Read and the new committee. Through the columns of The Ministry an announcement was made of the new committee and an invitation issued for research papers to be contributed. There was thus direct continuity between the Bible Research Fellowship and the new Committee for Biblical Study and Research.

The Bible Research Fellowship thus terminated nearly ten years of pioneering ministry to the church, during which time the Angwin chapter met regularly one Sabbath afternoon each month. It was my privilege to attend every meeting of the Fellowship from 1943 to 1952, and every meeting of the new Bible Research Committee from 1952 to 1975.

The influence of the Bible Research Fellowship did not cease with formal termination of its activities. In ten short years it made an impact on the denomination that has vitally affected church life and work. There were both immediate, tangible results, and less tangible but equally important long-range results. The principal tangible results consisted of:

1. A permanent General Conference office of Bible research, established in 1952, the year of transition.
2. A permanent General Conference Committee for Biblical Study and Research, also established in 1952.
4. The principles of interpretation built into the SDA Bible Commentary, 1952 to 1957. Practically all of the writers and the two editors of the Commentary were Bible teachers and members of the Bible Research Fellowship at the time they accepted their assignments. The Commentary reflects the spirit, the hermeneutical principles, and the interpretation of Scripture encouraged by the Fellowship, and is a living monument to it. These hermeneutical principles are also set forth at some length in my chapter.
on principles of Bible interpretation in the book Problems in Bible Translation; in my article on "The Role of Israel in Old Testament Prophecy" in Volume 4 of the Commentary; and in numerous unpublished papers on the subject.

Less tangible results of the Fellowship include:

5. A demonstration of effective group dynamics in cooperative Bible study on the research level for the first time in the history of the church. It brought the college Bible teachers of the church—with their concern for such study—together in a permanent, cooperative working relationship in which mutual respect and confidence, complete freedom of expression and investigation, and a spirit of dedication and loyalty to the church prevailed.

6. A demonstration of the atmosphere necessary for creative, cooperative research-level Bible study. This atmosphere is composed of willingness to recognize the Holy Spirit as the author, guardian, and arbiter of truth, and to follow wherever the Spirit leads; willingness to deal objectively and fairly with all of the available evidence; and willingness to listen attentively and with an open mind to the other person's perspective of the truth, in the realization that he may have a more accurate understanding of some facets of it than I do, and with sincere respect for his perception of truth and confidence in his personal integrity, dedication, and loyalty to the church. Such an atmosphere is vital to a successful corporate quest for truth.

7. Its provision of a place to which the Bible scholars of the church could take reports of their individual study for evaluation and constructive criticism by their peers; that is, persons competent to evaluate research-level study projects. Ellen White counseled those who, in their study of the Bible, find what they take to be a clearer understanding of truth, to submit their findings to persons of experience—obviously persons with more experience than their own:

   ...the only safety for any of us is in receiving no new doctrine, no new interpretation of the Scriptures, without first submitting it to brethren of experience. Lay it before them in a humble, teachable spirit, with earnest prayer; and if they see no light in it, yield to their judgment; for "in the multitude of counselors there is safety."

But to whom can those with the best training and highest degree of competence in Biblical studies go for such counsel? Obviously, only to their peers; that is, persons with comparable training and experience in Biblical studies. The Bible Research Fellowship provided a forum in which the results of Bible study on the research level could be evaluated by a panel of other competent Bible scholars, in an atmosphere of mutual respect and confidence.

8. A demonstration that freedom to investigate the Bible objectively, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, with an open mind and in mutual confidence, is a far more effective catalyst for unifying competent, responsible, thinking persons than regimentation of thought. The Fellowship was unofficial in its
organization and operation, and therefore had no need to take a position or make a pronouncement. It never did so. Its purpose was simply to help its members in their individual quests for truth. Inasmuch as the Fellowship eventually included virtually all the college Bible teachers of the church, through them it made a major contribution to our collective perception of truth. In this unofficial atmosphere the investigation of alternative possible interpretations and points of view could proceed in a relaxed, secure atmosphere of mutual respect and confidence, without fear of being misunderstood, or of recrimination or reprisal. The responsible scholarly exchange and examination of alternative interpretations and points of view in such an atmosphere seem essential to any genuine quest for truth.

9. A demonstration that cooperation with others in the quest for truth is a highly desirable safeguard against weak spots in one's own reasoning process, and that the experience of working with others in the quest binds hearts and minds together in a richer understanding of God's word. I feel that one of the most valuable byproducts of the Bible Research Fellowship was the spirit of unity and fellowship it provided for its members in their collective quest for truth.

10. Its powerful incentive to diligent, thorough, persevering Bible study on the research level, with a view to ascertaining as accurate and complete an understanding of the import of Scriptures as possible. It brought individual endeavor to understand the Bible into sharp focus. The experience of critically evaluating many scores of papers, analyzing an author's presuppositions, his hermeneutic, his reasoning process, and the validity of his conclusions in terms of the evidence he presented was also of estimable value.

The church is deeply indebted to the Bible Research Fellowship and to the dedication and vision of its founder and leading spirit, Dr. Leon L. Caviness. The church might well be served today by a revival of the objectives, the incentives, the principles, the atmosphere, the procedures, and the spirit of fellowship in the quest for truth it provided those who participated in it.
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Uriah Smith’s Small Epic:

THE WARNING VOICE OF
TIME AND PROPHECY

John O. Waller

The entire front page that week—March 17, 1853—of The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald, Vol. III, No. 22, was covered with the lines of a single blank verse poem entitled “The Warning Voice of Time and Prophecy.” And the poem continued to appear in eight more installments for a total of something more than 3,000 surprisingly skillful, often powerful lines.

The poet, Uriah Smith, was just twenty-one years old, a graduate of the prestigious New England preparatory school, Phillips Exeter Academy, where he seems to have been a sort of unofficial poet among his fellow students. For two successive years, 1850 and 1851, he had composed creditable but undistinguished odes for anniversary exercises of the academy’s Golden Branch Society. Amateur psychologizers who like to correlate poetic activities with physical handicaps might feel reinforced to hear that young Smith walked on an artificial limb, having lost his left leg to an infection at age thirteen.

Only a few months before his long poem began to run in the Review, Smith, who had already been deeply stirred as a boy by the Advent movement of 1844, had accepted the seventh-day Sabbath, and was now on fire to do something really effective to advance the new cause. That same spring he joined the Review’s small working staff where he remained.

Chairman of the English Department at Andrews University, John O. Waller is also interested in early Adventist history.

This is one of the earliest photographs of Elder Uriah Smith, taken about ten years after he wrote his epic poem.
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THE WARNING VOICE

OF TEMPTATION AND DECLINE.

By ORIAS SMITH.

Oh! all the moral world, where, otherwise,
No light could come, or through the midnight gloom
Of sorrow, fear, and trouble, a ray of hope
Should pierce the night—the deepening shades dispel,
And the darkness of sin sunk down in the deep.

Darkness by day, and darkness by night,
With shades of sin and suffering, and poverty
And want, and sorrow, and woe;
Oh! when will the day of peace, of love, and joy?

When will the day of peace, of love, and joy?
When will the day of peace, of love, and joy?
When will the day of peace, of love, and joy?

When will the day of peace, of love, and joy?
When will the day of peace, of love, and joy?
When will the day of peace, of love, and joy?
When will the day of peace, of love, and joy?
When will the day of peace, of love, and joy?
with only brief interruptions until his death on March 6, 1903, barely two weeks short of the fiftieth anniversary of the first installment of the poem. During thirty-four of those fifty years, including the last two, he was the editor.

For James White, Review editor in 1853, it was no trivial matter to devote an eighth or more of an entire precious number of his paper to a single poem, to say nothing of doing it for nine successive weeks. Evidently White believed in the practical power of poetry to carry a message, not merely to supply sentiment or typographical variety. In fact, several of the issues carrying the Smith poem also carried one or more smaller poems by other authors. (Smith, in his private life, moved in a circle of versifiers. His mother, Rebekah, wrote poems, as did the woman he married, Harriet Stevens. His sister Annie, who died in 1855 at the age of twenty-seven, remains the best-known of early Seventh-day Adventist poets and hymn-writers.)

In that same year, 1853, James White published Smith’s Warning Voice of Time and Prophecy as a small book (110 pages of poetry plus ten of preface and notes).

**PREFACE BY Smith explains his poem’s intent “to give a general outline of the foundation, rise and progress of the Advent movement up to the present time, showing that it was the work of God, also, its connection with prophecy, and the prophetic fulfillment upon which it is based.”**

The poem was written in two parts. Part I, showing the Bible and its prophecies to be “man’s only guide” covered the period “from the commencement of the work to the passing of the time in 1844.” It described the signs in the sun, moon, and stars; the “state of the world just previous to the preaching of the Advent;” the first angel’s message, “Fear God and give glory to him; for the hour of his judgment is come,” and Daniel’s prophecies, basis of the message; the “voice of Time, showing the fulfillment of those prophecies in the past;” the going forth of a pilgrim band to proclaim the message, its rejection by “the Nominal Church . . . hence the second angel’s message, ‘Babylon is fallen, is fallen;’” the 1843 Disappointment, the Midnight Cry, and finally the 1844 “great disappointment at the passing of that time, and its immediate effects.”

Part II, after opening with “an apostrophe to the ‘Blessed Hope,’ to which a few still clung, and were sustained in all their trials,” went on to show “the more gradual effects of the disappointment . . . the numerous divisions which crept in and scattered the flock.” Then an explanation of “the Sanctuary . . . wherein lay the cause of the disappointment;” from there, “the third angel’s message,” based on the prophecies of Revelation; and the Sabbath truth. There were addresses to the lukewarm Laodiceans and to former Adventists “gone back into the world.” Then came “a warning to the shepherds” and to the world; mention of “the Spirit manifestations, Satan’s last scheme to deceive mankind;” and, finally, a forward look at “distress of nations,” the “coming storm,” the “time of trouble, and the seven last plagues,” the “final battle,” and the “Restitution,” in the New Earth.

For students of Adventist history, the poem provides a unique source for inwardly experiencing the powerful imaginative self-image of the small circle revolving around James and Ellen White at Rochester in the early 1850’s. Less than nine years removed from 1844, these people felt themselves firmly positioned as nothing less than the God-directed protagonists in the central epic of the universe. In Smith they had a youthful poet who, under the spell of that conviction, was almost equal to the artistic challenge of capturing this overwhelming feeling in words and lines and soaring poetic periods. It is a poem composed for the voice—sight-reading will not do here—a poem to be declaimed, intoned, to reach and move the believing heart by way of the listening ear.

True to the outline in the preface, the poem opens with lengthy, eloquent praise of Biblical prophecy as “a guiding star,” the only light efficacious to lead man through a morally bewildering maze on to the Eternal Kingdom:

O’er all the moral world, where, otherwise, No light would come, or through its midnight gloom
No cheering ray appear, to dissipate
The darkness, God has set a guiding star—
A luminary bright—whose rays divine
Should pierce the night—the deep’ning shades dispel,
Which o’er the earth in sullen silence brood.
Nay, more, a ray of God’s own brightness, sent
Direct to man from off his radiant throne;
That those who gladly should the light receive,

**Uriah Smith’s poem, “A Warning Voice of Time and Prophecy,” ran on the first page of the REVIEW AND HERALD for nine weeks.**
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And follow where it led, should here enjoy
A glorious foretaste of the bliss of Heaven.

It is God's Holy Word, immutable,
Through life's bewildering maze alone can guide
The wandering traveler to eternal rest.
Without it, man were lost—lost in the deep,
Dark labyrinth of dread uncertainty—
Where doubts distract, and fearful thoughts arise—
With nought his steps to lead, save the dim lamp
Of human reason, whose misguiding flame
Would serve to make the gloom still more profound,
The darkness deeper, and more keenly felt.
But 'twas not God's design to leave man thus,
In error's devious paths, to grope his way;
So, through his Sacred Word, his will revealed,
And pointed out the narrow path, that bright
And brighter shines, e'en to the perfect day.

...And to his chosen ones, the prophets, men
Of holiness and truth—and worthy all
Of favors so divine—he has revealed
The secrets of his purposes and plans.
Yea, in their visions, he removed the veil,
The mysterious veil which o'er the future hangs,
And bade them look far down the stream of time,
Until that stream was in eternity's
Vast ocean lost.—E'en to the day
When this dark, weary, groaning earth, again,
In Eden glory shall rejoice anew;
The curse, the blighting curse, of sin removed,
And all its hideous progeny destroyed;
Until the righteous from all ages saved,
Rejoicing in the glory of their God,
And in eternal life through Christ the Son,
Shall round his throne their songs of triumph raise,
And then go forth—immortal forms and fair—
With shining crowns, and harps of glittering gold,
To dwell for ever on the earth renewed,
And praise forever their Eternal King.—

The poetry here, and throughout, inspected as poetry (not only as message), impresses with its considerable metrical virtuosity. The sound of the first line is somewhat disappointing, with its retarding early cluster of three o-r-l combinations, trailed by two more r's; but at its end the line recovers, pauses suspensefully, sets the pleasing long i motif which will do so much to help organize the next nine lines, then eases the reader into the more open second line, and thence through the syntactically admirable seven-line first sentence. The twelve-line first paragraph is tied together not only by ten long i's, but also by five long e's, and the alliterative effect of seventeen d sounds, including six initial d's. The metaphor of God's prophetic word as a guiding star—indeed, "a ray of God's own brightness, sent / Direct man to off his radiant throne"—penetrating through the moral confusion hanging like a cloud sullenly over the earth is well sustained into the second paragraph.

Smith's compositional unit throughout his long poem—and in this respect more than in any other he demonstrates control of his blank verse—is the sentence, or even the paragraph, and almost never the single line. Any truly competent blank verse will do no less. But the English poet from whom Smith had learned the most was one of the two greatest of them all—John Milton. Obviously Smith knew Paradise Lost, and Milton's peculiar way with the blank verse line had drilled itself deeply into his consciousness. From Milton, Smith learned to avoid the worst pitfalls of blank verse monotony—specifically, how to vary the pauses within his lines, and how to sweep his thought past the death-trap of excessive end-stopping. The reader is left free to concentrate upon Smith's thought and feeling, not overly conscious of his lines.

Here is Smith's description of the signs in the heavens—the dark day and darker night, and the more recent falling of the stars:
The day has passed, the day of terror, when
The sun his glories veiled, and dim, withdrew
Behind the thick'ning gloom; when darkness rose,
And over mid-day brightness, giant-like,
His sable mantle threw—unfettered then,
With freedom stalked, throughout a frightened land.

And when the night came on, and fair, and full,
Down from her lofty throne, the moon refused
To give her light, the pall of darkness dense,
And denser yet became, e'en to be felt.
And not far back, among the wonders rare,
Of modern times, behold, in bold relief,
The fearful night, when fell the stars from heaven;
As her untimely figs a fig-tree casts,
When fiercely shaken of a mighty wind:
When all the starry hosts, innumerable,
In wild confusion seemed, and sad dismay;
And countless myriads of meteors, bright,
Shot flaming forth, east, west, and north, and south,
Marking their swift career with vivid lines
Of coruscating light, which meeting oft,
All heaven appeared a net-work, bright, of flame,
And earth with floods of dazzling brightness filled.

Men, however, recovering from their initial wonder and fright, soon rationalized such wonders, and ignored the significance of other signs on earth. “Oh what can rouse them,” cried the poet, “ere the pent-up storm / Of fiery indignation held in store / For an ungodly and a wicked world, / Shall on them burst in fury, and involve / In ruin, irretrievable and sure...?”

Satan, knowing his time short, grimly assembled his diabolical “dark legions” to hoodwink mankind with “dead’ning opiates, and with siren songs, / And fables cunning of a world’s reform, / An age to come, a bright millennial age / Of peace, and happiness, and plenty, ere / The Saviour should to earth descend again.”

To counteract such deceptions God commissioned the mighty First Angel of Revelation 14:6, 7, speeding him off to earth with his message, “Fear God and give him glory; for his hour / Of judgment now is come.” Men by the thousands awoke to search the prophecies as never before: “a thousand echoes back, / Gave deep response, a thousand voices took / The Heaven-born message and proclaimed the cry.” The prophetic books, long “closed and sealed,” lay open at last—the prophecies of Daniel 2, and Daniel 7, and Daniel 8 (all energetically recounted in Smith’s iambic pentameter).

To interpret the prophetic symbols, Smith dramatically created an allegorical character, the personified voice of Time (earthly history). Poor Time was old and tired, “drooping and weary,” being so close to his “journey’s end,” but he spoke unequivocally as he reviewed his own long, troubled history—Assyria, Medo-Persia, Greece, Rome—in light of the prophetic words. Finally Time reached the feet of the great image with its toes of iron and clay:

“Thus far I’ve gone;
Four universal kingdoms have I seen
Arise and fall, and of the last, behold
The crumbling fragments, only, now remain;
And but for one more kingdom can we look,
The endless kingdom of the God of Heaven.
The image have I followed, till we stand,
Even now upon the ends of its ten toes,
Full well matured and ready to receive
The fatal blow of that great ‘stone,’ which, as
It grinds the whole to powder, fills the earth—
And next in order comes.

And I have seen
The lion, bear, and leopard all expire;
And now the body of that fourth great beast,
the new message a “delusion,” make it unpopular by ridicule, and to corrupt the popular churches through their love of worldliness. “That is the cord by which I’ll hold them down; / For I will strengthen now their love of earth, / Its pleasure and its forms, its pride and show, / Its luxury and wealth, and vain esteem.” “I will join,” Satan plotted, “professors and divines, / Church-men and worldly-men, drunkards and thieves, / And every being, vile, both heart and hand, / In one grand mass, to crush this rising truth.”

The consequent rejection by the popular churches led to the fearful message of the second angel calling out the true believers: “Babylon is fallen, is fallen!” dread words With solemn import full, and terrible In meaning. . . .

And from the gilded galleries where rose, In worldly pomp, the measured anthem, deep, Now beating back in mournful notes, and slow— To which the vaulted ceiling, high, returned, In corresponding tones, the notes again— These startling words fell heavy on the ear: Babylon is fallen, is fallen! At once, With simultaneous impulse, thousands rose, And broke, with her, their bonds of intercourse; Left the dull place where they no food received, No spiritual benefit, no life, no light, Left and unshackled, free, themselves declared; Free from her sects, unfettered by her creeds . . . .

Lo! now on all her shrines there settled down The speedy gath’ring death-mould, thick and fast; A death-damp issued forth in all her aisles, And all her lamps of piety and love, Of godliness and truth, for ever quenched, Behold, through all her courts, now reigned The blackest moral darkness deep and dead. . . .

The hour came on, And with it came, as on the whirlwind borne, “Behold the Bridegroom cometh, go ye out To meet him!” Then, swift as the lightning shoots From cloud to cloud, quick as the thunder bursts, Deaf’ning through all the air—so quickly ran The spirit of that cry throughout the land, So quickly utterance found in one great shout That, rising, shook, throughout, heaven’s lofty dome, “Behold the Bridegroom cometh, go ye out To meet him;” nor could a shock, electric, Sooner have roused to life a faltering band, Who now immediate from slumber sprung, And with full many a cheer, rallied again, With ten-fold vigor ‘round their standard bright, Now brighter, far, than ever, gleaming forth, The Lord is coming, while all doubts and fears, And ghostly shadows gath’ring fast around, Scattered precipitate, with headlong route. And Prophecy raised high her gilded page, From which blazed forth, at once, redoubled light, Clear as the sun, and unmistakable. . . . “Up to the seventh month, meanwhile, the world, / Under Time’s rapid hand was rolling on, / Nearing th’ appointed day.” The believers left their fall harvests ungathered: “the fields, unripe, nodded their heads of yellow grain, and sere, / As if it affirm, / The Lord is at the door.” / Such was the faith, through deeds made manifest. . . .

In reliving the final weeks, Smith’s verse takes on slow suspense, then funeral disappointment: Meantime the distance shortens; weeks depart, Weeks, intervening, dwindle into days, Which soon alone remain, while brighter burns Hope and the love of God, among the saints, And from their ranks, songs of thanksgiving rise, And shouts of praise, up to their glorious King, Whom they so soon caught up will be to meet. In such proportion, so much fiercer, burns ‘Mong all the wicked, malice, wrath and hate, Though fearful, lest the warning yet be true. To hours are days reduced—to moments hours— Fast sitting through the ceaseless glass of Time; Till dawns at last the much expected day; In dead suspense and breathless stood the world. The wise prepared it found, and waiting then To make their exit to their glorious home; But ah! it passed away, and, waiting, still,
Left them all here; no King from heaven appeared; The world breathed easier and calmly Time’s Great wheels moved on, unstopped, and undis-turbed.

The time pass’d by, but bro’t no outward change! Heavy the blow came down, with crushing weight, On that devoted flock, as if ’twould send Hope, reeling, to its grave; and faith destroy; And to destruction scatter all belief; And blot out trust in truth or prophecy. Through every trusting heart, like some keen shaft With triple barbs it pierced: and tore away, A shield from off their breast, and from their grasp An anchor wrested; while they stood exposed, E’en as shorn lambs to the bleak, wintry blast.

HISTORICALLY CONSIDERED, Smith’s narrative had reached its climax, but his poem was only half-finished. We have followed him to page 55 of his 110 poetic pages. Indeed, the most urgent rhetorical tasks he had assigned himself were scarcely begun. Smith was not aimlessly versifying, nor White publishing a poem for art’s sake alone. No doubt most Review and Herald readers in 1853 were already of the remnant of Second Advent believers who had survived the disappointment. The Review was attempting to round up as many as possible of these—from cities, small towns, remote farms, east, west, and south—and rally them around the newly embraced Sabbath truth. Patience in waiting upon the Lord’s own time was now the virtue to be cultivated—patience and steadfast readiness. Many had lost courage, abandoned their faith. Perhaps they could be revived through hearing the entire Third Angel’s Message, including the Sabbath doctrine. Smith was calling with special intensity to such persons as these. “Ho! all ye scattered ones,” he cried, in what is probably his most eloquent passage:

Ho! all ye scattered ones, who ever once Stood on the side of God and fought for truth, Into whatever lone and dreary path, The cloudy day and dark has seen you stray, Return around the standard of your King! “Tis the last rallying-call that bids you come!
The last recruiting officer that Heaven,
To bid men join its army, e’er shall send,
Is out upon his final mission now;
Ere, then, too late, enroll your names again,
To aid the glorious cause you once did love.
The bright remembrances of former days,
Bid ye return—thoughts of the holy joy
That filled your souls while struggling for the truth
In scenes gone by, bid ye return—the sun,
Fast counting off the numbered days of time,
Telling how swift the coming end draws near,
Bids ye return—and loud the rolling earth
Trembling beneath its weary load of years,
Palsied and old, like one who seeks the grave,
Bids ye return—and louder still the voice
Of Heaven’s last messenger to sinful man,
Deep in its warning tone, bids ye return,
And fight the battle through and win the prize.

O that a soul should perish now, who e’er
Has borne the cross and trod the heavenly road!
Should almost reach the blissful land of rest,
Then turn, through disappointment, from the path!
Should brave the conflict ’till ’twas almost o’er,
Then lay their armor by, and miss the crown!
Should, with the Golden City just in view,
Yea, almost on its threshold standing, turn
Away from truth to error’s poisonous cup.

Ho! all ye wandering ones, who ever once,
Stood on the side of God and fought for truth,
Who’ve borne the cross and trod the heavenly road.
Who e’er have felt the holy love of God,
Within you burn, and fed on heavenly food—
Where will ye find it now? Whence will ye draw
Subsistence for your hungry, starving souls?
Whence will ye seek it? In a godless world?
Behold it drenched in sin, alien from God,
Full of all lust, iniquity and pride,
Driving deliriously on to death!
And hope ye then for spiritual comfort there?
Whence will ye seek it? In a fallen church?
Behold it dead, a withered lifeless thing,
Enveloped deep in shades of moral death!
O’er which the balfeul fires of that most Heaven
Insulting sin, a cold formality,
Sheds its sulphurous glare, and makes the gloom
More hideous still.

Both the scattered ones, called back, and the
remnant who had stood by needed to have their
vision renewed and reinforced. After briefly recount-
ing the post-disappointment bickerings and wander-
ings into error, reviewing the Sabbath truth,
exhorting the lukewarm Laodiceans to new zeal,
and calling the scattered ones, Smith turned to preach
again Christ’s sure coming and the beauty of the
earth made new. The last quarter of the book is a
powerfully versified Second Advent sermon:

O world! O devotees of fashion! O
Ye glittering sons of pride! Ye worshipers
At pleasure’s empty shrine! Of what avail
Will it soon be that ye have followed here
The paths of worldly happiness? What joy
Will the reflection bring, that ye have thrown
Your years away in chasing empty dreams—

‘Once did the Saviour come, lowly and meek, / To
pay the penalty for guilty man, / And point the way
to never-ending life. / Once more he comes; but not
as then he came; / He comes a king, to whom all
power is given / in Heaven and earth, and all
dominion given. . . .’ The young poet, his verse
enriched with Scriptural paraphrase, reaches near-
estacy in his contemplation of the beauty of the
world to come:

Then through the massy gates, each gate a pearl
Enter the City, bright, for them prepared,
Decked with the glory of its maker God;
And like a jasper stone, the light thereof,
As crystal clear; and all whose holy streets,
With purest gold, even like transparent glass,
Are dazzling paved; which ever fair reflect
Bright back again the living gorgeousness;
And never-fading splendors ceaseless glow;
And beauty answers beauty, deep’ning still,
And grandeur, grandeur, ever leading on
Through scenes of glory, new, ineffable.

. . .

Radiant in light the holy city stands;
Nor hath it need of moon, or shining sun;
For God’s surpassing glory lightens it,
And through its gates of pearl, night never comes.

. . .

In youthful freedom, then will earth again
Rejoice, its fetters broken, and its voice
Long choked by Sin and Death to notes of wo
Shall rise in anthems loud of grateful joy.
All shall be Eden, all be paradise,
The garden of the Lord; abundantly,
With joy and singing shall the desert bloom
And blossom as the rose, and Lebanon’s
Bright glory share, and Carmel’s excellence.

. . .

But all shall lovely be, all shall be pure.
The trees shall clap their hands, and fields shall
smile
Bright in the cloudless sunshine of their God,
And fear no blasting storms, nor fear decay.
Nor turbid waters in the streams shall flow,
But fountains, pure, make glad the face of earth.
All with abundance swells; in tree and flower,
And shrub, and creeping vine and clustering fruit
And lawn and fertile field, behold no lack.
Thus to its primal purity restored,
Thus glorious and beautiful shall be
The earth, renewed, the saints’ eternal home.

Smith addresses the Earth: “Haste then, O Earth,
haste and fulfill complete, / The appointed circles of
thy gloomy course. / Time in his warning voice,
proclaiming loud / That his last trembling sands are
falling now, / Has a sweet tone for thee; it tells, thy
years / Of mourning, wo and grief are closing fast.
...” He turns and addresses man’s evil passions:
“A little space is left you yet, to rule; / To urge men
on in wickedness; but lo, / Your days are numbered,
and your tomb prepared. / In the great, final day, all
these shall die / A death that has no hope of life
again.” And in his final verse paragraph, he calls out
to the saints: “Sing honor, praise, and glory unto
God, / Who gives us foretaste of the coming joy / To
cheer our weary way; who grants so great, / So
glorious prize to crown so short a race.”

Soon in the holy City shall we strike
Our golden harps, to glory’s anthems tuned.
Earth’s toil will then be done, earth’s care all o’er,
Its woes, its griefs, its passions and its tears,
All gone and all forgotten; while we raise,
With seraphim and high arch-angel joined
In silver tones our hallelujahs, loud,
Wide o’er the fields of bliss; and Heaven shall ring
With high hosannas, and sweet notes of joy

Blessing and honor to our God, and to
The Lamb, who hath redeemed us by his blood,
To reign with him in glory evermore
And share his blessing, ages without end.
Miriam Wood, a former classmate and friend of Jerry L. Pettis, has written a sympathetic, brief biography about an extraordinary person. Among the several distinctions that cover this man’s life is the fact that he was the first Seventh-day Adventist to serve in the House of Representatives. First elected in 1966, he represented California’s Thirty-seventh Congressional District.

Wood states that she has attempted to capture “the essence of the man himself.” For this reason she disclaims any definitives about the book. The essences of Jerry L. Pettis as presented by Wood are “boundless energy, ambition, and dedication to his many lives.” In reading the book, one is impressed that Pettis had all of these qualities.

Jerry Pettis was born in Arizona on July 18, 1916, one of five children of an Adventist school teacher. He later left home to work his way through an Adventist academy, and then through Pacific Union College, where he majored in religion and speech. The first of his many lives was that of a preacher, beginning as an evangelist in his home state of Arizona. After this, he became a speech teacher at Union College in Nebraska. Then, during World War II, he served as a pilot for the Air Transport Command. He followed this with a career in public relations; and then founded his own company, providing taped digests of professional materials for physicians. In addition to the success of this enterprise, Pettis enjoyed his success as an avocado and citrus rancher. His final vocation—that of politician—lasted for the nine years he served as Congressman. A tragic airplane crash on Valentine’s Day, 1975, claimed this noble life.

Wood uses her own personal recollections and the reminiscences of Pettis’ friends to reconstruct his development. She details incidences that highlight his positive characteristics; and also some, as she puts it, that Pettis would rather have forgotten. The picture one gets of the subject throughout is that of a very dedicated person, gifted with boundless energy, who was determined to overcome obstacles in his life. One skein running through all of Pettis’ careers is a certain restless drive—once he had achieved success in one endeavor—to go on to new...
challenges. In this respect, the book presents an example of what can be done, not only through providence, but through sheer determination.

Despite the biographical details, one comes away from the book with a certain ambiguity about the "essence" of the man. This seems to be particularly true in the recounting of Pettis-turned-politician.

Even though the author begins her narrative by conjecturing that someday Pettis might have been President, there is no solid evidence that he had any serious interest in politics per se. It is more apparent that his entry into politics was the result of a combination of events, including the fact that the incumbent had left office, and that Pettis had friends in the local Republican Party who encouraged and supported his candidacy. In a relatively conservative district, his winning the seat on his second try made it plausible that he could make a career out of the House of Representatives.

One learns very little about Pettis' political philosophy, except that he believed government was too big and too removed from the people and that it was his primary role as a representative to serve in the interests of his constituents. In this regard Pettis played the delegate role in the Jeffersonian model of representation.

And this delegate role set provides a possible insight regarding the relationship or tension that Pettis found in being a politician and a Seventh-day Adventist. It is a matter of record that when the House of Representatives was considering an amendment to the Constitution to overrule the Supreme Court's decisions on prayer and Bible reading (which forbade the government to sponsor such religious activities in public schools), Pettis supported the amendment, which would ostensibly allow prayer in public schools. He gave as his reason for doing so that his constituent sentiment overwhelmingly favored such an amendment.

The leadership of the Seventh-day Adventist Church and its Religious Liberty Department opposed such an amendment, testifying to Congressional committees that it was unnecessary and threatening to the separation of church and state. One view of these events is that there was no unanimity of opinion among Adventists as to the essential relationship of religion to the state. But what is missing in this biography is even a glimmer of introspection about this discontinuity. In this regard, Wood's biography is a call for serious scholars of Adventism to get inside the lives of their men of public life and trace the intellectual tensions and the secularization process inherent in their careers, instead of just presenting hero models for Adventist youth.

The only career Pettis wanted to enter upon graduation from college was law. He did not enter law, however, because church leaders who counseled him at that time indicated that the church looked unfavorably upon such a career. But, in circuitous manner, he climaxed his life as a lawmaker.

Explanation needs to be made for the developments that allowed Pettis to enter into an analogous career of politics; when, years before, the church's hesitancy kept him from a legal career.

There is an ironic parallel between the life of the first Adventist politician of whom we have record, William C. Gage, and that of the first Adventist to attain the high office of United States Congressman. Both men left the ministry to enter careers in business and politics.

It may be that as the Seventh-day Adventist Church began with the Anabaptist view of religion and politics, so do Adventist politicians make that generational journey across the Reformation to Luther's stance on religion and public life.
Dear Editor:

"... Thank you for this outstanding piece of work! My only criticism [of the last issue] is that there were several spelling errors!!"

Very sincerely yours,
Evelyn B. Brown

Dear Editor:

"I have just finished reading Volume 2, Number 4 of ADVENTIST HERITAGE, and have very much enjoyed the splendid contents. My attention was distracted time and again, however, by the totally inadequate proof-reading . . . ."

Very sincerely yours,
Irene Wakeham

Dear Editor:

"As Professor Emeritus of History at Walla Walla College I enjoyed reading the recent issue of ADVENTIST HERITAGE. However, for a professional journal to allow so many typographical errors there is no excuse . . . . I sincerely hope the next issue will be more indicative of a professional journal and that the typist and/or proof-reader will do a better job!"

Sincerely yours,
Frank E. Meckling

We apologize for the mistakes that appeared in the last issue of ADVENTIST HERITAGE. Though they occurred during a time of change in the editorial personnel of the journal, there was still no excuse for letting so many errors get into print. We are attempting to insure that it doesn’t happen again. Obviously, we are not the first editors who have had problems with typographical errors. Sometime before her death in 1855, Annie Smith, sister of Uriah Smith and an early worker in the REVIEW office in Rochester, New York, wrote the following poem entitled "Proof-Reader’s Lament." It pretty well sums up our feelings.

—The Editors

Ah! where it happened, when and how,
This way or that, no matter now;
Myself from blame I cannot shake—
For there it is, that sad mistake.

Guilty, condemned, I trembling stand,
With pressing cares on every hand,
Without one single plea to make,
For leaving such a bad mistake.

From morn till night, from night till morn,
At every step, weary, forlorn,
Whether I sleep, or whether wake,
I’m haunted still with a mistake.

If right, no need of praise is won,
No more than duty then is done;
If wrong, then censure I partake,
Deserving such a gross mistake.

How long shall I o’er this bewail?
"The best," “tis said, “will sometimes fail;”
Must it then peace forever break—
Summed up, “tis only a mistake.

A smile is my delight to share,
A frown is more than I can bear;
How great the sacrifice I’d make,
If I could cease from a mistake.

"I’ll try," my motto yet shall be—
Whate’er I hear, whate’er I see,
And for my own and others’ sakes,
Look out betimes for all mistakes.

Proof-Reader’s Lament

What news is this falls on my ear?
What next will to my sight appear?
My brain doth whirl, my heart doth quake—
Oh, that egregious mistake!

"Too bad! too bad!!" I hear them cry
"You might have seen with half an eye!
Strange! passing strange!! how could you make
So plain, so blunderous a mistake!!"
Elder Roth visited the Hutchinson church last Sabbath and reported a very good interest. He also reported that an unusually good midsomer offering was received. One party alone gave a check for $250.

Professor E. R. Maas has returned from his trip to the west and is now preparing for the opening of school at Enterprise. A large attendance is expected.

Brother R. E. Bowles, manager of the Omaha branch of the Pacific Press, spent a day with Brother Earl Gregg in the Kansas Book and Bible House getting literature ready for our coming camp meeting.

Miss Blanche Griffith is doing exceptional work in favor of the temperance movement in the city of Hutchinson. It would be a splendid thing if many more of our people would take an interest in this line of work.

**WYOMING**

H. E. OSWALD, President
H. D. JOHNSON, Sec.-trea.
804 South Wolcott St. Casper

**Meeting at Rawlins**

Sabbath, July 27, will long be remembered by the brethren and sisters assembled at Rawlins. Almost every church in the district was represented. A good spirit prevailed, and the Lord spoke very definitely to the hearts of His people. Victories were gained and decisions made.

The isolated were there expressed their determination to continue wholeheartedly in the faith and to be more earnest and sincere in preparing for the coming of the Saviour. We are greatly interested in our people who are isolated and do not have the opportunity of meeting with those of like precious faith.

The attendance was not large, but the forty people in attendance gave liberally of their means to support God’s work at home and abroad. An offering of $903 was received in pledges and cash.

We are greatly encouraged with the spirit of liberality manifested by the Lord’s people in the Wyoming Conference.

The brethren returned to their homes greatly encouraged and inspired, and we have every reason to believe that God will abundantly bless the progress of the work in Wyoming.

E. H. OSWALD

---

HON. GEORGE A. WILLIAMS

**WILLIAMS**—Honorable George A. Williams was born Aug. 17, 1864, in LaFayette, Ill., and fell asleep in death at the Boulter Sanitarium, Boulder, Colo., Sunday, July 7, 1944. Brother Williams was always a sincere Christian. He and Mrs. Williams joined the Adventist church in 1889 at the time when the message preached by Elder W. B. White, then president of the Nebraska Conference.

Throughout the years he has held several places of leadership and responsibility in connection with the denomination. For several years he served as manager of the Atlanta Sanitarium, Atlanta, Ga. After returning to Nebraska he became business manager of the Hastings Sanitarium.

It was in connection with the state election of 1910 that he became interested in politics and was persuaded to run for representative of the Nebraska State Legislature to which he was elected and served two terms from 1917 to 1921, under Governor Sam R. McKelvie. In 1926 he was elected lieutenant-governor of the state of Nebraska. He served two terms in this capacity under Governor Alvin McNamara and one term under Arthur J. Weaver.

Since retiring from active participation in state politics he has continued in activities in connection with the local church and conference. For the past eleven years he served as a member of the local conference committee for Nebraska. For the past four years he was a member of the General Conference committee, serving also during this time as a member of the Union College board, the Boulder Sanitarium board, and the Porter Sanitarium board.

During his last sickness he manifested a very patient attitude, with confidence and explicit trust in his heavenly Father.

Left to mourn are his devoted wife, Mrs. Mabel Lucretia Grubbs Williams of Paimont, Neb., seven children: Arthur F. of Bridgeport, Ala., Mrs. Mary Ada McIntyre of Freevee Val, Mrs. E. E. Ky. of Mancosfield, Mo., Mrs. Estel Willing of Jackson of Bumford, Neb., Mrs. Mildred Allen of Los Angeles, Calif.; George A., Jr., of Cheyenne, Tenn.; Mrs. Ada Turner of Los Angeles, Calif.; 19 grandchildren, nine great-grandchildren, and a host of friends. May God bless the memory of one who was much loved and highly esteemed.

Not only the country, state and community sustained a great loss in the passing of Brother Williams, but the denomination has lost a member who has done much through the years in the interest of the church and the cause of God. Often he seemed to be the man qualified and in a position to be used of God to make the right contact with men of affairs in the state and nation. He was a great lover of civil and religious liberty, and was always willing and ready to speak both privately and in public, voicing the convictions dear to his heart.

Mrs. Williams and the entire family can with confidence look forward to that resurrection morning when Christ will come and call forth His sleeping saints. Surely it can be said of Brother Williams that “his works do follow him.”

Words of eulogy were spoken by Elder N. C. Wilson and Elder Carl Sandin and the writer assisted in the service. Brother Williams was laid to rest in the cemetery at Fairmont to await the call of the Life-Giver.

D. E. VENDEN

---

**ALLEN**—Mrs. Josephine Allen was born March 30, 1903, at Lincoln, Neb., and passed away at the Bryan Memorial Hospital May 22, 1946, in the blessed assurance of the first resurrection.

Mrs. Allen was the daughter of Theodore and Minnie Kline of Lincoln, Neb. On Dec. 12, 1923, she was married to Henry Allen, who preceded her in death by four years. Except for a year in Galveston, Tex., and a short stay in Kansas City, Kans., she spent her life in Lincoln. Her education was gained in the Lincoln Seventh-day Adventist parochial school and the Lincoln public schools.

She was then baptized into membership in the Seventh-day Adventist church at 14 years of age and renewed her membership before she passed away.

Sister Allen is survived by her husband, Albert F. Kline, George E. Kline, William J. Kline, and Charles W. Kline; and two sisters, Nettie Jones and Carrie Wright, all of Lincoln.

May God in His mercy comfort those that mourn.

CARL STONDER

---

**Business Notices**

"FROM EXILE TO FREEDOM"—This thrilling book, just off the press, contains 160 pages of human interest plus a number of personal photographs. At the request of thousands who have heard his lecture, the author, W. S. Jesser, has put in print his personal experiences in the land of the Oppressor. You can now read of Mr. Jesser’s breathing experiences while in Siberian exile, how the Russian police and starvation, was chased by native to be killed, and how his two sisters and brother lost their lives. Thrilling tales of his escape from Siberia and final escape from Russia to the “Land of Stars and Stripes” bring this story to a dramatic climax.

You may send to the following address for a copy of this book copy by copy, 709 E. Broadway, Denver, Colorado. Price $1.50 postpaid.

WANTED: Peach pickers. Good wages offered. Harvest begins about Aug. 18. Write Lawrence Axelson, Pocahontas, Colo. 31-2

AN OPPORTUNITY for a couple who can do some work to make home with aged sister in Clinton, Missouri. For particulars write Mrs. C. M. Stack, 400 E. J. D. Shively, 418 S. Main Street, Clinton, Mo. 30-9

FOR SALE: Three-room house and three lots located in Centralia, Mo. Price $250. Nice buy for anyone interested in Sunnydale Academy. Sis E.Davis, Centralia, Mo. 32-1

**GEOLOGY AND THE FLOOD**, a complete study—strata, fossils, glaciation, earth structures, in harmony with creationism—is now available in The New Diluvium, by Harold Arnold, 300 pages, 80 color plates, duotone printing, cloth boards, $12.50. Order from Standard Publications, Augsburg, Calif. 32-1

---

**Sabbath Begins**

Friday...Aug. 9...Aug. 16
Colorado, Denver...7:05...6:56
Kansas, Topeka...7:26...7:17
Missouri, Kansas City...7:21...7:12
Nebraska, Lincoln...7:34...7:25
Wyoming, Casper...7:22...7:11

The death of George A. Williams on July 7, 1946, was reported in newspapers as well as the Adventists’ Central Union Reaper.