

The *Review and Herald* and Early Adventist Response To Organized Labor

by Eugene Chellis

The “Gilded Age,” roughly that period from the end of the Civil War to the close of the nineteenth century, witnessed the emergence of a fundamentally new society in America. The great debate over slavery which had gripped the nation for so long was finally put aside, and the United States entered a turbulent period of transition from a rural, agrarian community to a modern, industrial world power. Huge corporations tied the country together with a network of railroads and telegraph lines. Giant trusts like Rockefeller’s Standard Oil empire mobilized the resources of the nation in search of greater profits. The industrial workman, however, rapidly becoming a cog in an economic machine, did not calmly accept his new status. Violence erupted in such incidents as the general railroad strikes of 1877, the Homestead Strike of 1892 and the Coal Strike of 1902, as labor organized to counteract the power of the “captains of industry.”

It was in this context that the Adventist response to the phenomenon of labor unions

developed. This study attempts to analyze Adventist comments on organized labor appearing in the official Seventh-day Adventist paper, the *Review and Herald*, during these early years of the church.¹ Little, if any, mention of labor organizations can be found in the *Review* before 1872, and the majority of the material discussed here was published between 1877 and 1903. Few of the articles were lengthy discourses; most were merely news items or editorials, some even reprinted from other publications. Nevertheless, they provide insight about the concerns of early Adventists and reveal influences that may have swayed their opinions.

Several of the themes running through articles in the *Review* were typical of the thinking of many Protestant churches of the time. More than they realized, Adventist writers and theologians conformed to the prevailing values, fears and prejudices of rural America. The flood of 23,000,000 immigrants arriving between 1860 and 1910 intensified traditional American nativist suspicions. Adventists, like many others, were quick to accept conspiracy theories identifying communists, foreigners or Catholics as sinister forces behind the labor movements, threatening, they felt, the very foundations of established gov-

Eugene Chellis, a graduate of Walla Walla College, is studying law at Yale University. Copyright by Eugene Chellis.

ernment and society. These, as well as other themes appearing frequently in the *Review and Herald*, were commonly held ideas among conservative Americans of the nineteenth century.

At the same time, Adventist writers approached labor issues from their own theological perspective. One unique factor in shaping the church's response to labor was Mrs. Ellen G. White, undoubtedly the single most influential person in Adventist history. While she carefully avoided the label of "prophet," Adventist leaders believed that Ellen White was divinely inspired, a messenger of God with the gift of prophecy for the church.² It was her husband, James White, who founded the *Review and Herald* and served as editor until 1864. She herself wrote numerous books and articles for publication, exerting an understandably lasting and powerful effect on Adventist thinking.

Adventists were driven by an evangelical fervor and a steadfast conviction of their own heaven-ordained role. In the conflict and violence of the expanding labor movement, they looked for evidence of the impending end of time. They saw unions as dangerous worldly associations restricting individual freedom of conscience. Bolstered by faith in their prophetic guidance, Adventists confidently maintained that all labor organizations were evil. But this confidence often colored or blurred their perception of events around them and elevated their conclusions into moral absolutes; doctrine obscured social issues. The reports in the *Review* of the 1894 Pullman Strike confrontation provide an outstanding example of Adventist reactions to the nineteenth-century labor movement.

Employees of the Pullman Palace Car Company lived in neat brick houses surrounded by flower beds, trees and parks in the "model" community established by sleeping-car magnate George M. Pullman. They had little choice, however, but to live in this company town where rents and utilities cost 20 to 25 percent more than in neighboring Chicago, and where Pullman controlled the stores, the library, the bank — even the church. Hit by falling sales in the depression

of 1893, the company laid off more than 4,000 of its 5,800 employees and cut wages of the rest by as much as 40 percent. Rents and utility charges, though, remained the same, with disastrous effects on the workers. Many were only partially employed, even at lower wages, and few earned enough to meet living expenses after rent was deducted from their paychecks.

On the other hand, the Pullman Company did not reduce the salaries of its officials or the regular dividends it paid to stockholders. When the company still made no adjustments in rents or wages after business began to improve, a committee of employees presented their grievances to corporate officials. Although revenue from the company's operating division was sufficient to have absorbed the losses of the construction division and still have left profits of over \$2 million after dividends, Pullman categorically refused to consider either higher wages or lower rents. Dismissal the next day of three members of their grievance committee sparked the Pullman workers to strike.

The American Railway Union, to which the Pullman employees belonged, voted to support the strike by refusing to handle Pullman cars on any railroad. Although the boycott was aimed only at the Pullman Company, railway executives responded by ordering the discharge of any worker removing a Pullman car from a train. Whenever one man was fired, though, the entire train crew would quit, and within hours, 60,000 men had stopped work, nearly paralyzing traffic on many of the nation's railroads.

Despite the union's promise to operate mail trains as long as Pullman cars were not attached, railroad officials refused to allow mail trains to move without the sleepers. United States Attorney-General Richard Olney then, ostensibly to keep the mail moving, obtained a federal court injunction against the strikers and arranged to have several thousand men, actually hired and armed by the railroads, sworn in as deputy U.S. marshals. The character of the strike changed dramatically when federal soldiers, also dispatched at Olney's request, arrived in Chicago. Violent rioting broke out and continued for several days, but after union lead-

ers were arrested and a total of 14,000 federal and state troops sent in to suppress the disorder, the Pullman Strike collapsed.³

At the height of the Pullman struggle, an editorial in the *Review and Herald* described the controversy as “the most gigantic strike ever known in the United States, and perhaps in the world.” According to the *Review*, the strike was caused by traveling agitators who urged railroad men “to fight to the bitter end,” leaving railroad owners justly enraged at the “entirely unnecessary paralysis of their traffic and the interruption of the business of the country.”⁴ When the strike ended, as it was “sure to do,” the *Review* noted “the decided loss in popular support for the strikers,” and concluded that labor unions were probably of no real benefit “even to the laboring man himself.” The law of supply and demand controls the price of labor, wrote M. E. Kellogg; only general prosperity, not union organization, could increase wages. To G. C. Tenney, another *Review* editor, the boycott had been simply “a gigantic and unjustifiable strike at the heart of the country’s commercial life.”⁵

Conscious or unconscious predispositions, however, or unawareness of critical details, fundamentally affected the Adventist response. The *Review and Herald*, official voice of the church, declined to examine the “real or fancied grievances” of the workmen. It overlooked that the railroad owners, far from being surprised by the strike, had deliberately chosen to become involved, hoping to destroy the American Railway Union. While making a point of the ultimate failure of the strike, the *Review* did not mention the part played by railroad-hired deputies in bringing about that failure; it ignored the role of government officials openly sympathetic to the railroads, particularly Attorney-General Olney, a former railway lawyer and a member of the board of several railroads.⁶ Though the editors of the *Review*, writing only weeks after the strike, could hardly have been expected to have had the benefit of a historical perspective, nevertheless these examples are rather typical of the early Adventist attitudes toward labor incidents:

. . . although it may now subside, and all

things again take their normal course, we shall see the same thing again probably far more intensified; for we are in the last days, and “distress of nations with perplexity,” is one of the evidences of the nearness of the coming of Him who “shall reign in righteousness.”⁷

Seventh-day Adventists very early adopted prevalent notions linking labor unions and strikes with the communist “International” movement. Conditioned by their belief in satanic forces behind earthly events, Adventists easily concluded that labor turmoil stemmed from a global, godless conspiracy. The Railway Strikes of 1877, touched off by a ten percent reduction in wages on eastern railroads, provide one example. Overlooking previous wage cuts totaling 35 percent in three years and longstanding worker resentment over arbitrary treatment by their employers, newspaper editorials across the country denounced the spreading violence as the work of communist revolutionaries. The headline of one paper announced “Chicago in the Possession of Communists.”⁸ Uriah Smith, successor to James White as editor of the *Review and Herald*, followed this lead in attributing the strikes to communist agitation:

Since the recent strike in this country with its accompanying riot, pillage and arson, it is ascertained that these troubles can be traced to the International Society of the United States, and that the great masses of American workmen are united in this secret organization. Surely the elements are rapidly accumulating for a time of trouble such as never was.⁹

Communism loomed as a threat to all cherished social, political and religious standards. The “International,” according to another 1877 article in the *Review*, was “the declared enemy . . . of every country and every religion, atheistical, anarchical and subversive of established notions of right and justice.” The bloody Paris Commune of 1871 excited fears of similar socialist uprisings in the United States: “To anyone not bereft of reason it is easy to see that [communism] would lead to the extinction of per-

sonal enterprise, to the arrest of the progressive march of the age, to moral stagnation and to social degradation.”¹⁰ Since this was their view of communism, Adventists not surprisingly saw labor organizations, which they believed to be associated with it, as tainted with similar evil characteristics.

To many in the nineteenth century, Adventists among them, communism was not the only dangerous foreign group bent on the overthrow of American government. Throughout the country, sentiment against socialists and immigrants ran strong; anarchism nearly caused hysteria. In May 1886, a

“Bolstered by faith in their prophetic guidance, Adventists confidently maintained that all labor organizations were evil. But this confidence often colored or blurred their perception of events. . . .”

bomb exploded while anarchist leaders addressed a crowd in Chicago’s Haymarket Square, touching off a riot that left 11 persons dead. Correctly or not, the anarchists were universally blamed for the bombing. Although organized labor joined in condemning the anarchists, the public generally associated labor with the incident as well.¹¹ And only a few months later, this theme also appeared in a *Review and Herald* article drawing connections between labor union activities and “foreign anarchists.”¹²

Large numbers of the immigrants pouring into America from Europe in the late nineteenth century were laborers who joined the early labor unions. As a result, unions became a target for the widespread distrust of all foreign-born. By 1893, the *Review* was warning that “all the trades-unions of the country are controlled by foreigners, who comprise the great majority of their members.”¹³ Though this may have matched the popular mood in the America of the 1890s, it remains a strikingly xenophobic statement for a people claiming to be a worldwide

church. Nor had this attitude died by 1905 when the *Review* was still linking international socialism with general strikes.¹⁴

Like a majority of Protestant clergy, Adventist leaders spoke out not only against socialists but also against “oath-bound secret societies” such as the Knights of Labor which these conservative churches feared might become socialistic.¹⁵ The tendency of early trade union movements to imitate the forms of Masonic orders was itself a cause of suspicion. In an 1872 article, G. I. Butler, president of the General Conference and later an editor of the *Review and Herald*, focused on the similarity of labor unions to organizations such as the Masons or Odd Fellows. To him, even the Grange was a suspect secret brotherhood, and it was obvious that these “secret combinations” such as the Crispins (a relatively innocuous shoemakers’ union with primarily political activities) were the cause of recent strikes in large cities. “Their secrecy and exclusiveness,” he wrote, “are contrary to the genius of the religion we profess.” Their “gripes and passwords” represented “a fragment of the dark ages of popery and monkish cunning.”¹⁶

Distrust of secret societies and organizations was not new with Adventism or Gilded-Age Protestantism. An active movement in the 1820s and 1830s had attacked the Masonic order as antireligious and undemocratic. It originated, interestingly, in the same western Vermont and upstate New York district, and at nearly the same time, as the millennialist movement of William Miller from which came the first Seventh-day Adventists.¹⁷ When she wrote about secret societies, Ellen G. White stressed their oaths of absolute loyalty to the order, employing many of the same arguments used earlier by the Antimasons.¹⁸

Adventist leaders did not seem to recognize that secrecy was almost a necessity for the early labor organizations. Workers who joined unions could be, and often were, victims of oppression by employers. Union members might be blacklisted or arbitrarily discharged; some suffered physical abuse. After the “Molly Maguire Riots” of 1875–76, though, secrecy became a disadvantage as the public began to associate secret labor

societies with criminal activity, riots and murder.¹⁹ Ironically, it was mainly Catholic pressure against the pseudoreligious elements of labor movements which forced the Knights of Labor, originally a secret order, to abandon much of their secrecy by 1879-81²⁰

In 1886, the *Review and Herald* was still denouncing "secret" labor organizations.²¹ With the decline of the old Knights of Labor and the rise of the new and more open American Federation of Labor (AFL) during the late 1880s, however, secrecy was no longer a major issue. Even so, some writers for the *Review* continued to treat labor unions and secret societies as nearly synonymous.²²

As fears of foreign conspiracy and secret organizations diminished, apprehension was focused on the Catholic church as the threat behind labor agitation. Predominantly Protestant rural America instinctively distrusted Catholics as much as socialists or immigrants. Catholic recognition of efforts by the emerging AFL to gain tangible benefits for its members increased these misgivings. For example, when the Federation announced, months in advance, a strike for an eight-hour workday in the carpentry trade, the *Review and Herald* noted the development without much comment.²³ Announcement of a Catholic plan to moderate the conflict, however, prompted a sharp response: "The astute Leo is not slow to utilize this movement, as he has others of less magnitude, to the exaltation of that system of which he is the head. . . . It is not for the papacy to remain inactive at such a time." Without discussing either the justice of labor's demands for improved working conditions or the merits of the pope's proposal, the article nonetheless urgently warned against the "forces of Rome."²⁴

Anxiety about Catholicism's manipulating the labor movement was heightened when the pope in 1891 announced that the church should become more involved in social reforms. In his encyclical *Rerum novarum* ("Of New Things"), Leo XIII rejected socialism but deplored the dehumanization of workers by unrestrained capitalism.²⁵ To Adventists, with their distinctive views of

prophecy and eschatology, his encouragement of formation of Catholic trade unions suggested that unions were instruments of the Catholic church. By 1905, the *Review* reported that the AFL was controlled by Catholics and offered this remarkable prediction:

The boycott is the favorite weapon of the labor unions; a majority of the members of the American Federation of Labor, an organization composed of many labor unions, are Catholics. Catholics do not hesitate to make use of any organization through which it [*sic*] can further the interests of the church; when by a federation with apostate Protestantism and spiritualism the Catholic Church becomes the ruling religious element in this country, it will have the machinery already in running order for declaring a general boycott against those who refuse to worship the beast and his image or to receive his mark, . . . The Catholic Church never changes.²⁶

"The collective economic power exercised by unions raised the spectre of the 'mark of the beast' in Adventist minds. Many now felt that . . . labor unions might be used to enforce the Sunday laws they so dreaded."

The collective economic power exercised by unions raised the spectre of the "mark of the beast" in Adventist minds. They had long held that the prophecy of Revelation 13 referred to Sunday worship as a symbol of allegiance to Roman Catholicism.²⁷ Many now felt that under Catholic influence labor unions might be used to enforce the Sunday laws they so dreaded. Those who would not submit to this false religious authority, they believed, would be prevented from conducting business. "This is the modern boycott described in Biblical language," declared one writer. Ellen White added that those who refused to join unions would become "marked men." This volatile and rather

speculative theme linking union membership with the mark of the beast appeared repeatedly in the pages of the *Review*, especially after 1900.²⁸

Perhaps the most conspicuous cultural influence emerging from Adventist comments on labor, though, is a commitment to the ideal of self-sufficient individualism. The pioneering, equalitarian nature of nineteenth-century American society fostered a spirit of rugged independence. The Protestant ethic and concepts of free moral choice led many to adopt Social Darwinism's rationalization that the poor were poor because they were not fit to be rich. Seventh-day Adventists did not escape the influences of this individualistic philosophy. While Ellen White appealed for church members to work personally for the oppressed in the cities, she warned that joining trade unions would destroy individuality.²⁹

L. A. Smith, an associate editor of the *Review and Herald*, was especially vocal in supporting the right to work without joining a union, but the timing of his remarks is highly significant. President Theodore Roosevelt's intervention in the Coal Strike of 1902, appointing an arbitration commission which ultimately granted several of the miners' demands for better working conditions, had stirred widespread concern that unions were gaining excessive power. Beginning in 1903, the National Association of Manufacturers launched a campaign to turn public opinion against labor, attacking the "closed shop" as un-American and claiming that unions oppressed the workers.³⁰ In a series of articles also appearing in 1903, Smith too championed the cause of the "open shop" with emotional and patriotic appeals against anarchy, union monopoly and "government by labor unions." He even advanced the unlikely claim that trade unions would precipitate an industrial depression in which "the great mass of the unemployed will become desperate, and a struggle between them and the labor unions will be the result, attended by terrible rioting and destruction of property and life."³¹ While ready to report on abuses by labor, though, the Adventist press was generally less willing to admit the comparable practices of business.³²

One reason Adventists hesitated to support labor organizations as a step toward improvement of industrial conditions was their sincere belief that unions could not actually obtain benefits for workers. Trade unions, they argued, "are the greatest enemies of the workingman. Laboring men have suffered more from them than from oppressive employers." The struggles of the unions were often lightly dismissed as "utter blindness and folly," vain efforts with no chance of success.³³

If unions were an advantage to laboring men, reasoned M. E. Kellogg after the Pullman Strike of 1894, then workers should have been prosperous because the number of trade organizations had grown so large. In 1872, G. I. Butler wrote that even if unions could increase wages in all trades, workers would not benefit because prices would also rise.³⁴ It is true that prices might indeed have risen. But this approach assumed that producers could simply pass all increased costs on to the consumer. It did not consider the possibility that much of the cost of higher wages might have come instead from inflated profits because factory owners may not have been able, given nineteenth-century economic conditions, to further raise their prices in proportion. And it overlooked the dilemma posed by an isolated worker's unequal bargaining position against industrial employers not unwilling to organize and exercise their monopsony position against him. Such elementary logic may have been valid within the context of established notions of laissez-faire individualism, but it certainly failed to answer the problems of economic reality. It was more nearly a reflection of Adventism's conservative, agrarian background and lack of contact with the laboring classes.

In contrast to these cultural fears and prejudices which provoked such hostility toward organized labor, the theological arguments voiced in the *Review and Herald* were directed less against unions themselves than just against Adventist participation in them. Ellen G. White spoke very strongly against church members' becoming associated with secular labor organizations: "Those who

claim to be the children of God are in no case to bind up with the labor unions that are formed or that shall be formed. This the Lord forbids.”³⁵ Such seemingly unconditional counsel from one considered a messenger of God would obviously exert a considerable influence on other denominational leaders.

Ellen White repeatedly warned against joining unions and often condemned the lawless tactics employed by some labor groups.

“Rejection of the ‘here and now’ was basic to the early Adventist view of labor. They were a people with a mission. As Christians, they were seeking another world, and wages were not to be their concern.”

She did not, however, oppose the basic objectives — fair wages, decent working conditions and humane treatment — which they sought. Her earlier writings discussed only just wages and the problems of poverty; not until 1902 did she even specifically mention labor unions. She instructed church members to pay liberal wages to their employees. She deplored the miserable condition of the poor in large cities and urged individuals to aid the oppressed. She acknowledged that poverty may be the result of misfortune rather than indolence. These were progressive concepts in the nineteenth century.³⁶

Despite this apparent sympathy with the goals of labor, Adventists continued to oppose union membership on theological grounds: “The trades unions and confederacies of the world are a snare. Keep out of them and away from them, brethren. Have nothing to do with them.”³⁷ The biblical command not to be “unequally yoked together with unbelievers,” they felt, encompassed business associations and plainly applied to labor unions. Joining a union meant surrendering freedom of control over

one’s hours and wages to the organization, according to the *Review*, “in flagrant contradiction to the principles of the gospel.” Worse yet, no matter what his personal stand might be, every member of a union would bear full moral responsibility for any and all actions of the group, merely by virtue of his membership.³⁸

Union members in reality often acted quite independently, but Seventh-day Adventists subscribed to the currently popular belief in dictatorial control by union organizers. In 1886, L. A. Smith denounced “the tyranny of these secret organizations” whose “voice sounding from head-quarters must be obeyed as law.” Adventists not surprisingly perceived a threat to their own religious freedom in what they saw as the unions’ centralized authority. Though union leadership had, in fact, disapproved of the strike which he used as an example, Smith wrote that workers could give no other reason for their actions than an order from their leaders:

The members of the Knights of Labor obeyed without hesitating the command for the strike on the Missouri Pacific, notwithstanding their own interests were deeply involved. Would the same men heed less readily a command from the same source for the ostracizing of those who will not pay homage to the first day of the week?³⁹

At times, both Ellen White and writers for the *Review and Herald* acknowledged the injustices of the existing system. As early as 1877, for instance, Uriah Smith pointed to the condition of Pennsylvania coal miners “on the verge of starvation” demonstrating, he said, the “greed and oppression of capitalists.”⁴⁰ But for them, social inequities could never justify organization against established order, especially if opposition involved violence.⁴¹ They seemed more comfortable with a surface calm of passive submission to the industrial barons than with the confrontations that resulted when workers took direct action such as a strike or boycott trying to improve the conditions under which they worked. Ellen White particularly stressed the violent nature of labor organizations: “Violence and death mean nothing to them if their unions are opposed.”⁴²

Adventists, however, did not seem to always understand the nature and causes of labor violence. The *Review and Herald* in 1890 quoted with disapproval an article from the *Journal of the Knights of Labor* which argued that violence was preferable to submission and subjugation and warned that labor would organize secretly if not allowed to do so openly. Uriah Smith obviously could not accept these “frightful” possibilities. Yet, despite Adventists’ previous condemnation of secret societies, Smith appears to have entirely overlooked the article’s primary message that refusing to recognize labor organizations would merely force workers into secrecy, multiplying the dangers of crime and violence.⁴³ That “strikers have no respect whatever for any civil authority”⁴⁴ was the common belief.

Seventh-day Adventists frequently proclaimed the violence of the evolving labor movement as a “sign of the end.” The response to the disorder accompanying the 1894 Pullman Strike was only one example of this often-repeated theme.⁴⁵ Nearness of the end of the world was a fervent conviction of these early Adventists. In light of subsequent history, the actual prophetic significance of the unrest so vividly described might be debatable, but warnings of approaching doom were certainly consistent with the theology of the church and its sense of advent mission. And this mood was accentuated by the admonitions of Ellen White who wrote that labor unions would become “very oppressive” and would prove instrumental in bringing “a time of trouble such as has not been since the world began.” “Can [the people of God] not see,” she cautioned, “in the rapid growth of trades unions, the fulfilling of the signs of the times?”⁴⁶

But above and beyond anything else, in the final analysis problems of labor were only “a matter of secondary importance” to early Seventh-day Adventists. Their thoughts were on eternity as they anticipated the shortness of time. Although by 1905 one writer, K. C. Russell, was willing to concede that, in human terms at least, unions were the most effective defense of the laboring man against an oppressive capitalist system, he

immediately added that the Christian who has been “born again” must no longer see from this human point of view.⁴⁷

Rejection of the “here and now” was basic to the early Adventist view of labor. They were a people with a mission. As Christians, they were seeking another world, and wages were not to be their concern. “Let those have this world who will,” advised the *Review and Herald*. Christians were not to worry about the future; without thought or question they should accept God’s plan in faith, “knowing that thus all will be well in this present world, and we will have an abundant entrance into the world to come.”⁴⁸

This kind of statement, though, reflects at least some degree of wishful thinking. Whatever the world to come might be, obviously all was not well in the present world. One need only read works such as Upton Sinclair’s famous *The Jungle* to discover conditions far less than perfect. Wages were not the only complaint of labor; industrial safety precautions were virtually unknown and injury rates were appalling. In 1893, one of every ten railroad workers was injured and one of every 115 killed. The annual injury rate in the Pennsylvania mines during the 1890s was one of every 150; the death rate, one of every 400.⁴⁹

Seventh-day Adventists clearly saw themselves in a unique role. They were a chosen people — God’s true church in the last days — standing apart from the cares of the world:

We have all we can do to attend to our own work and far more than most of us are doing. We should live humbly, faithfully, and righteously in this world of sin. We should be honest in our deal [*sic*] with our neighbors, treat them kindly, and be friendly and courteous to all that we can benefit; but to unite in these worldly organizations, and become absorbed and interested in their objects, we think is contrary to the Scriptures.⁵⁰

To take either side would be a mistake, warned the *Review*: “Rather let us stand where, by our example and influence, we can proclaim the principles of peace and goodwill to all.” Adventists were constantly to look to Christ, wrote Ellen White: “We are now to use all our entrusted capabilities in

giving the last warning message to the world. In this work we are to preserve our individuality. We are not to unite with secret societies or with trade-unions."⁵¹

Adventists could not avoid recognizing that oppression and misery existed. But these, they held, were merely the inevitable result of the "inordinate greed" of man, his selfishness and his sinfulness. Temporary minor improvements in social conditions might be obtained, but Adventists, like most Protestants in general, believed that none of the fundamental problems of the world could be solved until the return of Christ: "[Earthly conditions] will change when Christ comes. In the kingdom of heaven we shall have better times."⁵² In the meantime, though, they often missed the tangible implications of social issues in their eagerness to draw religious conclusions. "If we see others suffering from the oppression of the world," wrote G. C. Tenney in 1894, "let us point them to Christ for rest and to his kingdom as that happy place where the shackles of sin will all be broken."⁵³ This was the Adventist preoccupation. With their vision focused on heaven, they sometimes failed to live in the present, too often misjudged the world around them, occasionally lost sight of a need for "better times" on earth.

It bears repeating that the scope of this article has been limited primarily to the *Review and Herald* and to comments dealing directly

with labor organizations. It has concentrated on exploring the historical context in which these early statements were made. Any attempt at fully understanding the Adventist position on labor would also need to examine a variety of other sources of Adventist thought, especially the writing of Ellen G. White dealing with social injustice and treatment of employees.⁵⁴ Yet, even from this initial inquiry, it is possible to discern some priorities and thought patterns which, in hindsight, made the nineteenth-century Adventist response to the labor movement to a large degree predictable.

Those early Seventh-day Adventists blended a genuine concern for the welfare of individuals, a background of conservative orthodoxy and a generous flavoring of the popular beliefs of the day with their own distinctive theology and a conviction that they were being led by prophetic instruction. While it should be emphasized that the reactions of the editors of the *Review* were certainly not unreasonable considering the information they probably had available to them, neither was their interpretation of the labor movement timeless. Their attitudes reflected a cultural and intellectual provincialism deeply rooted in an earlier revivalist heritage. A twentieth-century reexamination of their conclusions is needed.

Note: An earlier version of this paper was submitted for a seminar in history at Walla Walla College in 1976. I would especially like to thank Professor Carlos Schwantes for his assistance and advice.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. The *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald*, general church paper of the Seventh-day Adventists, first appeared in 1850. It moved several times during its first few years, but from 1855 until 1903 it was published weekly at Battle Creek, Mich., then was again transferred to its present location in Washington, D.C. The periodical is commonly known as the *Review and Herald* or often simply as the *Review*. (Hereafter citations will be to *R&H*.)

2. See, e.g., J. N. Loughborough, *Rise and Progress of Seventh-day Adventists* (n.p., 1892), p. 388.

3. One particularly well-documented study of the Pullman Strike is Almont Lindsey, *The Pullman Strike: The Story of a Unique Experiment and of a Great Labor Upheaval* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942; Phoenix Books, 1964). See also, among others, Joseph G. Rayback, *A History of American Labor* (New York: Macmillan, Free Press, 1966), pp. 201-4; and Foster Rhea Dulles, *Labor in America: A*

History, 3rd ed. (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1966), pp. 171-78.

4. M. E. K[ellogg], "The Great Railroad Strike," *R&H*, 71 (July 10, 1894), 438.

5. M. E. K[ellogg], "Labor Unions," *R&H*, 71 (July 24, 1894), 470-471; and G. C. T[enney], "The Outlook," *R&H*, 71 (Aug. 7, 1894), 502.

6. See Rayback, *History of American Labor*, pp. 201-3. The commission appointed by President Cleveland to investigate the strike concluded that the union was not guilty of provoking the violence and characterized the railroad executives' association as "illegal, dangerous to the public welfare, and wholly unjustifiable." Lindsey, *The Pullman Strike*, p. 120.

7. Kellogg, "The Great Railroad Strike," p. 438.

8. Rayback, *History of American Labor*, pp. 134-35; Dulles, *Labor in America*, p. 121.

9. U[riah] S[mith], "The Outlook," *R&H*, 50 (Oct. 11, 1877), 113.

10. "The Commune," *R&H*, 50 (Oct. 11, 1877), 113. This article was credited to a Philadelphia newspaper. However, when quoting other publications, editors of the *Review* were quick to point out views with which they disagreed. Thus unsigned articles or those reprinted without comment can be assumed to reflect, or at least be consistent with, opinions of the editorial staff. Also see [Uriah Smith], "The International-Communism," *R&H*, 39 (March 26, 1872), 116; "The Internationals," *R&H*, 43 (Jan. 20, 1874), 45; and "The Coming Storm," *R&H*, 62 (Apr. 14, 1885), 240.
11. Dulles, *Labor in America*, pp. 124-25.
12. L. A. S[mith], "A Poor Promise," *R&H*, 63 (Nov. 30, 1886), 752.
13. "American Boys and American Labor," *R&H*, 70 (Aug. 29, 1893), 551. This article is credited to the *Literary Digest* which, in turn, apparently reprinted it from "Topics of the Time: American Boys and American Labor," *Century Magazine*, 46 (May 1893), 151-52.
14. "Note and Comment," *R&H*, 82 (Dec. 7, 1905), 7.
15. See Henry F. May, *Protestant Churches and Industrial America* (New York: Harper & Row, 1949; Harper Torchbooks, 1967), p. 164.
16. George I. Butler, "Secret Societies," *R&H*, 41 (Dec. 17, 1872), 4-5. About the Knights of St. Crispin, see Henry Pelling, *American Labor*, Chicago History of American Civilization (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960), pp. 54-55.
17. Alice Felt Tyler, *Freedom's Ferment: Phases of American Social History from the Colonial Period to the Outbreak of the Civil War* (New York: Harper & Row, Harper Torchbooks, 1962; originally published by University of Minnesota Press, 1944), pp. 68-69, 351. This same area, called the "burned-over district" by some historians because it was swept so often by the flames of various religious revivals, also produced Joseph Smith and Mormonism, and the spirit-rappings of the Fox sisters.
18. Ellen G. White, "Should Christians Be Members of Secret Societies?" (pamphlet, 1893) reprinted in *Documents From the Office of Ellen G. White Publications Concerning Controversial Matters in the Seventh-day Adventist Church: Collection I* (n.p., n.d.). Compare Tyler, *Freedom's Ferment*, pp. 351-58.
19. Following an unsuccessful coal strike in 1875, newspapers reported a rash of murder, assault and arson against mine officials and property. After the mine operators hired a detective, 24 miners were convicted of murder and conspiracy in a secret ring called the "Molly Maguires." Considerable evidence, however, indicates that the entire incident was planned by the mine owners in an attempt to destroy the union. See Pelling, *American Labor*, p. 60; and Rayback, *History of American Labor*, pp. 131-33.
20. Pelling, *American Labor*, p. 65.
21. L. A. S[mith], "The Coming Boycott," *R&H*, 63 (Sept. 14, 1886), 583.
22. See Clarence Santee, "Shall We Join Secret Societies or Unions?," *R&H*, 78 (Dec. 24, 1901), 829; and K. C. Russell, "Seventh-day Adventists and Labor Unions," *R&H*, 82 (Jan. 26, 1905), 9.
23. "A New Eight-Hour Movement," *R&H*, 66 (Jan. 8, 1889), 23; "The Eight-Hour Movement," *R&H*, 67 (Feb. 4, 1890), 71; and "The Eight-Hour Movement," *R&H*, 67 (Apr. 15, 1890), 231. Cf. Pelling, *American Labor*, p. 86.
24. L. A. S[mith], "The Industrial Revolution," *R&H*, 67 (Apr. 29, 1890), 267.
25. See Norman Rich, *The Age of Nationalism and Reform, 1850-1890*, Norton History of Modern Europe (New York: W. W. Norton, 1970), p. 20.
26. "Labor Organizations and Catholicism," *R&H*, 82 (July 27, 1905), 5-6. Abandoning earlier claims, the *Review* now argued that socialists were trying to destroy the labor movement because it was Catholic-controlled.
27. See especially Uriah Smith, *Daniel and the Revelation: The Response of History to the Voice of Prophecy* (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1897), pp. 595-624, 668 [rev. ed., *The Prophecies of Daniel and the Revelation* (Nashville, Tenn.: Southern Publishing Assn., 1946), pp. 601-19, 667].
28. L. A. Smith, "The Coming Boycott," p. 583; and Ellen G. White, Letter 26, 1903, quoted in Ellen G. White, *Selected Messages*, 2 vols. (Washington, D.C.: Review & Herald Publishing Assn., 1958), II, 142. See also Santee, "Shall We Join Secret Societies or Unions?," p. 829; L. A. S[mith], "Some Aspects of the Labor Question," *R&H*, 80 (Dec. 31, 1903), 5; and L. A. S[mith], "The Latest Development of Labor Unionism," *R&H*, 81 (Feb. 11, 1904), 6.
29. Ellen G. White, *Testimonies for the Church*, 9 vols. (Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press Publishing Assn., 1885-1909), 6 (1900), 275-76 and 7 (1902), 84.
30. Dulles, *Labor in America*, pp. 190-95; Rayback, *History of American Labor*, pp. 210-15.
31. L. A. S[mith], "A Despotism Principle," *R&H*, 80 (Oct. 15, 1903), 7; see also "The Government Versus the Labor Unions," *R&H*, 80 (Oct. 1, 1903), 5; "The Danger of Irresponsible Power," *R&H*, 80 (Oct. 15, 1903), 6; "A State Greater Than the Union," *R&H*, 80 (Dec. 10, 1903), 5; and "Some Aspects of the Labor Question," *R&H*, 80 (Dec. 31, 1903), 5; all by L. A. Smith.
32. For instance, compare L. A. Smith, "The Latest Development of Labor Unionism," with the conclusion of the original article from which Smith draws: ". . . the methods employed by the new unionism . . . are essentially similar to those employed by capitalistic combinations. . . . It is as necessary to commend and encourage the able and honest labor leaders as it is to fight the corrupt boss. . . ." Ray Stannard Baker, "A Corner in Labor: What Is Happening in San Francisco Where Unionism Holds Undisputed Sway," *McClure's Magazine*, 22 (February 1904), 378.
33. "The Labor Question," *R&H*, 77 (Dec. 18, 1900): 803; "The Strikes in England," *R&H*, 53 (Feb. 27, 1879), 68.
34. Kellogg, "Labor Unions," p. 470; and Butler, "Secret Societies," p. 5.
35. Ellen G. White, Letter 201, 1902, quoted in Ellen G. White, *Counsels From the Spirit of Prophecy on Labor Unions and Confederacies*, comp. Dept. of Public Affairs and Religious Liberty (Takoma Park, Md.: General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, n.d.; hereafter cited as *Counsels*), p. 7.
36. White, *Testimonies*, 2 (1885; published as pamphlets, 1868-71), 156-61, and 6 (1900), 273-80.
37. L. A. S[mith], "The Spirit of Worldly Confederacies," *R&H*, 80 (Oct. 1, 1903), 4, quoting Ellen

G. White from *General Conference Bulletin* (Apr. 6, 1903), pp. 87-88; partially reprinted in White, *Selected Messages*, II, 142; and in White, *Counsels*, p. 8.

38. Russell, "Seventh-day Adventists and Labor Unions," p. 9; Butler, "Secret Societies," pp. 5-6; and G[eorge] I. B[utler], "Seventh-day Adventists and Labor Unions," *R&H*, 63 (June 22, 1886), 392.

39. L. A. Smith, "The Coming Boycott," p. 583. Compare Ellen G. White, Manuscript 145, 1902, quoted in *Counsels*, p. 5. But see Dulles, *Labor in America*, pp. 133, 143; and Rayback, *History of American Labor*, p. 162.

40. Uriah Smith, "The Outlook," p. 113; cf. "A Sad Report," *R&H*, 50 (Oct. 11, 1877), 114.

41. See especially "The Labor Question," p. 803.

42. Ellen G. White, Letter 93, 1904, quoted in *Counsels*, p. 10. See also Ellen G. White, Letter 292, 1907, in *Counsels*, p. 11.

43. [Uriah Smith], "Mutterings of the Coming Storm," *R&H*, 67 (Dec. 9, 1890), 760-61. The article is unsigned, but has been attributed to Smith, who was editor at that time.

44. Editorial, *R&H*, 76 (Aug. 1, 1899), 492.

45. Also see Uriah Smith, "The Outlook," p. 113; G. C. T[enney], "Be Patient, Therefore, Brethren," *R&H*, 71 (May 15, 1894), 310; editorial, *R&H*, 76 (July 25, 1899), 476; and editorial, *R&H*, 76 (Aug. 1, 1899), 492.

46. Ellen G. White, Letter 5, 1904, quoted in *Selected*

Messages, II, 141; White, Letter 200, 1903, quoted in *Selected Messages*, II, 142; and White, Letter 93, 1904, quoted in *Counsels*, p. 10.

47. Russell, "Seventh-day Adventists and Labor Unions," p. 9. See also Tenney, "Be Patient, Therefore, Brethren," p. 310. Cf. "The Labor Question," pp. 803-4.

48. "The Labor Question," p. 804; and Santee, "Shall We Join Secret Societies or Unions?," p. 829.

49. Pelling, *American Labor*, p. 81.

50. Butler, "Seventh-day Adventists and Labor Unions," p. 392.

51. Tenney, "Be Patient, Therefore, Brethren," p. 310; and White, *Testimonies*, 7 (1902), 84.

52. G. C. T[enney], "Are Better Times Coming?" *R&H*, 71 (July 3, 1894), 420. Compare Herbert G. Gutman, "Protestantism and the American Labor Movement: The Christian Spirit in the Gilded Age," *American Historical Review*, 72 (October 1966), 76.

53. G. C. T[enney], "Lawlessness vs. Christianity," *R&H*, 71 (June 19, 1894), 392. See also J. O. Corliss, "A Terrible Calamity," *R&H*, 70 (June 20, 1893), 331.

54. For one such more general analysis, see the article by Carlos A. Schwantes, "Seventh-day Adventists and Organized Labor: The Formative Years, 1877-1903," *Adventist Heritage*, 4 (Winter 1977), 11-19.