

Commentaries on *The White Lie*
How Long Must Adventist Women Wait?
Faculty Reductions: 1982-1983

SPECTRUM

A Quarterly Journal of the Association of Adventist Forums

Volume 12, Number 4

ELLEN WHITE AND INTERPRETATION OF SCRIPTURE

Amalgamation of Man and Beast
The Sanctuary Doctrine
Prophecies of Revelation

SPECTRUM

Editor

Roy Branson

Associate Editor

Charles Scriven

Senior Editor

Tom Dybdahl

News Editor

Bonnie Dwyer

Manuscript Editor

Gene Daffern

Book Review Editors

Peggy Corbett

Kelowna, British Columbia

Rennie Schoepflin

University of Wisconsin

Editorial Board

Roy Branson

Ethics, Kennedy Institute
Georgetown University

Molleurus Couperus

Physician
Angwin, California

Bonnie Dwyer

Journalism
Loma Linda, California

Tomy Dybdahl

Editor
Allentown, Pennsylvania

Alvin L. Kwiram

Chemistry
University of Washington

Gary Land

History
Andrews University

Rennie Schoepflin

History
University of Wisconsin

Charles Scriven

Theology
Walla Walla College

Otilie Stafford

English
Atlantic Union College

Consulting Editors

Earl W. Amundson

President
Atlantic Union Conference

Eric Anderson

History
Pacific Union College

Roy Benton

Mathematics
Columbia Union College

Geri Fuller-Col

Public Relations
Washington, D.C.

Raymond Cottrell

Theology
Loma Linda, California

Gene Daffern

Physician
Washington, D.C.

Lawrence Geraty

Old Testament
SDA Theological Seminary

Fritz Guy

Theology
SDA Theological Seminary

F.E.J. Harder

Educational Administration
College Place, Washington

Jorgen Henrikson

Artist
Boston, Massachusetts

Edward Lugeneal

Anthropology
Berrien Springs, Michigan

Margaret McFarland

Attorney
Washington, D.C.

LaVonne Neff

Publishing
Downers Grove, Illinois

Ronald Numbers

History of Medicine
University of Wisconsin

Gary Patterson

President
Georgia-Cumberland Conference

Edward E. Robinson

Attorney
Chicago, Illinois

Gerhard Svrcek-Seiler

Psychiatrist
Vienna, Austria

Carolyn Stevens

English
Walla Walla College

Helen Ward Thompson

Administration
Walla Walla College

L. E. Tridder

Education
Marienhoehe Gymnasium
West Germany

Louis Venden

Pastor
Loma Linda University Church

Association of Adventist Forums

Executive Committee

President

Glenn E. Coe

State's Attorney
West Hartford, Connecticut

Vice President

Lyndrey A. Niles

Communications
Howard University, Washington, D.C.

Executive Secretary

Claire Hosten

Attorney
Washington, D.C.

Treasurer

Richard C. Osborn

Principal
Takoma Academy
Takoma Park, Maryland

Directors

Of International Relations

Molleurus Couperus

Physician
Angwin, California

Of Membership

Ronald D. Cople

Business
Silver Spring, Maryland

Staff

Legal Consultant

Bradley Litchfield

Attorney
Washington, D.C.

Systems Manager

Don McNeil

Computer Programmer
Spencerville, Maryland

Regional Representatives

Atlantic

Richard B. Lewis, Jr.

Advertising
Boston, Massachusetts

Central

Darrell J. Huenergardt

Attorney
Kimball, Nebraska

Central Pacific

Guy D. Cochran

Dental Surgeon
Palo Alto, California

Columbia

E. Theodore Agard

Radiation Physicist
Kettering Medical Center
Kettering, Ohio

Northern Pacific

John Brunt

Theology
Walla Walla College
College Place, Washington

Southern

T. Grace Emori

Nursing
Atlanta, Georgia

Southern Pacific

Mike Scofield

Business
Monterey Park, California

SPECTRUM is a journal established to encourage Seventh-day Adventist participation in the discussion of contemporary issues from a Christian viewpoint, to look without prejudice at all sides of a subject, to evaluate the merits of diverse views, and to foster Christian intellectual and cultural growth. Although effort is made to ensure accurate scholarship and discriminating judgment, the statements of fact are the responsibility of contributors, and the views individual authors express are not necessarily those of the editorial staff as a whole or as individuals.

The Association of Adventist Forums is a nonsubsidized, nonprofit organization for which gifts are deductible in the report of income for purposes of taxation. The publishing of SPECTRUM depends on subscriptions, gifts from individuals and the voluntary efforts of the contributors and the staff.

Editorial Correspondence: SPECTRUM is published quarterly by the Association of Adventist Forums. Direct all editorial correspondence to SPECTRUM, Box 5330, Takoma Park, Maryland 20912. Manuscripts should be typewritten, double spaced and in matters of style and documentation, conform to *A Manual of Style* (University of Chicago Press). Submit the original and two copies, along with a self-addressed, stamped envelope. Responses from readers may be shortened before publication.

Subscription Information: In order to receive SPECTRUM, send a membership fee (\$15 per 4 issues, except \$18 in Canada and in other foreign countries; \$2 less for students) to Association of Adventist Forums, Box 5330, Takoma Park, Maryland 20912. Single copies may be purchased for \$4. Pay by check made out to the Association of Adventist Forums. For address changes, send old address label along with the new address.

In This Issue

Volume Twelve, Number Four, Published June 1982

DYRE DYRESEN
9092 WOODLAND DRIVE
BERRIEN SPGS, MI 49103

SPECIAL SECTION: Ellen White and the Interpretation of Scripture

Is Ellen White's Interpretation of Biblical Prophecy Final?	Donald Casebolt	2
Amalgamation of Man and Beast	Gordon Shigley	10
Ellen White and Doctrinal Conflict: Context of the 1919 Bible Conference	Bert Haloviak with Gary Land	19

REPORTS

College Faculty Reductions, 1982-1983	Harold Hopp and Rick Rubner	35
How Long Must Women Wait?	Janice Eiseman Daffern	39

REVIEWS

<i>The White Lie</i> , by Walter Rea	Jonathan Butler	44
	Alden Thompson	48
<i>Tell it to the World: The Story of Seventh-day Adventists</i> , by C. Mervyn Maxwell	Benjamin McArthur	55
<i>Parochialism and the Courts</i> , by Dale E. Twomley	Robert G. Higgins	56

RESPONSES

		57
--	--	----

UPDATE

Davenport, Pacific Press Case, EGW Project	Bonnie Dwyer	63
--	--------------	----

About This Issue

The essays in this issue recounting debates about Ellen White's interpretation of biblical passages make one thing clear: Vigorous discussions of her authority are not peculiar to our time. Walter Rea's compilation of parallels between Mrs. White's work and other writings has elicited strongly worded reviews from two Adventist professors, Jonathan Butler and Alden Thompson, who have themselves written and lectured on Ellen White.

Significant changes have recently taken place in the SPECTRUM staff. "Update," a new department in SPECTRUM, reflects the addition of Bonnie Dwyer, introduced in the last issue as the news editor. Richard Emmerson, professor of English at Walla Walla College, has decided to devote further time to an expanding scholarly career. He relinquishes the post of executive editor which he filled with energy and distinction for five years. He has graciously agreed to continue as a member of the editorial board. Since the printing of SPECTRUM is shifting to the greater Washington, D.C., area, Sandy Clayton-Emmerson will also not be continuing her efficient work as an editorial assistant.

Charles Scriven, a member of the theology faculty of Walla Walla College, re-

emerges from the editorial board to assume the post of associate editor. In addition to writing readable books on theology, he was the shaping force at the founding of *Insight* and co-editor of SPECTRUM at a critical period in its history.

Tom Dybdahl, Assistant to the chairman of Rodale Press, becomes Senior Editor, working on special projects. After receiving an M. Div. from Andrews University, Tom became the first Adventist to earn a Masters' degree from the Columbia School of Journalism. Among other posts, he was the Administrative Assistant to a U.S. congressman. He has written widely in Adventist publications, including SPECTRUM.

A former student of Scriven's, Gene Daffern, now a physician in the Washington, D.C., area, joins SPECTRUM as the manuscript editor. At Walla Walla College and at Loma Linda University, he edited student papers, and is presently managing editor of the AAF newsletter, *Forum*. As he has for this issue, Gene will review all SPECTRUM material through various stages of production. Finally and happily, Vinette Anderson, formerly a secretary at the United Nations and at the World Bank, has agreed to become the secretary for both SPECTRUM and AAF.

—The Editor

Is Ellen White's Interpretation of Biblical Prophecy Final?

by Donald Casebolt

No doubt a major cause of the present ferment within the Seventh-day Adventist denomination is caused by disappointment that events considered to be fulfillments of end-time prophecies have not led to the Second Coming. After all, the church was founded by Seventh-day Adventist pioneers who were convicted that prophecies were being fulfilled very rapidly.

Now, as Adventists struggle to understand more fully the Second Coming of Christ, they are returning to Scripture to see if it has been correctly understood. We are convinced that it must be Scripture, not our forebears, however revered, which must determine our beliefs about the return of Christ. This article will examine the basic approach of the early Adventist expositors, the limitations of their verse-by-verse commentaries of prophecy, and Mrs. White's adoption of their faulty conclusions.

Early Adventist leaders were convinced that a great many of the end-time prophecies were being fulfilled very rapidly. The Lisbon earthquake of 1755, the Dark Day of 1780, the captivity of Pope Pius VI in 1798, and the falling of the stars in 1833 had all taken place within recent memory. Even more striking, however, was the fact that Turkey lapsed into impotency in 1840, apparently on the exact day that

Josiah Litch had predicted, according to his interpretation of Revelation 9. This gave tremendous impetus and credibility to the 1843–1844 predictions. Until these predictions failed, last day events linked with prophecy seemed to be unerringly homing in on the world—like successive cannon blasts, with the next shot due to explode at the climax of earth's history.

Early Adventist expositors interpreted the book of Revelation by using a principle of interpretation known as the continuous-historical approach. Expositors using this approach center their efforts on “endeavoring to select events in history which might possibly be fulfillments of the prophecies of the book [of Revelation].”¹ The inherent danger in applying this approach is that expositors may force historical events onto a text without adequate support. Besides straining the biblical text, this also involves an unjustified selective application of historical documents. Two examples where this has actually taken place will be examined: 1) the seven trumpets of Revelation 8:6–9, 21; and 2) the shaking of the heavens and the earth of Revelation 6:12–17.

Before examining Revelation 8:6–9, 21, it is vital to have a clear conception of the context. The sixth chapter of Revelation concerns the opening of the seven seals, the sixth of which brings us up to the time when the inhabitants of the earth exclaim “the great day of their [God and the Lamb] wrath has come.”²

Don Casebolt is a graduate of Andrews University and did graduate work at the University of Chicago. He now lives in Roseburg, Oregon.

After this I [John] saw four angels standing at the four corners of the earth, holding back the four winds of the earth, so that no wind should blow on the earth or on the sea or on any tree. And I saw another angel ascending from the rising of the sun having the seal of the living God; and he cried out with a loud voice to the four angels to whom it was granted to harm the earth and the sea saying, "Do not harm the earth or the sea or the trees, until we have sealed the bond-servants of our God on their foreheads." And I heard the number of those who were sealed one hundred and forty-four thousand sealed from every tribe of the sons of Israel (Rev. 7:1-4).

Note that the earth, trees, and sea are not to be harmed until the sealing is accomplished. The tense of the verb "to seal" in verse four indicates sealing has been accomplished.³ After an enumeration of the sealed group, Revelation 8:1 describes the breaking of the seventh seal. There follows in Revelation 8:7 the description of the first two trumpets. Here *immediately* after the sealing has taken place we find that the earth, trees and sea are damaged. "A third of the earth was burnt up and a third of the trees were burnt up, and . . . fire was thrown into the sea and a third of the sea became blood." Moreover, when we reach the fifth trumpet we learn that the locusts are commanded to hurt "only the men who do not have the seal of God on their foreheads" (Rev. 9:4). Thus it is clear that the events of the seven trumpets follow the sealing. Since the sealing occurs right after the announcement that the day of God's wrath "has come" it is virtually impossible to place the events of the first six trumpets within a historical framework circa 400-1840 A.D.

With the chronological position of the seven trumpets established, one must determine their topological extent. To do so one must understand biblical cosmology (the study of how the universe is structured). The basis for biblical cosmology is found in the Genesis account of creation. Here the first

six days are arranged into two corresponding groups of threes.

Day	Event	Realm
1	Light/Darkness	I Heavens
2	Water/Atmosphere	II Seas
3	Earth/Vegetation	III Earth
4	Heavenly Bodies	I Heavens
5	Sea & Sky Creatures	II Seas
6	Land Creatures	III Earth
7	Sabbath Rest	

This three-tiered scheme is found throughout Revelation and the rest of the Bible. In different passages they may be mentioned with slight variations. The familiar text of Revelation 14:7 commands us to "worship Him who made (1) the heaven and (2) the earth and (3) sea and springs of waters." Other texts include Revelation 5:13; 10:6; and 11:6. This principle is already well established in Old Testament passages that speak of God's great day of judgment. For example, in Zechariah 1:2-3 we read:

"I will completely remove all things from the face of the *earth*," declares the Lord. "I will remove man and beast. I will remove the birds of the *sky* and the fish of the *sea*."

In both Old and New Testaments, when these three realms are mentioned, the scope involved is *universal* and cannot be limited to one geographical area.

Returning to the seven trumpets of Revelation 8, we see that the action there involves all three of these realms:

1st Trumpet	Earth (trees and grass)	8:7
2nd Trumpet	Sea (ships and sea life)	8:8-9
3rd Trumpet	Rivers & Fountains	8:10-11
4th Trumpet	Sun, Moon & Stars	8:12

Thus, there can be no doubt that the scope of the seven trumpets is universal, as is the scope of the seven bowls—popularly known as the seven last plagues—which are similarly structured.

However, upon examining typical Adventist exposition,⁴ we find that these basic

chronological and spatial structuring principals have been entirely overlooked. Instead, Uriah Smith—for example—in *Daniel and the Revelation*, makes the gratuitous assumption: “The blowing of the trumpets . . . comes as a complement to the prophecy of Daniel 2 and 7. . . . In the first four trumpets, we have a description of the special events which marked Rome’s fall” (p. 475). There is no textual or logical basis for this assertion, but once it is made, all that remains is for the interpreter to find some semblance of a connection between a word in the text and an historical event that occurred in Rome’s fall. The remainder of Smith’s verse-by-verse commentary on the seven trumpets is just such an effort, and an exhaustive analysis of his interpretation is unnecessary. An example or two suffice to illustrate the superficiality of the connections he draws. Regarding the first trumpet he states:

The terrible effects of this Gothic invasion are represented as “hail,” from the northern origin of the invaders; “fire,” from the destruction by flame of both city and country; and “blood,” from the terrible slaughter of the citizens of the empire by the bold and intrepid warriors (p. 476).

The connection he makes between hail and the northern origin of the Goths is purely arbitrary, for all the barbarian invasions came down on Rome from the North. Also, it is obvious that virtually any invasion throughout the millenia has involved destruction by fire and the shedding of blood. There is nothing in the text that can be specifically tied to the Goths.

According to Smith, it is very clear that the fifth and sixth trumpets describe the Saracens’ and Turks’ assault on the Eastern part of the Roman empire. “It is so obvious that it can scarcely be misunderstood,” says he (p. 493). However, this statement is unfounded, both exegetically and historically.

We begin with a consideration of the Greek word *abussos* (or abyss) translated as

“bottomless pit” in Revelation 9:1. This word is found in the New Testament a total of nine times. Only two of these instances are outside Revelation: Romans 10:7, where Paul quotes Deuteronomy 30:12–14 very inexacty;⁵ and Luke 8:31, where a legion of devils inhabiting a demoniac beg Jesus not to send them back to the “abyss.” Of the remaining occurrences, only four fall outside Revelation 9. These are Revelation 11:7; 17:8; and 20:1, 3.

After studying all these instances, it is clear that in the New Testament *abussos* always refers either to the abode of the dead or to that of Satan and his demons, never to a geographical location on the earth’s surface.⁶ Similarly, in its 35 occurrences in the Septuagint, an ancient Greek translation of the Old Testament, it always refers to a watery depth beneath the earth or to the abode of the dead.⁷ Therefore, Smith’s contention that *abussos* “may refer to any waste, desolate, and uncultivated place,” and in this case to the “unknown wastes of the Arabian desert” (p. 498), is *entirely* incorrect. The Greek word that is used for desert, wasteland, or semi-arid land in both the New and Old Testaments is not *abussos* but *erēmos*. It is found, for example, in Revelation 12:6 and Exodus 19:1 ff.

As referred to above, another occurrence of *abussos* is found in Revelation 9:11, where the phrase “the angel of the bottomless pit” is used. According to Smith, this angel is the sultan acting as chief minister of Moham-medanism (p. 502). Since *abussos* cannot be the deserts of Arabia, the angel of the *abussos* can hardly be the Turkish sultan. The real identity of this angel is actually quite clear. The same angelic being is found in Revelation 20:1–3. Namely, Satan, the destroyer, who is shut up in the abyss. He is the king of demons, and as such rules over them in their abode. While in Revelation 9:1 he is permitted to have the key that opens the abyss—and then opens the abyss and allows smoke and destroying locusts to go forth—in Revelation 20:1–3 the authority and freedom of action symbolized by this *same* key is taken from him. He is the star of Revelation 9:1 that fell to earth, as biblical parallels adequately show. For example, in Revelation a war in which the dragon and

his angels participate is found (Rev. 12:7–9, 12–13). Here the dragon is thrown down to earth just as the star of Revelation 9:1 falls to the earth. In Luke 10:18 Jesus sees Satan fall like lightning from heaven. Isaiah 14:12 reads: “How you have fallen from heaven, O Star of the morning, son of the dawn!” The more familiar King James version is: “How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning!”

Once it is demonstrated that *abussos* cannot be equated with the “unknown wastes of Arabia,” that the key was not the “fall of Chosroes” (p. 496), that the angel of the *abussos* was not a sultan, and that the star from heaven that fell to earth cannot be Muhammad or the religion of Islam—as Smith implies—there remains no textual basis for an identification of the fifth trumpet with the Moslem world.

Neither can Smith’s interpretation be justified from an historical standpoint. This becomes evident upon examining how he, following Josiah Litch, arrives at a starting point for the five-month period of Revelation 9:10. According to him, this period should begin when the “king” of Revelation 9:11 begins his rule. He asserts that “from the death of Mohammed until near the close of the thirteenth century, the Mohammedans were divided into various factions under several leaders, with no general civil government extending over them all.” He implies that this situation changed with the advent of Othman.

This is incorrect on several counts. First, in 1299 Othman was far from ruling over “all the principal Mohammedan tribes” (p. 502). His domain then scarcely covered a fifteenth part of what is now modern Turkey, and it was not until 200–250 years later that the dynasty he founded could be said to rule over “all the principal Mohammedan tribes.” Not until after 1566 did the Ottoman empire control even a part of Arabia, for example. Second, there was a “general civil government” over the Islamic world between the time of the prophet Mohammed’s death and 1300. The Omayyad (or Umayyad) dynasty from 715–750 A.D.

ruled over a larger empire than the Ottoman government ever did.⁹

The Omayyads can fairly claim a chapter of glory, unsurpassed by any other empire in human history. At the zenith of Omayyad power in 715 the Arab empire stretched from the Chinese frontier to the Atlantic Ocean, from France to the borders of modern India, and from the Caspian Sea to Nubia.¹⁰

“According to Smith . . . the fifth and sixth trumpets describe the Saracens’ and Turks’ assault on the Eastern part of the Roman empire. . . . However, this statement is unfounded, both exegetically and historically.”

Therefore, both exegetically and historically, the entire basis for beginning the five months in 1299 with Othman is groundless. This being the case, the derived dates of 1449 and 1840 are automatically meaningless and do not necessitate any further discussion. Nevertheless, a few major difficulties within them will be pointed out.

Smith’s historical support for the 1449 date is the fact that at that time a Turkish sultan supported Constantine, one of the deceased emperor’s sons, to succeed him (p. 506–7). He interprets this as a voluntary surrender of the Byzantine empire’s independence. However, for some time previous to this, the Turks had had a large hand in the internal politics of Byzantium. As of 1373, Byzantium was “a vassal state of the Turks, pledged to pay tribute and to provide military assistance to the Ottoman sultan.” Vassals by definition are not independent. Even in 1346 John Catacuzenus was made emperor during a civil war only with the help of Turkish troops.¹¹

The 1840 date has both exegetical and historical problems. Exegetically, the hour, day, month, and year of Revelation 9:15

refer to a *point in time rather than a period of time*. Namely, the particular time when the four angels at the Euphrates are to be released. *The Jerusalem Bible's* translation illustrates this more clearly: "These four angels had been put there ready for this hour of this day of this month of this year, and now they were released to destroy a third of the human race."¹²

Historically, the choice of 1840 for marking the end of Turkish independence is dubious. Already in 1808 the Ottoman empire was in a desperate situation, but even after 1840 it still had more land territory than it did in 1449. Furthermore, Turkey still exists as a modern state, never having lost its independence.¹³ Given the fact that anyone in the 1830s could see that the Ottoman empire was in a serious decline and the license which Litch allowed himself in pressing dates and events into his historico-prophetic scheme, it is not at all surprising that he successfully "predicted" the end of Turkish "independence."

Revelation 6:12–17 was incorrectly interpreted by Smith as foretelling the 1755 Lisbon earthquake, the 1780 Dark Day, and the 1833 meteor shower. To comprehend this passage correctly, the Old Testament concepts which the Revelator employed must be understood. The key concept which he utilized is best expressed in the Old Testament phrase "the day of the Lord."

Amos, writing in the mid-eighth century before Christ, is the first to employ this expression. He characterizes "the day of the Lord" as a day of darkness when God will "make the sun go down at noon," and the land will "quake" and "be tossed about" (Amos 5:18–20; 8:8–9). Many other Old Testament writers develop this concept vividly and extensively (Zeph. 1:14–16; Ez. 32:7–8; Jer. 4:19–25; and Joel 1:15–20; 2:2, 10, 30–31; 3:15). All these texts should be read, since only Isaiah 13:9a, 10–11a, and 13a can be quoted in full here.

Behold the day of the Lord is coming,
Cruel, with fury and burning anger,
For the stars of heaven and their
constellations

Will not flash forth their light;
The sun will be dark when it rises,
And the moon will not shed its light.

Thus I will punish the world for its evil.

Therefore I shall make the heavens
tremble,

And the earth will be shaken from its
place.

Throughout all these texts are developments and variations in detail. For example, in Amos 8:8–9 it is said that the sun will "go down at noon," and in Isaiah 13 the sun will be dark upon rising, while in still other texts the sun is mentioned as being darkened by clouds. Clearly, a precise interpretation of such details is impossible. However, the basic point of all these descriptions is clear. First of all, the event described is a cosmic, not a local event. It depicts a fundamental collapse of all earthly and cosmic powers. Second, as implied in the expression the "day of the Lord," the event is concise, not protracted. It happens at a point in time, not over a long period of time. Third, it is a day of wrath and judgment.

Revelation 6:12–17 corresponds precisely. In verses 15–17 the day is characterized as a day of wrath. Verses 12–14 show the cosmic nature of the event. All the (1) *heavenly* bodies are shaken in verses 12b–14a, and the mountains of (2) the *earth* and islands of the (3) *sea* are shaken in verses 12a and 14b. Finally, there is no break in the action throughout the entire passage. It is one single (not protracted) and singular (not repetitive) event from start to finish. Here it would be well to reread Isaiah 13:6–13 in its entirety. There we do not find an earthquake occurring at one time in a certain location, and then later at another place the sun and moon being affected, and finally still later the stars being shaken. Rather, just as in Revelation 6:12–17, Isaiah is giving a multi-faceted description of one event. The popular Seventh-day Adventist notion of time gaps between all these events, and a particularly large one between verses 13 and 14, is merely an assumption that is read into the text.

Thus, purely from an exegetical point of view, the Lisbon earthquake of 1755, the Dark Day of 1780, and the meteor shower of 1833, do not correspond to *the* event mentioned in Revelation 6:12–17. Similarly, from a historical and scientific viewpoint these events do not measure up.

In a series of three articles (May 22, May 29, and June 5, 1980) appearing in the *Adventist Review*, Merton E. Sprengel conclusively demonstrated that the Dark Day of May 19, 1780, was caused by smoke from huge forest fires burning in the New England states combining with a dark storm front passing through the area. Furthermore, if one locates the extent of the darkness on a globe, it is clear that the area covered was virtually an infinitesimal portion of the earth's surface, and thus certainly not the cosmic event described in Revelation 6. In the *Collegiate Quarterly* of April-June 1980, pages 71-72, the same author has pointed out that the meteor shower of November 1833 "was by no means a singular event." In fact, it is a regular event occurring every 33¼ years with records going as far back as 902 A.D.

In the past, much has been said about the 1833 shower being the greatest on record. LeRoy Froom, for example, has a chart comparing some recent meteor showers. There he lists the Leonids of 1833 at the rate of 60,000 meteors per hour, while the next highest he lists is the Giacobinids of 1933 at only 15,000 meteors per hour.¹⁴ While accurate techniques for counting falling meteors have only been developed recently, with considerable progress having been made since 1833, the descriptions of early records strongly remind one of popular accounts of the 1833 shower found in Adventist literature.

For example, concerning the 902 A.D. Leonid meteor shower, Arabic records state that "an infinite number of stars were seen during the night, scattering themselves like rain to the right and left." Then when observing the same system in 1202 A.D., it is recorded that the meteors "flew against one another, like a scattering swarm of locusts."¹⁵ Thus, there is no inherent reason to suppose that the 1833 shower must have been greater than anything ever seen. However, there is even more precise, positive evidence that the 1833 shower has been surpassed. Scientific reports of the 1966 Leonid shower mention rates of up to 150,000 per hour, or two-and-a-half times the rate of the 1833 shower, according to

Froom's figures.¹⁶ In sum, both the 1833 meteor shower and the 1780 Dark Day have natural, not, as commonly believed, supernatural causes.

"In sum, both the 1833 meteor shower and the 1780 Dark Day have natural, not, as commonly believed, supernatural causes."

But, as is urged by some Seventh-day Adventist thought leaders, "it is the *fact* of the darkness, not its cause, that is significant." Accordingly, they are willing to grudgingly concede that the "Dark Day *may* be accounted for by natural causes" (emphasis mine).¹⁷ However, as one letter to the editor shows, the average person in the pew probably has an even more difficult time accepting the idea of a natural cause:

It is very hard for me to believe that Ellen White and her associates, like S. N. Haskell, and others whom I have heard preach, were mistaken in thinking the event was supernatural in its cause.¹⁸

In any case, it appears quite clear that the great majority of Seventh-day Adventist pioneers believed that the Dark Day and the Falling Stars were supernaturally caused. Why? Both events, though not supernatural, were certainly awe inspiring, and persons deeply engrossed in the book of Revelation were naturally reminded of Revelation 6:12-17. Also their lack of knowledge concerning the nature of meteor showers and weather inversions led them to ascribe these "strange" events to a supernatural cause, much like primitive peoples think of solar eclipses. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, *they* originally thought that Revelation 6:12-17 required for its fulfillment a supernatural event, which indeed it does. There can hardly be a more graphic way of expressing the idea that when the Day of the Lord arrives the whole of nature in one single moment will experience such an upheaval as has never occurred in history, including Noah's Flood. Thus, apologetic arguments—based on a later awareness that the 1780 and 1833 events were not

supernatural and which, nevertheless, seek to interpret these events as prophetic fulfillments—are both incongruent and ironic.

Another argument that is brought forward to support the significance of the 1780 Dark Day is that of timing. It is claimed that Christ predicted that the “sun would be darkened before the end of the 1260-year period in 1798 but after the persecution had ended, which occurred *probably* around 1755” (emphasis mine).¹⁹ This argument lacks substance because it interprets the text inconsistently. The meteor shower of 1833 took place outside the period 1755–1798, yet the phrase “in those days after that tribulation,” interpreted consistently, would apply to both the darkening of the sun and moon and the falling of the stars.

“Adventists cannot avoid making judgements as to whether the conclusions of their forebears are in harmony with an accurate exegesis of the Bible, for Scripture cannot be superseded by an appeal to Ellen White’s transcendent authority.”

There is no doubt that Uriah Smith’s book *Daniel and the Revelation* had—and continues to have—a great impact on Seventh-day Adventist conceptions of the 1780 Dark Day, the 1833 meteor shower, and the “Moslem interpretation” of Revelation 9. His comments, largely composed of quotations, are replete with statements emphasizing the unnatural nature of the 1780 Dark Day. He terms it “the wonderful darkening of the sun.” One of the authorities he uses states: “The true cause of this remarkable phenomenon is not known” (p. 443). In an 1862 *Review and Herald* article Smith asserts that the 1833 meteor shower “cannot be accounted for on supernatural and scientific principles” but that it took place by “an

independent and direct exertion of omnipotent power.”²⁰

Mrs. White echoes and also emphasizes the interpretations made by Smith and Litch. In her discussion of the Dark Day, also made up largely of quotations, the following statements are found: “Almost, if not altogether alone, as the most mysterious and as yet unexplained phenomenon of its kind . . . stands the dark day of May 19, 1780. . . . the darkness was supernatural.” The following quotation was used by both Smith and Mrs. White:²¹

I could not help conceiving at the time, that if every luminous body in the universe had been shrouded in impenetrable shades, or struck out of existence, the darkness could not have been more complete.

Immediately following this quotation Mrs. White took the next citation used by Smith and made it even more emphatic.²²

As quoted by Smith:

In the evening . . . *perhaps* it never was darker since the children of Israel left the house of bondage (emphasis mine).

Mrs. White’s paraphrase:

Since the times of Moses no period of darkness of equal density, extent, and duration has ever been recorded.

In her only paragraph on the Dark Day that is not a paraphrase or quotation, Mrs. White emphasizes that a quarter century prior to 1798 papal persecution “had almost wholly ceased” and that the date of the May 19, 1780, Dark Day made it therefore a “striking” fulfillment of Christ’s prediction. In commenting on Matthew 24:29 regarding the falling of the stars, she says: “This prophecy received a striking and impressive fulfillment in the great meteoric shower of November 13, 1833.” With respect to the “Moslem exposition” of Revelation 9, she says that “in the year 1840 another remarkable fulfillment of prophecy excited widespread interest” and further: “The event [Turkey placing herself under the control of Christian nations] exactly fulfilled the prediction.”²³

The following conclusion is therefore established by the evidence presented. Both Smith’s and Litch’s detailed exegesis of Revelation 8:6–9:21 and 6:12–17 is faulty

textually, most obviously in their Greek translations, both historically and scientifically. Furthermore, it is evident that Mrs. White echoed and emphasized their fundamental conclusions. The extent and directness of her dependency in this instance is not as obvious as when she is paraphrasing from a single historian for an entire chapter on a specialized topic such as the Waldenses; but she *did* err in borrowing mistaken prophetic expositions. Important implications for the role of Ellen White's writings in determining doctrinal positions result from this fact.

In trying to understand the Biblical view

of the Second Coming, Adventists have no alternative but to examine the Scriptures for themselves. Even with Mrs. White, Adventists will have to avoid adopting the position of Mormons concerning Joseph Smith and Christian Scientists regarding Mary Baker—that the Bible *as interpreted by our prophet* is our standard of faith and practice.

Adventists cannot avoid making judgments as to whether the conclusions of their forebears are in harmony with an accurate exegesis of the Bible, for Scripture cannot be superseded by an appeal to Ellen White's transcendent authority.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Kenneth A. Strand, *The Open Gates of Heaven*, 2nd ed. (Ann Arbor: Ann Arbor Publishers, 1972), p. 34.
2. Biblical quotations are from the New American Standard Version unless otherwise noted. The Greek verb "has come" is 2nd Aorist, active, indicative.
3. H. E. Dana and Julius R. Mantey, *A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament* (Toronto: The MacMillan Company, 1957), p. 200 state that "the perfect is the tense of complete action. . . . That is, it views action as a finished product." The verb "to seal" in verse four is in the perfect tense.
4. Uriah Smith, *Daniel and the Revelation*. Rev. ed. (Nashville: Southern Publishing Association, 1944) will be used throughout this discussion as the most typical example of Seventh-day Adventist exposition. Further references to his book will be put in the text with parentheses, for example (p. 20).
5. Richard Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1975), pp. 114, 121-122.
6. W. Bauer, *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments* [A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament]. 4th ed., trans. W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957), p. 2.
7. Everett F. Harrison, ed., *Baker's Dictionary of Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1960), p. 21.
8. Our English name Lucifer is derived from a Latin word meaning morning star from *lucifer*, "light bearing." The original Hebrew word is derived from a verb meaning "to shine," and is given the meaning "shining one" by E. Kautzsch and A. E. Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, 2nd English ed. (London: Oxford University Press, 1976), p. 237.
9. Philip K. Hitti, *History of the Arabs* (London: Macmillan, 1960), p. 216; *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 15th ed., s.v. "History of the Ottoman Empire and Turkey," by Malcom Edward Yapp.
10. Anthony Nutting, *The Arabs* (New York: Clark N. Potter, Inc., 1964; reprint ed., New York: Mentor Books, 1965), p. 80.
11. *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 15th ed., s.v. "Byzantine Empire," by Donald MacGillivray Nicol.
12. For a justification of the definite article being translated as a demonstrative pronoun see H. E. Dana and Julius R. Mantey, *A Manual Grammar*, pp. 136, 147.
13. *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 15th ed., s.v. "History of the Ottoman Empire and Turkey," by Malcolm Edward Yapp.
14. LeRoy E. Froom, *The Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers*, 4 vols. (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1950-54), IV:1217.
15. E. Walter Maunder, *The Astronomy of the Bible*, 3rd ed. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1909), p. 114.
16. "Great Leonid Meteor Shower of 1966," *Sky and Telescope*, January 1967, pp. 4-10.
17. Kenneth H. Wood, "The Dark Day," *Adventist Review*, May 20, 1980, p. 13.
18. David I. Shaw, "Letters: The Dark Day," *Adventist Review*, July 17, 1980, pp. 2, 21.
19. Wood, "The Dark Day," p. 13.
20. Uriah Smith, "Falling of the Stars in 1833," *Review and Herald*, May 20, 1862, p. 196.
21. Smith, *Daniel and the Revelation*, p. 445; Ellen G. White, *The Great Controversy* (Mountain View: Pacific Press Publishing Assn., 1911); pp. 306, 307.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 308.
23. *Ibid.*, pp. 306, 333-335.

Amalgamation of Man and Beast: What Did Ellen White Mean?

by Gordon Shigley

On September 8, 1947, fifteen of the Seventh-day Adventist church's highest officials gathered near San Francisco, California, to listen to two young Adventist biologists—Dr. Frank L. Marsh and Dr. Harold W. Clark—debate the meaning of two brief statements published in the mid-nineteenth century by their church's prophet, Ellen G. White. The biologists (both still alive and active) discussed whether Mrs. White's writings implied that sexual relations between men and animals had produced confused species, helped to deface God's image in man, and left traces of its activity lingering for all to see in certain unnamed races of men.

The explosive racial implications of such statements gave a sense of urgency to the debate. Controversy swirled around the implication that blacks descended from the sexual union of humans with animals. Had God revealed to Ellen White in a vision that blacks were not fully human? Through the years, critics and apologists of Ellen White had joined battle over this emotionally charged issue. Less tangible issues for the church loomed in the background. How and to what extent should religion accommodate scientific data that contradicts revelation? If Mrs. White's inspiration fell short of infallibility, what were its limits?

James McElhany, president of the

church, assembled the distinguished tribunal along the far side of a long table that faced Marsh and Clark, who sat in front of bookshelves filled with Mrs. White's publications, while Milton Kern, president of the Board of Trustees of the Ellen G. White Publications, chaired the proceedings. Shortly after 9 a.m., Kern took the floor and gave a brief history of the controversy surrounding the amalgamation statements.

Mrs. White's statement first appeared in *Spiritual Gifts, Important Facts of Faith in Connection with the History of Holy Men of Old*, a four-volume set first published in 1864. After describing a series of antediluvian sins that included intermarriage between the righteous and wicked, idolatry, polygamy, theft, and murder, Ellen White wrote:

But if there was one sin above another which called for the destruction of the race by the flood, it was the base crime of amalgamation of man and beast which defaced the image of God and caused confusion everywhere. God purposed to destroy that powerful, long-lived race that had corrupted their ways before him.¹

Her second reference to amalgamation came in the next chapter and dealt with the amalgamation of man and beast that occurred after the Flood:

Every species of animal which God created were [sic] preserved in the ark. The confused species which God did not create, which were the result of amal-

Gordon Shigley wrote this article while a graduate student at the University of Wisconsin.

gamation, were destroyed by the flood. Since the flood there has been amalgamation of man and beast as may be seen in the almost endless varieties of species of animals and in certain races of men.²

Both statements later appeared in *The Spirit of Prophecy*, Vol. 1, and in the 1870 reorganization of the material in *Spiritual Gifts*. In 1871 they appeared again in *The Great Controversy*, Vol. 1, an alternate title for *The Spirit of Prophecy*.

Finally, almost 20 years later, both amalgamation statements were not included in the 1890 *Patriarchs and Prophets*. In the 1947 compilation, *The Story of Redemption*, the Ellen G. White Publications editors removed the questionable statements and even a few of the surrounding sentences that had appeared in *Patriarchs and Prophets*.

Kern noted that the statements had aroused controversy almost from the time Ellen White had published them in 1864. During the last 20 years, he continued, several men had offered different interpretations of Ellen White's statements, and it was the purpose of this meeting to hear from advocates of the two most widely publicized viewpoints, after which there would be an opportunity for questions and discussion. He then turned the floor over to Clark.

Clark rose and began by complimenting Marsh on his contribution to the study of creation. As far as their relation to the theory of evolution, he noted, they stood 100 percent shoulder to shoulder and were even in substantial agreement on many aspects of the amalgamation statements. The anxious church officials were relieved to find Clark and Marsh such good friends, and Clark's opening remarks helped to dispel some of the tension.

Clark then gave a brief summary of the context for the amalgamation statements, calling attention to their location at the end of a chapter detailing crimes committed by the antediluvians. It was difficult to read the statements within their contexts without seeing a series of sins, of which the last sin—the “one sin above another”—was obviously the climax. It was not likely that Ellen White was talking about intermarriage since she already had described that sin in an

earlier paragraph. Four years after the statements appeared, Uriah Smith, then editor of the Adventist organ *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald*, defended them in his *Visions of Mrs. E. G. White: A Manifestation of Spiritual Gifts According to the Scriptures* (1868) with an interpretation that gave no room for misunderstanding, and James White, Ellen's husband, had, in his own words, “carefully read the manuscript” before recommending the wide circulation of Smith's book.

The almost certain implication, continued Clark, was that Ellen White also had been interested in how Uriah Smith had defended her, and that she, too, had read the work. Clark called attention to his work with Ellen White's son, W. C. White, and D. E. Robinson, her secretary. Neither of these men ever had doubted that Ellen White meant the crossing of man and beast by the phrase “amalgamation of man and beast.” Although there was controversy over the statements, critics and supporters alike had accepted this interpretation. How easy it would have been to correct her critics in 1870 if she really had intended “the base crime of amalgamation of man and beast” to mean intermarriage between the races of Seth and Cain. It was a common practice, he continued, for Ellen White to make changes where her words had elicited a wrong interpretation, yet in this case she made no attempt at clarification even though critics had charged her with teaching that blacks were not human.

If one diagrammed the expression, “one sin above another was amalgamation of man and beast,” continued Clark, one could see that *man* and *beast* stand in the same relation in the sentence; they are coordinates. Whatever applies to one applies to the other, and it is impossible to make the amalgamation of beast with beast or man with man the one sin greater than idolatry, adultery, polygamy, theft, or murder. History showed that cohabitation with animals was one of the greatest sins of antiquity, for which there was abundant evidence. Furthermore, anthropologists had discovered human-like skulls in many parts of the world that showed peculiar ape-like affinities. Competent authorities had described characteristics of living tribes in

Africa and Malaysia that were of a distinctly simian nature. While there was no positive evidence that man and animals could cross today, there were, nevertheless, many facts to indicate that just such crosses may have taken place in the past. Moreover, God's commands to Israel specifically forbidding cohabitation of man and beast indicated that humanity was practicing this base crime. To say that amalgamation between man and beast never occurred in the past because it does not occur now, Clark stressed, is to take the same position of uniformitarianism that misled geologists. There was, in fact, only *one* objective fact that could not be explained: the lack of an authentic record of such a cross. This one fact did not justify the conclusion that the "one sin above another" committed by antediluvians was either interracial marriage or marriage between believers and unbelievers. Such an interpretation did violence to the language Ellen White actually used. On the contrary, two conclusions were clear: Ellen White knew what she meant to say, and she clearly intended her readers to interpret "the base crime" as a sexual act that included the crossing of man and beast.

It was now about 9:45 a.m., and Kern called on Marsh. He began with a few words of praise for Clark, and noted that they were good friends who merely had a professional difference of opinion on statements that always had been unclear as to precise meaning. He then called attention to the definition of amalgamation given by J. R. Bartlett in the 1859 *Dictionary of Americanisms*. In the United States the word "amalgamate" was applied universally to the mixing of black and white races, he noted, and only since the turn of the century had "hybridization" become a perfectly satisfactory substitute. But at the time Ellen White wrote the amalgamation statements, "the amalgamation of man" would call to the mind of the general reader a fusion of two races, in this case the ungodly race of Cain and the godly descendants of Seth. Neither the language of the statements themselves, the Scriptures, the findings of science, nor any other statements from the writings of Mrs. White demanded the conclusion that man had crossed *with* beast.

Suppose, he suggested, that in the first statement Ellen White had meant that man had crossed with beast. How could *both* of the stated results occur? True, God's image might be defaced, but would that cause confusion *everywhere*? Man could, after all, cohabit with no more than a few forms, and cohabitation was not synonymous with hybridization. The Scriptures made clear, he continued, that the principal sin that made the Flood necessary was coalescence of the "sons of God" and the "daughters of men." Furthermore, if the Holy Spirit actually had told Ellen White that man had crossed with beast, she would not have deleted the amalgamation statements from *Patriarchs and Prophets*.

Marsh now brought in the testimony of science. One of the most clearly demonstrated principles of biology, Marsh noted, was the fact that the different Genesis kinds of animals *will not cross*, not even to the extent of producing a sterile hybrid. There was no reason either from modern data or from the fossil record to suppose that this was not a law extending all the way back to Creation. If amalgamation of the Genesis kinds was the principal sin that made destruction of land forms necessary, we should be able to find these amalgamated forms as fossils. As for Uriah Smith's supposed defense of the amalgamation statements and Ellen White's unchanged reprinting of both statements two years later, that hardly proved that Ellen White meant that man had crossed with beast. Ellen White had made no statement whatsoever regarding Smith's defense. And furthermore, while it was difficult to explain how man could amalgamate with beast, it scarcely was necessary to explain how there could be an amalgamation of man with man. Marsh turned around to the wall of Ellen White books surrounding the conference room, reached for a copy of *Fundamentals of Christian Education*, and read from the bottom of page 499: "The enemy rejoiced in his success in effacing the divine image from the minds of the people . . . Through intermarriage with idolaters and constant association with them . . ." Marsh emphasized his point: "Ellen White said amalgamation defaced the image of God.

Here she says intermarriage effaced the divine image."

Finally, Marsh brought up the sensitive issue of race. Those who insisted that evidence for amalgamation of man with beast could be seen in "certain races of men," had the impossible task of pointing to races that were part human and part beast. The conclusion should be obvious: amalgamation of man defaced God's image; amalgamation of races within the created kinds of animals produced confused species. We should not tarnish God's priceless gift to Adventists by finding racial slurs in the statements and admonitions of Mrs. White, he concluded.³

Long before Marsh and Clark were active, Ellen White's statements had elicited discussion as soon as they appeared in print. The controversy then had revolved around the issue of whether blacks were the result of hybridization of humans with beast. In *The Visions of Mrs. E. G. White*, an apology for Ellen White's gift of prophecy, Uriah Smith answered 52 objections that critics had raised about Ellen White. Under "Objection 39: The Negro Race is not Human," he argued that Ellen White had given the second amalgamation statement "for the purpose of illustrating the deep corruption and crime into which the race fell, even within a few years after the flood,"⁴ and not to teach that blacks were not human:

There was amalgamation; and the effect is still visible in "certain races of men." Mark, those excepting the animals upon whom the effects of this work are visible, are called by the vision "men." Now we have ever supposed that anybody that was called a *man*, was considered a human being.⁵

However, that the present races included descendants from men that had come into being as a result of man-animal crosses was beyond dispute, Smith argued, citing "such cases as the wild Bushmen of Africa, some tribes of the Hottentots, and perhaps the Digger Indians of our own country, etc." Moreover, he claimed, naturalists found it

impossible "to tell just where the human ends and the animal begins. Can we suppose that this was so ordained of God in the beginning? Rather has not sin marred the boundaries of these two kingdoms?"⁶

Although Ellen White had not specified what races she wanted her readers to look upon as partial evidence for "the base crime," Smith's naming of specific races tended to support the contention that Ellen White had not expected anyone to encounter difficulty picturing the "certain races of men." When Uriah Smith defended Ellen White's amalgamation statements, he clearly reflected the popular idea of his time that crosses between men and animals had created a no-man's-land between man and beast, populated by gorillas, chimpanzees, wild bushmen of Africa, Patagonians, and Hottentots.

"Uriah Smith . . . clearly reflected the popular idea of his time that crosses between men and animals had created a no-man's-land between man and beast, populated by gorillas, chimpanzees, wild bushmen of Africa, Patagonians, and Hottentots."

Uriah Smith's views were compatible with students of the "American School" of anthropology, which was reaching its crest of influence in the United States by 1850. These anthropologists claimed that species could cross to produce intermediate forms of offspring.⁷ They argued that simple observation demonstrated that races of men were capable of crossing even though they constituted separate species that God had intended should remain separate. Samuel George Morton, founder of invertebrate paleontology in America and author of the controversial *Crania Americana* (1839), suggested that since drawings from Egyptian tombs, known to be at least 3,000 years old, showed the races every bit as distinct then as

now, it was unreasonable to assume that natural causes had produced the races in what could be "at most a thousand years" since the Flood.⁸ It was more likely that God had created the races from Noah's three sons, or perhaps at the Tower of Babel.

Realizing that hybridization would be the battleground on which they would win or lose their case, proponents of the "American School" attacked the validity of inter-fertility as a test for species. In 1847 Morton published a paper in the prestigious *American Journal of Science* that claimed hybrids existed between an amazing variety of organisms including deer and hog, bull and ewe, sheep and deer, as well as many crosses between different species of fish, birds, and insects.⁹

James White read Smith's book and warmly recommended it with the following notice in the August 25, 1868, *Review and Herald*:

The Association has just published a pamphlet entitled, "The Visions of Mrs. E. G. White, A Manifestation of Spiritual Gifts According to the Scriptures." It is written by the editor of the *Review*. While carefully reading the manuscript, I felt very grateful to God that our people could have this able defense of those views they so much love and prize, which others despise and oppose. This book is designed for very wide circulation.
—James White.¹⁰

James and Ellen White took 2,000 copies of Smith's book with them to campmeetings that year.¹¹

Despite Smith's defense of Ellen White's statements, controversy never wholly subsided. Even when Ellen White deleted the statements from her new book, *Patriarchs and Prophets* (1890), the old statements remained a topic of much discussion.

Forty years after the appearance of *Patriarchs and Prophets*, scientists had begun to cast a long shadow over Uriah Smith's already traditional interpretation. It could no longer be claimed, as Uriah Smith had once done, that "no one" denied the possibility of man-animal crosses. The amalgamation statements became a popular topic of discussion

among Adventists interested in natural science and revelation.

In the April 1931 issue of *The Ministry*, George McCready Price, the church's most prominent opponent of evolution, proposed to make a slight alteration in the wording of Ellen White's statements—the addition of a single word in brackets—that could reconcile them with science and remove all difficulty associated with the controversy.

Without attempting to deal with all the interesting statements in this passage, I may be allowed to say a few words about the latter part, which I think is the portion most liable to be misunderstood. Let me rewrite the last sentence, adding just one word in brackets, and I think the supposed difficulty will disappear almost of itself. "Since the flood, there has been amalgamation of man and (of) beast, as may be seen in the almost endless varieties of species of animals, and in certain races of men."¹²

Price was proposing two non-overlapping amalgamations—one for the races of man and another for union of the various kinds of animals.

His solution evoked a storm of opposition. One of the first to reply the same year was D. E. Robinson, for many years Ellen White's personal secretary. In a paper titled "Amalgamation Versus Evolution" Robinson said that Price's insertion of the word "of" into Ellen White's statement did violence to the "obvious meaning" that the author herself intended.¹³ He went on to argue that the amalgamation statements helped solve some of the problems in the conflict between science and religion, such as "how such a variety of animals . . . could have been produced in the short time allowed by Bible chronology . . ." ¹⁴ and the problem of comparative anatomy:

Mrs. White's statement, if accepted, will solve the problems connected with the close physical resemblance between man and some of the apes, between whom and the tailed monkeys there are greater structural difference than between them and man. Any one who observes the chimpanzee, the gorilla, or the orang, would not find it difficult to believe

that they have some common ancestry with the human race.¹⁵

Just what races of man actually showed traces of animal ancestry, Robinson conceded, was impossible to determine; Mrs. White had not specified the “certain races of men.”

Harold Clark’s involvement with the problem of Ellen White’s views on amalgamation began when his biology students at Pacific Union College continually asked him about Ellen White’s amalgamation statements. After consulting with Elders W. C. White and Dores Robinson, the latter a secretary to Mrs. White and a cousin of Clark’s first wife, Clark felt obliged to at least put forward hypotheses to provide a reasonable explanation for Ellen White’s statements—for testing and study if nothing else.¹⁶ In 1940 he completed *Genes and Genesis*, which supported the traditional interpretation and suggested possible crosses in the animal kingdom. Even if his examples should prove wrong, Clark felt the basic principle behind Ellen White’s statements was sound.

The following year the book was so highly regarded by the denomination that it was chosen as a ministerial reading course selection. But in the spring of that same year, Frank L. Marsh, then fresh from the University of Nebraska with a doctorate degree, noted that scientists had failed to find a single instance of hybrids between man and beast. Perhaps it would be better, he suggested, to accept Price’s “the amalgamation of man and (of) beast” reading after all.

Before the end of 1941 Marsh completed his own *Fundamental Biology*, a 128-page mimeographed text that emphasized the lack of scientific evidence for belief in the ability of diverse organisms to cross.¹⁷ Ellen White, Marsh argued in the two chapters devoted to the amalgamation question, had not said man had crossed *with* beast. If confused species resulted from amalgamation, they were limited to hybrids between closely related animals of the same Genesis kind. If Ellen White said there has been union of man and beast, she would, said Marsh, “be in conflict with all laws of crossbreeding.”¹⁸ In an exchange of letters

with Marsh in 1941, Clark argued that what could happen now was not a safe guide for determining what might have happened in the past and warned Marsh of the danger of falling into the uniformitarian error that has misled geologists.¹⁹

“If Ellen White said there has been union of man and beast, she would, said Marsh, ‘be in conflict with all laws of crossbreeding.’”

On March 1, 1942, both Marsh and Clark completed papers defending their alternative positions and attacking opposing views. Clark’s “Amalgamation: An Analysis of the Problem of Amalgamation” stressed that the expression proposed by Marsh—amalgamation of man (with man) and beast (with beast)—left “beast with beast” in an impossible situation. “In order to get any sense from it we must imply that it was a *sin* for one kind of animal to cross with another.”²⁰

In his paper, “Analysis of the Amalgamation Statements,” Marsh argued that crosses between the different kinds, including man and the anthropoid apes, were contrary to all the laws of genetics. To avoid implying that interracial marriage today still constituted a “base crime” or sin, Marsh wrote that, although Ellen White had called amalgamation *before* the Flood a “base crime,” amalgamation after the Flood may not have been a sin at all.²¹

Further evidence that “the base crime of amalgamation of man and beast” did not refer to fusion of man and beast was found, said Marsh, “in the deletion of the amalgamation statements from the beautifully and carefully rewritten story in *Patriarchs and Prophets*,” an account that contrasted sharply with the “loosely written” earlier essay.²² By this argument Marsh introduced one of the more curious issues to arise out of the amalgamation controversy: the literary style of *Spiritual Gifts* is so poor that a correct understanding

of the amalgamation statements is very difficult. Only *Patriarchs and Prophets* clearly indicates what Ellen White meant by "the one sin above another," namely, inter-marriage between the righteous and wicked, he maintained.²³

Robinson and Clark, though sympathetic with Marsh's desire to reconcile the amalgamation statements with science, still agreed that Ellen White obviously had intended her readers to picture a sexual crime, and that amalgamation of man and beast after the Flood was the same activity as it was before the Flood; certainly it was just as much a "base crime." Furthermore, it seemed to them somewhat ironic to have amalgamation "counteract in part the degeneration of millenniums of Satanic activity" when it was amalgamation that supposedly had produced the degeneration in the first place.

"Unable to reconcile the most obvious reading of Ellen White's statements with science and with a commitment to the genetic equality among races, the church has accepted Marsh's ingenious interpretation. . . ."

Marsh remained undaunted. In *Evolution, Creation and Science*, completed in 1944, he argued that since it was the "Creator's obvious intention to keep the kinds separate," God must have created each kind with protoplasm that was "physiologically incompatible" with that of a different kind.²⁴

Clark soon answered Marsh, taking aim at his interpretation of amalgamation to mean crosses only between varieties of the same Genesis kind: "Assuming that the hybridization spoken of in *Spiritual Gifts* was between ecological races, we would have the word of Inspiration declaring in one place that normally fertile groups were allowable within the kind, but saying in another statement that the products of such races were denied entrance into the Ark

because they were confused, the result of processes that God did not approve."²⁵

By late 1946, however, the continuing advance of genetics, the apparent clash between science and revelation, and the need to address the racial implications of the traditional view of the amalgamation statements combined to make Marsh's interpretation appear increasingly attractive. In the summer of 1947, just before the confrontation in California, Marsh met privately in Washington, D.C., with General Conference President McElhany and several other denominational leaders who would attend the September meeting. He came at their invitation and spent an entire evening detailing his views and warning of the dangers associated with other interpretations both in the realms of science and racial relations. In retrospect, Marsh may have gone to California already the winner.

In California on September 8, 1947, both men had completed their presentations by 10:15 a.m.; Kern invited questions and discussions on the issues. Clark received most of the questions, and as the session continued it became apparent that most of the leaders, however they might feel about Ellen White's original intentions, clearly favored a position that could accommodate science and defuse the racial problems associated with the amalgamation statements. Marsh offered just such a solution. If his interpretation seemed a bit strained even to some of his supporters, it nevertheless was possible and reasonably defensible. After a break for lunch, the discussion resumed with about a third of the group missing, only to adjourn at 3 p.m. without a vote. At the close of the meeting Kern and Marsh discussed how the questions had gone and concluded that if a vote had been taken, it would have gone at worst 12 to 3 in Marsh's favor.

The church officials did not encourage either Clark or Marsh to write summaries of their views. However, when Marsh returned to Union College he thought a summary would be useful for his students.

On November 16, 1947, he completed an 11-page paper, "The Amalgamation Statements," and sent it to Clark suggesting that he, too, write a paper briefly summarizing his arguments. On March 1, 1948, Clark completed his "Amalgamation: A Study of Perplexing Statements Made by Mrs. E. G. White." It included a point-by-point rebuttal of Marsh's latest paper. To Marsh's suggestion that hybrids could only result from the crossing of the same "kind" of animal, for example, Clark again wanted to know why such an activity should constitute a "base crime."

When two such creatures crossbreed, they do not in any way produce a confused or corrupted kind. They merely make a new variant in the same kind.

Such interbreeding seems to be the perfectly natural and orderly process.²⁶ Nor could Clark believe that "amalgamation of man and beast" after the Flood was not the same activity it was before the Flood, or that it in any way had decreased in sinfulness. Because Clark's paper replied to particular arguments in Marsh's past papers, Marsh decided to write just one more: "A Discussion of Harold W. Clark's Paper 'Amalgamation,' Published March 1, 1948."

The real battle was over, however, and these were primarily post-war skirmishes. Marsh's view had prevailed. In 1951, when

F. D. Nichol was preparing his *Ellen G. White and Her Critics*, he requested all of Marsh's papers on amalgamation. Marsh sent them to him and Nichol leaned heavily on them for his chapter on the amalgamation statements.²⁷ The White Estate made available in 1968 a copy of Nichol's chapter under the title "Ellen G. White Statements Regarding Conditions at the Time of the Flood—by F. D. Nichol." This is still the paper sent to those who request an official statement on Ellen G. White and amalgamation.

For many years the Adventist community assumed Mrs. White believed that part of man's fall involved sexual amalgamation of man with beast and defended her views as scientific. After 1947 the dominant view changed and has continued for 35 years. Unable to reconcile the most obvious reading of Ellen White's statements with science and with a commitment to the genetic equality among races, the church has accepted Marsh's ingenious interpretation of what Ellen White meant. It may be that the present generation of Adventists will agree with the earliest generations of Adventists that—at least at one time—Ellen White did believe amalgamation of man with beast took place, but will not accept that view as scientifically authoritative today.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Ellen G. White, *Spiritual Gifts, Important Facts of Faith in Connection with the History of Holy Men of Old* (Battle Creek: Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association, 1864), III, p. 64.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 75.

3. The events of this meeting were reconstructed from accounts given to the author by Harold W. Clark and Frank L. Marsh and from papers written before and immediately after the 1947 meeting. I then sent a copy of my description to both Clark and Marsh for further comment and revision.

4. Uriah Smith, *The Visions of Mrs. E. G. White: A Manifestation of Spiritual Gifts According to the Scriptures* (Battle Creek: Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association, 1868), p. 103.

5. *Ibid.*

6. *Ibid.*: "But does any one deny the general statement contained in the extract given above? They do not. If they did, they could easily be silenced by a reference to such cases as the wild Bushmen of Africa, some tribes of the Hottentots, and perhaps the Digger Indians of our own country, etc. Moreover, naturalists affirm that the line of

demarcation between the human and animal races is lost in confusion. It is impossible, as they affirm, to tell just where the human ends and the animal begins. Can we suppose that this was so ordained of God in the beginning? Rather has not sin marred the boundaries of these two kingdoms?" *Ibid.*

7. For a detailed account of the rise of the "American School" of anthropology see William Stanton, *The Leopard's Spots: Scientific Attitudes Toward Race in America, 1815-1859* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1960).

8. Samuel George Morton, *Crania Americana; or A Comparative View of the Skulls of Various Aboriginal Nations of North and South America, to which is Prefixed an Essay on the Varieties of the Human Species* (Philadelphia, 1839), pp. 1-3. See William Scranton, *Leopard's Spots*, pp. 24-44.

9. Samuel Morton, "Hybridity in Animals, considered in reference to the question of the Unity of the Human Species," *American Journal of Science*, 1847, 3 (second series): 39-50, 203-212; also cited in William Stanton, *op. cit.*, pp. 114-115. When Morton died in 1851 he was at the zenith of his

influence, lauded as one of America's greatest scientists. "One of the brightest ornaments of our age and country" eulogized the New York *Daily Tribune*, May 20, 1851, adding that "probably no scientific man in America enjoyed a higher reputation among scholars throughout the world, than Dr. Morton." Quoted in William Stanton, *Leopard's Spots*, p. 144.

10. James White, "New and Important Work," *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald*, XXXII, (Aug. 25, 1868), p. 160. Harold Clark, in commenting on James White's notice, wrote: "This work was carefully examined by James White with the almost certain implication that Mrs. White would also closely read it." Harold Clark, "Amalgamation: A Study in Perplexing Statements Made by Mrs. E. G. White," (March 1, 1948), p. 2. Although Clark questioned Smith's application to specific races, "yet it is evident that he [Uriah Smith] correctly understood what Mrs. White meant to say, for in 1870, when the statements were reprinted, no change was made in the wording. Changes were made in other publications where a wrong interpretation had been placed upon her words." *Ibid.*

11. This information appears as a handwritten note at the bottom of a copy of Uriah Smith's "Objection 39: The Negro Race Not Human," provided by Frank Marsh. Since James White had suggested in his *Review* notice that Smith's book was designed for "very wide circulation," it may be that he took these copies for sale at the various campmeetings that year.

12. George McCready Price, "The Problem of Hybridization," *The Ministry* (April 31, 1931), p. 13.

13. D. E. Robinson, "Amalgamation Versus Evolution," n.d., but written shortly after April, 1931, p. 1.

14. *Ibid.*, p. 2.

15. *Ibid.*, p. 3.

16. Information in a letter to the author from Harold W. Clark (June 14, 1979). Both Robinson and W. C. White definitely believed that Ellen White meant amalgamation of man with beast.

17. Information in a letter to the author from Marsh (Feb. 8, 1979).

18. Information in a letter to the author from Marsh (Feb. 8, 1979).

19. Harold W. Clark to Frank L. Marsh, April 10, 1941 (courtesy of Frank L. Marsh).

20. Information in a letter to the author from Harold W. Clark (June 14, 1979). See also Harold W. Clark, "Amalgamation," (March 1, 1942). Francis D. Nichol, a church apologist who later championed Marsh's interpretation in his *Ellen G. White and Her Critics*, actually would accept this strange suggestion. Animals were capable of "base crime" and "sin," Nichol argued, because they were violating natural law. F. D. Nichol, *Ellen G. White and Her Critics* (Washington, D.C.: The Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1951), p. 317.

21. Frank L. Marsh, "Analysis of the Amalgamation Statements," (unpublished paper, March 1, 1942), p. 5.

22. For example, see Frank L. Marsh, "The Amalgamation Statements," (unpublished paper, Nov. 16, 1947), pp. 4, 5. This argument has continued to the present and is reflected in F. D. Nichol, *Ellen G. White*. Marsh made the same argument in a question and answer session following his pre-

sentation on "Science and Religion" at Andrews University, Summer 1976, for the Ellen G. White Workshop. (From the author's transcript of the tape recorded session, p. 11).

23. See Marsh, "Amalgamation Within Genesis Kinds," June 11, 1942, pp. 1-4, and "The Amalgamation Statements," (unpublished paper, Nov. 16, 1947), p. 6. Also from information in a letter to the author from Frank L. Marsh (March 26, 1979). Other than the absence of the amalgamation statements, the changes in the various accounts are trivial. Compare *Spiritual Gifts*, III, pp. 61-74, with *The Spirit of Prophecy*, I, pp. 67-78, and *Patriarchs and Prophets*, pp. 90-107.

A parallel reading of *Spiritual Gifts*, *The Spirit of Prophecy*, and *Patriarchs and Prophets*, however, shows a remarkable similarity. One can, in fact, easily follow the flow of ideas paragraph by paragraph, sentence by sentence, noting where Ellen White added new material, right up to and including the last word before the paragraph that begins each amalgamation statement. The improvement in literary style in *Patriarchs and Prophets* seems to consist more in the deletion of the amalgamation statements than in substantive changes in language or rearrangement of ideas, and falls short of the transformation Marsh implied when he wrote: "The trained writer looks almost with horror at the lack of unity, coherence and emphasis in the 1864 essay. However, . . . in that description [*Patriarchs and Prophets*] the unity, coherence and emphasis of her essay are so above reproach as to leave no doubt as to what constituted the principle. . . ."

24. See Frank L. Marsh, *Evolution, Creation and Science* (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1944), p. 140. Marsh requested that the notice of this book as a Ministerial Reading Course selection—stated on the title page of the first edition—be removed because it "seemed to prejudice some evolutionists (such as Dobshonsky)." From a letter to the author from Marsh, March 26, 1979. The Review and Herald omitted the notice beginning with the second printing.

25. Harold W. Clark, "Hybridization in Relation to Genesis Kinds," (Angwin, Calif.: May 1, 1945), p. 2. Leon Caviness, a professor of biblical languages at Pacific Union College, tried to strike a compromise in his short paper, "The Meaning of the Amalgamation Statements." Those who really wanted to discover what Ellen White originally intended by her statements must not overlook, he reasoned, that she reprinted the same expressions, unchanged, six years after the initial controversy and two years after Uriah Smith's defense. Caviness did not rule out the possibility of a cross between men and beast, but felt that the hybrid, if it could be produced, would not lead to the introduction of a new species intermediate between man and ape. Each cross would represent a single event, and the offspring would be incapable of further crossing. Caviness solved the racial problem associated with Mrs. White's statements by postulating products no longer produced and a process no longer functional at least between man and beast, but his compromise satisfied neither side. L. L. Caviness, "The Meaning of the Amalgamation Statements," n.d., pp. 1-2.

The same month Clark's essay appeared, Marsh responded with "The Basic Unit of Creation," an essay that used interfertility as the test for defining

the Genesis kinds. The resulting argument appeared to be circular. A year later he completed *Studies in Creationism*, a mimeographed text used during 1946 and 1947 as a reference for his classes at the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary in Washington, D.C. Marsh devoted some twenty-five pages to the amalgamation question, again restating most of the previous arguments. The Review and Herald Publishing Association published a heavily revised

version of *Studies in Creationism* in 1950 that stressed the impossibility for Genesis kinds to cross, but completely omitted any discussion of the amalgamation problem itself.

26. Harold W. Clark, "Amalgamation, A revision of a paper issued March 1, 1942," (Angwin, Calif.: March 1, 1948).

27. Information in a letter to the author from Marsh (Jan. 10, 1979).

Ellen White & Doctrinal Conflict: Context of the 1919 Bible Conference

by Bert Haloviak
with Gary Land

From the late 1890s until the 1920s, the Seventh-day Adventist Church faced theological controversies over pantheism, the sanctuary, and the meaning of the "daily" (to early Adventists, "daily" was a crucial word found in Daniel 8:11-13 in the King James Bible). These controversies resulted in several leading figures leaving the denomination; moreover, they engendered ad-

ditional controversy over the doctrinal and historical authority of the writings of Ellen White. Indeed, the authority of Ellen White became the focus of discussion and an important source of the divisions at the 1919 Bible and History Teachers Conference. Even defenders of Ellen White developed divergent understandings of inspiration (see SPECTRUM, Vol. 10, No. 1, pp. 23-57). What follows is an account of this turbulent period of theological debate. The ideas debated then have some parallels today. Certainly opposing interpretations of the authority of Ellen White have re-emerged in strikingly similar terms.

Bert Haloviak, assistant director, Office of Archives and Statistics, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, is a graduate of Columbia Union College, and holds an M.A. in history from the University of Maryland.

Gary Land, professor of history, Andrews University, holds his doctorate from the University of California, Santa Barbara.

Gary Land prepared for SPECTRUM this abridgement of two papers, written by Bert Haloviak in November 1979 and June 1980, originally titled, "In the Shadow of the 'Daily': Background and Aftermath of the 1919 Bible and History Teachers' Conference" and "Pioneers, Pantheists, and Progressives: A. F. Ballenger and Divergent Paths to the Sanctuary."

Pantheism

The debate about pantheism had its roots in the aftermath of the 1888 General Conference. Out of prolonged discussions following the 1888 General Conference session debate over justification by faith

arose a movement urging Adventists to "Receive ye the Holy Ghost." The conviction that, after the acceptance of God's righteousness, the Lord would pour out His Spirit to enable the finishing of the work occupied a central position in the *Review and Herald*, and at campmeetings during 1897 to 1899; it was articulated primarily by A. T. Jones, newly-named editor of the *Review and Herald*, and A. F. Ballenger, a prominent SDA minister. As editor, Jones concluded practically every editorial for over a year with the words "Receive ye the Holy Ghost." As a revivalist, Ballenger traveled from church to church and campmeeting to campmeeting preaching that same theme.

Jones had by this time added a significant element to the message, one with the potential, it seemed, of uniting the often antagonistic medical and ministerial elements of the church:

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

The connection of health reform with the indwelling of the Holy Spirit received consistent emphasis in the *Review and Herald* during this period.¹

As did others who preached the Holy Ghost message, Ballenger considered it to be the culmination of the 1888 emphasis. He presented the message as consisting of five essential steps:

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

According to Ballenger, "physical healing is now present truth to Seventh-day Adventists, but only to those who will give the Lord the glory." He urged the church to "clear the King's highway" of sins so that "signs and wonders may be done by the name of his holy child Jesus." Reports of physical healings regularly arose out of the campmeetings where Ballenger preached.²

Ballenger's concept of physical healing depended upon his understanding of the atonement, which for him included Christ's bearing of the physical illnesses of the world upon the cross. As he explained in his book *Power for Witnessing*, published in 1900:

It is clear that our Lord took our infirmities and bore our sicknesses that we might not have to bear them; that we might be loosed from them; that they might depart from us. Jesus bore them therefore, that He might bear them away from us, that we might bear them no more. All this proves that the gospel includes salvation from sickness as well as salvation from sin.³

A similar view appeared in the writings of E. J. Waggoner, who had edited the *British Present Truth* during the 1890's. He taught that the power by which a person received forgiveness of sins was the same power that healed disease and asserted that "perfect purity" was "absolutely necessary" for God's remnant people.⁴

Opposition to these views soon arose, notably from George Irwin, president of the General Conference, in letters to Ellen White. He observed that the Battle Creek physician J. H. Kellogg, who was influenced by these views, seemed to be moving increasingly away from teaching that could be termed "denominational." Furthermore, younger doctors—such as David Paulson, D. H. Kress, and Howard Rand, and ministers, including W. W. Prescott, E. J. Waggoner, and A. T. Jones—were "running along extreme lines also." He told Mrs. White, "I feel more and more to thank God for the Spirit of Prophecy; for it is our rudder that will guide us safely over the shoals and breakers that are before us." He called upon her to return to the United

States from Australia as soon as possible.⁵

Meanwhile, Irwin turned to his long-time associates to restore the fundamentals. He noted that Stephen Haskell in his work brought out the "great underlying principles of the message, which exploded many errors and beliefs that have been gaining a foothold in the minds of some." Haskell and J. N. Loughborough could combat these elements, he believed, because of their previous experience in dealing with fanaticism.⁶ Subsequently, articles by Haskell, Loughborough, and others appeared that were seemingly designed to counter the new perfectionism that was becoming more extremist.⁷ The Holy Flesh movement, concentrated in Indiana, was a major manifestation of this extremism at the end of the century.⁸

The issues came partially to a head when, at the British Conference meeting at Southsea, England, in 1903, conservative Adventists in England criticized E. J. Waggoner because of his teachings at the Bible School and in the *Present Truth*. The question of continued financial support for both the school and magazine arose. G. A. Irwin, then president of the Australasian Union Conference, who was representing the General Conference, reported that "the brethren there just came right up and took their stand, and said they could no longer sanction such teaching that was tearing down all order and organization." According to Irwin, Waggoner retorted that "the whole denomination was in the dark, and that sometime they might possibly see it if they did not drift entirely away and merge into a papacy."⁹ Waggoner soon submitted to Daniells a letter of resignation, remarking that Brother Irwin had done "his duty nobly for 'the old landmarks.'"¹⁰

The pantheistic implications of the new perfectionist theology appeared most clearly in John Harvey Kellogg's *The Living Temple*, which the denomination eventually refused to publish. The roots of Kellogg's philosophy reveal a remarkable similarity to that of Ballenger, Waggoner, and others. Kellogg's path led from a certain view of Christ's atonement. In 1902 he wrote:

Christ came to this earth with a mission of deliverance, whose scope was large enough to comprehend the whole world,

with all its needs, . . . Man needs physical healing as much as moral regeneration, and complete success is not possible in either one without the other.¹¹

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

At the same time, Kellogg expressed his belief in a personal God in heaven. He wrote Mrs. White: "Some of the brethren have gotten the idea that we do not believe in a personal God, which is certainly very wrong. There could be no worship without a personal God."¹²

" . . . Waggoner retorted that 'the whole denomination was in the dark, and that sometime they might possibly see it if they did not drift entirely away and merge into a papacy.' "

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

When we say God is in the tree, the word "God" is understood in its most comprehensive sense, and people understand the meaning to be that the Godhead is in the tree, God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit, whereas the proper understanding is that God the Father sits upon his throne in heaven where God the Son is also; while God's

life, or Spirit or presence is the all-pervading power which is carrying out the will of God in all the universe.¹³

Kellogg's explanations were insufficient, however, and opposition to his book prevented its publication by the denomination. A. G. Daniells, president of the General Conference, observed:

I consider the whole matter a deeply laid scheme to overthrow our cause and work, and to defeat the movement for which this denomination has been called into existence.¹⁴

Daniells, I. H. Evans, and others saw *The Living Temple* crisis as part of a "spiritualistic" teaching within the denomination that had existed for many years.¹⁵

Ellen White supported their position, noting that such "spiritualistic sentiments," had "for years been coming in." In several testimonies, she noted that Kellogg was misapplying scriptures, taking them out of context, and "giving a wrong application" to them; he was advocating erroneous views that were destructive to the landmarks; he was accepting erroneous theories that had been met time and time again in the past; his system led to a downplaying of the Sabbath; it taught, in effect, that "My Lord delayeth his coming"; it subverted the truth found "in the revelation given by Christ to John to give to the churches."¹⁶

W. W. Prescott extended Ellen White's testimonies regarding Kellogg to the entire church:

The instruction of the Testimonies does not have reference simply to one man or one book. There is no doubt that repeated efforts will be made to introduce error into the teaching of this message; and the instruction given in these Testimonies is designed to prepare our people so that they may be able to discern between truth and error by whomsoever presented.¹⁷

The testimonies did help, in fact, to clarify the differences between the pantheist group and other Adventists. As a result of reading these messages, some pulled away from the pantheist path—Prescott himself among them—whereas others, including E. J. Waggoner, refused to acknowledge that they were teaching error. A. G. Daniels

regarded the conflict over pantheism as an opportunity for the reassertion of historic Adventist theology, writing Ellen White in appreciation of her call "for us to come back to the peculiar and special truths given to this people at the beginning of this movement."¹⁸

Despite Daniell's appreciation for Ellen White's role in the conflict over pantheism, the Kellogg crisis raised important questions about Ellen White that refused to disappear. Many of those who moved toward pantheism originally took an extremely literal—perhaps fundamentalist would be an accurate term—view of Ellen White's writings. When urged, for example, to explain a pre-1900 testimony relating to medical work, Kellogg stated in 1905: "I don't know that it needs explanation. There is just the statement there." He further affirmed, "What is the use of trying to explain what the Lord is doing, what the Lord says. The Lord says it as he wants to say it." This approach to Ellen White's writings may explain why Kellogg believed he saw parallels between his own theology and hers.¹⁹

A. T. Jones also espoused a fundamentalist interpretation of Ellen White's writings. He told the congregation at the Battle Creek Tabernacle:

I have not a cent's worth of respect for any such plea as is made too often and especially of late years on "Testimonies up-to-date"; as if a Testimony up-to-date is to take the place of all that ever went before it. Mahomet taught the doctrine as to his revelations—that the last revelation took the place of all that went before it. But God's revelation is not that way. God's revelation is truth, and is just as good today as it was a thousand years ago. It never gets out of date; and the last one that comes is not going to contradict, or vitiate, or set aside, or annihilate any that went before it. . . . No sir, the Bible is the Word of God. It is the same today as it was when Isaiah wrote it, when Amos wrote it, when Hosea wrote it, when Paul wrote

it, and will be the same after the world is ended and gone. It is so with the Testimonies, too, as certainly as they are the truth of God.²⁰

In line with this, Jones refused to interpret in historical context an 1897 testimony that there should not be a single person regarded as General Conference president, and thus he continually opposed A. G. Daniells' ascendancy to that office. When Ellen White herself offered to help resolve his questions, Jones replied,

Such a proposition in itself surrenders at once the whole ground of the claim in behalf of your writings as the word of God, or as given by inspiration of God. For if the writings were really the word of God—a. They need no explanation. b. If the writings to be explained were not the word of God, then I would not want any explanation on them; for I would not care any more for them than for any other writings that were not the word of God.²¹

The Jones-Kellogg position on the inspiration of Ellen White seemed to place them in an awkward situation with respect to apparently inconsistent messages. They could totally reject all the messages or explain the inconsistencies away. They followed the latter route and concluded that in some of her testimonies Mrs. White was influenced by others. Thus not all that she wrote could be considered inspired. Once they placed themselves into the position of having to decide which of the writings were inspired and which were not, it seemed merely a question of time before they no longer would feel comfortable in the church.²²

Responding to this, Ellen White accused Jones and Kellogg of "undermining the foundation pillars of the faith." She noticed "misrepresentations and falsehoods" regarding the testimonies and warned that "Very adroitly some have been working to make of no effect the Testimonies of warning and reproof that have stood the test for half a century. At the same time, they deny doing any such thing." She frequently alluded to the alleged human influences on the testimonies, stating that many had gone into infidelity through the position "some-

body has told Sister White." She pointed out:

Unless there is a breaking away from the influence that Satan has prepared, and a reviving of the testimonies that God has given, souls will perish in their delusion.²³

Nevertheless, the Kellogg-Jones crisis was only the beginning of the disunion over the "spirit of prophecy" that was to plague the denomination in the early years of the century. Other apostasies sprang from—and operated in conjunction with or independently of—the Battle Creek faction. The element that most had in common was their conclusion that portions of Ellen White's writings were not inspired.

"Once they placed themselves into the position of having to decide which of the writings were inspired and which were not, it seemed merely a question of time before they no longer would feel comfortable in the church."

With Ellen White's testimonies helping to sharpen the differences, Daniells was able to form an alliance with Butler, Evans, Haskell, and others against Waggoner, Kellogg, Jones, and their associates who, in addition to preaching varying degrees of pantheism, were questioning Ellen White. Although the lines seemed sharply drawn, there were greater theological differences, particularly in relationship to Ellen White's writings, among the defenders of historic Adventism than the participants realized.

The Sanctuary

Cracks in this alliance of defenders began appearing as Adventism responded to A. F. Ballenger's teachings on the sanctuary, the second topic of theological controversy to achieve dominance near the turn of the century. Ellen White was still deeply

concerned with the pantheism crisis and its effects when reports arrived from England, where Ballenger was teaching that full atonement was made when Christ died. When He ascended, He went into the Most Holy Place and has been there ever since. This is substantiated, Ballenger argued, by Hebrews 6:19 where the phrase "within the veil," when compared to Old Testament usage, clearly refers to the Most Holy Place. Finally, Ballenger believed that it was impossible to harmonize his position with Ellen White's writings, the differences being "irreconcilable." This sprang from his understanding that Ellen White's use of "within the veil" theologically resolved the meaning of the expression.²⁴ Ballenger's critics regarded these teachings as a challenge to fundamental Seventh-day Adventist doctrine and reported that they were causing problems in England, Wales, and Ireland.²⁵

At the 1905 General Conference session, Ballenger presented his sanctuary teachings in three one-hour discussions before a select committee of twenty-five. In his first presentation Ballenger examined texts that used the phrase "within the veil" and put forward nine inconsistencies between scripture and the Adventist teaching that Christ performed his first-apartment ministry after the cross.²⁶

Although a full transcript of Ballenger's presentations on the second and third day apparently was not taken, it is clear that he spoke on the atonement. In answer to one question he said, "When Christ died on Calvary, by that act he had reached down and put his arms around the fallen world, and lifted it right back up to the place where it was before it fell off the platform of the garden of Eden, and left men again free to choose, where Adam was free to choose, between eternal loss and eternal gain."²⁷ It is quite likely that Ballenger at least implied that the atonement included physical benefits, a teaching with which he was already identified.

Although Ellen White apparently did not attend these meetings, she did present a testimony the day following the Ballenger presentations. She gave a message on May 24, 1905, not only to Ballenger, but "to our people," and treated it as divine guidance

specifically pertaining to the Ballenger situation, frequently using such words as "our Instructor spoke words to Brother Ballenger," "I am bidden to say in the name of the Lord," and "thus did the heavenly messenger pronounce."

Within this context, Mrs. White mentioned "erroneous theories" mingled with truth, compared Ballenger's theology with Kellogg's and "many ministers among us" who had "departed from Christ's plan," noted his "mystification" of the gospel, asserted that his teaching would "undermine the mighty truths" established for ages, and observed that his ideas would likewise destroy fundamental Adventist truths. Directly quoting heavenly counsel, she stated: "Our Instructor spoke words to Brother Ballenger: 'You are bringing in confusion and perplexity by your interpretation of the Scriptures . . . Put away any exposition of Scripture which means, 'My Lord delayeth His coming' ' ' By bringing the benefits reserved for heaven to the present life, she seemed to be saying, Ballenger was in effect delaying the coming of the Lord."²⁸

After an appearance before the General Conference Committee in May 1905, Ballenger was retired from the ministry to his 25-acre farm in Virginia. He remained relatively quiet in denominational affairs until 1909, when he wrote a letter to Ellen White that he later published that same year in his pamphlet *Cast Out for the Cross of Christ*. In that letter he quoted 12 passages of scripture that use the terms "within" and "without the veil." He also quoted Mrs. White's use—to him mistaken—of the phrase in *The Great Controversy* and concluded that she was not in harmony with Biblical teaching. He thus lost confidence in Mrs. White over her use of one word.²⁹ In 1911 he aligned with A. T. Jones and, by 1912, was visiting churches throughout the country espousing his cause. He began publication of the periodical *The Gathering Call*, which he edited until his death in 1921. The publication assumed an anti-organization tone and closely identified with the Pentecostal movement, stressing divine healings, speaking in tongues, and reception of the Holy Ghost.

By 1911 many within the denomination

questioned why no adequate response to the Ballenger pamphlet, *Cast Out for the Cross of Christ*, had been published. Reflecting upon the situation, Irwin suggested the E. E. Andross, who had been responding to Ballenger throughout California, write a rejoinder. A. G. Daniells had fears of such a project, however, based on his sense of lack of agreement even among the conservative defenders of traditional Adventist doctrine. He wrote W. C. White:

I suppose you know that there is quite a difference of opinion among our ministers regarding some features of the Sanctuary question. Some of us feel that Ballenger, Jones, Crisler, and Keck could have nothing better placed in their hands than positions concerning which our leading men could not agree . . . I am sure that some of the arguments presented by Brother Andross in his manuscript would be repudiated by a large number of our ministers.³⁰

The Daily

This variety of opinion within Adventism regarding “some features of the sanctuary doctrine” had its roots in the third of the trio of controversies that, as we are here suggesting, focused denominational concern over the authority of Ellen White. This was the controversy concerning the obscure term “daily” in Daniel 8:11–13. This passage has the “little horn” transgressing against the sanctuary, taking away the “daily”, and leads up to the famous announcement of the cleansing of the sanctuary: “Unto two thousand and three hundred days . . .” In the past most Adventists had supposed the term “daily” to refer to ancient Roman paganism. But as developed in Europe by such people as L. R. Conradi, W. W. Prescott, and E. J. Waggoner, the “new view” supposed “daily” to refer to the taking away, by the institution of a false sanctuary system, of the knowledge of Christ’s “continual” mediation in the heavenly sanctuary. The potential for conflict became apparent at least by 1900 when E. E. Andross wrote Haskell that the new view conflicted with

Mrs. White’s statement concerning the “daily” in *Early Writings*.³¹

Conradi and Prescott presented the new view to Daniells as he traveled through Europe in 1900 on his way to the 1901 General Conference session; at the session itself Waggoner and Prescott sought to present this view to Mrs. White. According to W. C. White, Mrs. White was instructed through vision not to listen to the views of Waggoner and Prescott “because that which they were counting as of superior value was mingled with views that were misleading,” particularly “overstrained ideas of sanctification.” Indeed, at the conference, Mrs. White, in her public addresses, sought to counteract Waggoner’s and Prescott’s influence. Nonetheless, Mrs. White herself neither examined nor condemned the new view of the “daily” that Waggoner and Prescott wanted to present to her. She instead suggested that they discuss their positions with Uriah Smith to get his reaction.³²

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

During the pantheist crisis of 1902 to 1907, the dispute over the “daily” was generally submerged. Beginning in 1907, however, the denominational position on Daniel 8 as enunciated in the books of Uriah Smith and others came under severe attack by non-Adventists and former Adventists. Prescott observed: “It is only a question of time when the present teaching concerning the daily will be discarded, and the sooner we do it, the easier it will be to do.”³³

The General Conference Committee in the fall of 1907 studied the subject and at that time Daniells fully accepted the new view. As did almost everyone who engaged in the debate, Daniells believed that the real issues involved far transcended the question over whether the “daily” represented paganism. If that was the only issue, he said, “I would

not waste much of my time arguing with men who persist in making claims utterly at variance with all the reliable history of the world.”³⁴

Although the statement in *Early Writings* concerning Millerite “correctness” on the question of the “daily” initially troubled Daniells, his study of the contextual and historical background to the statement resolved the question for him. The central point of the vision given Mrs. White, he concluded, concerned the “time” of the ending of the 2300 days, not the specific interpretation of the “daily.” Daniells believed those interpreting her statement similarly were the “truest friends of the gift of prophecy” and that “short-sighted expositors” were forcing a situation that would place the writings in an “indefensible position.”³⁵

During the 1909 General Conference session, the two views of the “daily” received a public airing for the first time. The writing and distribution to the delegates of a tract by O. A. Johnson that supported the old view provided the spark for a two-evening discussion of the subject following the session. W. C. White, who chaired the meetings, noted that in most cases the discussions were not antagonistic, except for a paper by L. A. Smith, son of Uriah Smith, and editor of the *Southern Watchman*, which he had left with the delegates but did not present personally.³⁶

L. A. Smith and F. C. Gilbert, then a minister in the Atlantic Union Conference, shortly thereafter published a tract that greatly inflamed the situation. They contended that the new view completely and consciously attacked the fundamental teachings of the church in terms of both doctrine and the role of the spirit of prophecy, “the infallible interpreter of the Bible.” Affirming that there was no possible escape from this conclusion, they said “that a view contradicts the Spirit of Prophecy should, we think, be sufficient condemnation of it in the minds of all Seventh-day Adventists to cause them to drop it at the start.”³⁷

Other advocates of the historic position,

such as Stephen Haskell, agreed, believing that once the leadership of the church accepted the position that the testimonies “do not mean what they say,” the church would compromise away the spirit of prophecy.³⁸

In responding to the Smith-Gilbert pamphlet, the advocates of the new view stressed the context both of the *Early Writings* statement and of Daniel 8, claiming this showed the new view to be consistent with Adventist teaching about Ellen White. They also stressed Ellen White’s articles written between 1890 and 1892 on the reception of advancing light, as well as her statements about the importance of studying the books of Daniel and Revelation. W. A. Spicer noted, “when the Testimonies have urged us to study the books of Daniel and the Revelation, it surely has not been with the idea that we have nothing to learn.” The new view gained wide exposure at union conference sessions and other meetings and through pamphlets by Prescott and Conradi during 1909 and 1910.³⁹

In light of L. A. Smith’s claim that those who held the new view did so in complete opposition to Ellen G. White’s teaching, Daniells believed himself justified in presenting his views of the “daily” at the seven union conference sessions of 1910. He believed that the influence of the General Conference officials holding that view was thereby being destroyed and required a response, and he bristled at the “fierce, fighting, arbitrary attitude” some held who defended the old view. He decried the access some seemed to have to “private testimonies” concerning others, believing that they had made “shockingly indiscreet” use of some of those testimonies.⁴⁰

It was apparent that the alliance which had defeated the pantheists was shattering over the position Ellen White should occupy in interpretation of the “daily.” By mid-1910 it seemed that Irwin, Haskell, Loughborough, and Butler would publicly join Johnson, Smith, Gilbert, J. S. Washburn, G. B. Starr, and a host of others to publicly oppose those holding the new view. In writing to Mrs. White about his intention of publishing on the subject, G. I. Butler stated:

I cannot see why we old hands ought

not to speak out on this great innovation, and stand for the old positions our people have endorsed, led by yourself, and your testimonies. I for one feel that I should act the coward, as one of the old hands in this cause, to keep still while they preach in Washington and in every union conference that which I consider an utter heresy.⁴¹

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

If Elder Daniells thinks that some of the interpretations of Scripture that have been held in the past are not correct, our brethren should listen to his reasons, and give candid consideration to his views. . .

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

At the same time, Mrs. White noted, "At present there is not that unity that should exist among our brethren, and the Lord says, 'Come together.'" Only when the proposed conference did not take place and Butler was on the verge of publishing did Mrs. White finally issue two testimonies on the "daily."⁴²

Significantly, these testimonies dealt with the larger question of Ellen White's role in settling a doctrinal dispute. She requested that her writings "not be used as the leading argument to settle questions over which there is now so much controversy." In noting that she had no specific instruction from the Lord on the "point under discussion," she again urged that her writings not be used in the debate. The testimony, dated July 31, 1910, was significantly entitled "Our Attitude Toward Doctrinal Controversy." The second testimony, dated August 3, 1910, contained the following call for unity:

We must blend together in the bonds of Christlike unity; then our labors will not be in vain. Draw in even cords, and let no contentions be brought in.⁴³

While advocates of the new view of the "daily" were pleased with Mrs. White's observation that, in *Early Writings*, she had not used the term "daily" in a technical, theological sense, they were disappointed that she called for "silence" on the subject and seemed to relegate it to minor status. They considered a proper understanding of the "daily" to have great significance, not only concerning the context of Daniel 8, but for understanding the mediatorial role of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary.⁴⁴

"Advocates of the new view of the 'daily' found themselves closely analyzing the role Ellen White's writings should play in the church. It seemed, however, that no useful dialogue in this area was possible."

Pressured by the pantheists from outside the church and by the supporters of the historic Adventist position on the "daily" from within it, advocates of the new view of the "daily" found themselves closely analyzing the role Ellen White's writings should play in the church. It seemed, however, that no useful dialogue in this area was possible. With the pantheists outside the church and attacking the spirit of prophecy, most of the opponents of the new view were calling for a spirit of prophecy that was an "infallible interpreter of Bible principles." This left the supporters of the new view isolated in their attempts to forge a new understanding.⁴⁵

Inspiration and the 1919 Bible Conference

The "daily" was one among several questions that led such men as M. C. Wilcox, A. O. Tait, and W. C. White to call for a

meeting of editors, Bible teachers, and ministers. Although the first call for such a conference appeared in 1913, it was not until 1919, in Washington, D.C., that the meeting finally took place.⁴⁶

The area of perhaps greatest interest during the discussions in 1919—both in the Bible Conference from July 1–21 and in the meeting of the Bible and History Teachers Council that followed—concerned the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy. The subject was discussed on several occasions; stenographic reports of meetings (some of which were published in *SPECTRUM*, Vol. 10, No. 1) afford insight into the various understandings of the nature of Ellen White's inspiration.

W. W. Prescott, General Conference field secretary, first broached the subject on July 10 by suggesting that statements of Ellen White needed to be "interpreted" to bring them into "harmony with history and fact." This, he noted, might at times conflict with the normal first reading of a specific statement. Prescott then moved from that point to concluding that Mrs. White should be "corrected" when errors of fact were uncovered. He listed six such "corrections" that had been made in the 1911 edition of *The Great Controversy*.⁴⁷

A. O. Tait picked up Prescott's theme and stated, "In other words, Ellen White never claimed that she had inspired evidence in regard to those dates and historical facts." Prescott responded by attributing the following position to W. C. White: "I talked to Elder W. C. White about this matter, as I had something to do with this book, and he has told me that there was no claim that this book was to be an inspired authority on facts of history." White, however, had in fact studiously avoided distinguishing between so-called inspired and uninspired aspects of Ellen White's writings.⁴⁸

While D. E. Robinson offered an explanation that could account for at least three of the six "corrections" mentioned by Prescott, W. G. Wirth, a Bible teacher from Pacific Union College, affirmed that he had never believed "that the history of the spirit of prophecy was to be taken as inspired." He considered that the "history was merely

thrown in to substantiate the principles."⁴⁹

Six days later A. G. Daniells expressed pleasure for the opportunity of meeting and having a "plain talk about this question." He also expressed happiness for the chance to place himself "on record regarding this gift to the church" because of the criticisms that seemed to plague him and other members of the General Conference that they were "shaky with reference to the spirit of prophecy," and that they stood on slippery ground.⁵⁰

During his July 30 talk, Daniells revealed rather fully his concept of the inspiration of Ellen White. While he clearly considered her testimonies to be from the Lord, he likewise stressed that there was a need for interpretation. He emphasized that the real basis for his confidence in the gift was its fruitage within the church.

Daniells considered Ellen White's writings to be inspired commentary upon the Bible, but he rejected the concept that it was the only safe or infallible interpreter of the Bible. On questions of interpretation, Daniells stressed his belief that the "whole trend of teaching and thought that is put through the Testimonies on that subject" should determine the conclusions.⁵¹

Daniells asserted that Mrs. White had never claimed "to be an authority on history, or a dogmatic teacher on theology." "Her gift has not the gift of exegesis," he affirmed. He emphasized that he believed that "as far as she was concerned, she was ready to correct in revision such statements as she thought should be corrected." Just as Mrs. White should not be considered an "infallible interpreter" of the Bible, he stressed, so she should not be considered an "infallible guide to history." Daniells distinguished between the question of infallibility and inspiration and stated, "I never understood that she put infallibility into the historical quotations," affirming that the final proof of the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy was its spiritual value rather than its historical veracity. He further warned that while all efforts should be made to avoid casting doubts upon the gift to students, another way to injure the student would be "to take an extreme and unwarranted position."⁵²

The most prominent feature in the discussions of Ellen White's writings on August 1, 1919, was the question of verbal inspiration. F. M. Wilcox stated that because of his knowledge of the methods used in the Ellen White works he "never believed in the verbal inspiration of the Testimonies." He called for cautious moves towards educating church members to avoid the serious crisis that might someday occur. Daniells seemed to be reacting to those who questioned his stand concerning Ellen White's inspiration when he stated:

I think more mischief can be done with the Testimonies by claiming their verbal inspiration than can with the Bible. If you ask for the logic of it, it might take some time to bring it out, and I might not be able to satisfy every mind; but if you ask for practical experience, I can give it to you, plenty of it.

Daniells expressed his opinion that holding to a verbal inspiration concept of Mrs. White's testimonies was illogical "because everybody who has ever seen the work done knows better, and we might as well dismiss it."⁵³

G. B. Thompson believed that church members had been incorrectly educated and thus the denomination faced the possibility of a shock on the question of verbal inspiration. His confidence in Ellen White's gift was not in its verbal inspiration, he stated, but rather in its "influence and power in the denomination." He concluded that Ellen White's writings "are not verbally inspired—we know that—and what is the use of teaching that they are?" When M. E. Kern suggested that the question of verbal inspiration did not settle the problem of defining the inspiration of Ellen White, Daniells responded by suggesting that difficulties sprang from the two questions of infallibility and verbal inspiration. He then referred to James White statements in the *Review and Herald* that attempted to correct erroneous ideas about verbal inspiration. Believing that, because that explanation had not been accepted "and passed on down," the present generation was facing perplexity, Daniells continued:

We could mention some old and some

young who think they cannot believe the Testimonies without just putting them up as absolutely infallible and word-inspired, taking the whole thing as given verbally by the Lord. They do not see how to believe them and how to get good out of them except in that way. . . . I am sure there has been advocated an idea of infallibility in Sister White and verbal inspiration in the Testimonies that has led people to expect too much and to make too great claims, and so we have gotten into difficulty. . . . Brethren are we going to evade difficulties or help out the difficulties by taking a false position? (VOICES: NO!)

The next three pages of transcript depict Daniells applying the question of verbal inspiration to such questions as salt, eggs, butter, and book revision. How, he asked in connection with the last point, could the writings be revised if they were verbally inspired.⁵⁴

"I am sure there has been advocated an idea of infallibility in Sister White and verbal inspiration in the Testimonies that has led people to expect too much and to make too great claims, and so we have gotten into difficulty."—A. G. Daniells

Several attempts were made to arrive at a practical way to deal with the concept of inspiration. B. L. House considered the problem not to be the question of verbal inspiration, but rather the methodology used in preparing the books. Because he believed the Testimonies were prepared differently than other works containing historical extracts, he implied that the Testimonies were more inspired. F. M. Wilcox stressed his over-all concept of inspiration that would allow for the possibility of fallibility in a specific detail. But he added, "It seems to me I would have

to accept what she says on some of those general policies or I would have to sweep away the whole thing."⁵⁵

Perhaps the most basic question was that posed by C. L. Benson, dean and history teacher at Pacific Union College:

If there are such uncertainties with reference to our historical position, and if the Testimonies are not to be relied on to throw a great deal of light upon our historical positions, and if the same is true with reference to our theological interpretation of texts, then how can we consistently place implicit confidence in the direction that is given with reference to our educational problems, and our medical school, and even our denominational organization? If there is a definite spiritual leadership in these things, then how can we consistently lay aside the Testimonies or partially lay them aside when it comes to the prophetic and historic side of the message and place these things on the basis of research work.⁵⁶

Others asked similar questions but no definitive answers emerged from the conference.

Despite the failure of the conference to resolve the leading issues, Daniells wrote W. C. White, who had been unable to attend: "I think I can truly say that at the close of this important meeting, we stand together more unitedly and firmly for all the fundamentals than when we began the meeting."⁵⁷

But not everyone agreed. Claude E. Holmes, linotype operator and Washington correspondent of the *Southern Watchman*, was among the unofficial attendants at the conference. Reflecting a view of Ellen White's writings not shared by the conference's invited participants, Holmes published an open letter to J. S. Washburn, a long-time Adventist minister. He decried the statements he heard at the conference "again and again by a number of our Bible and history teachers that Sister White is not an authority on history." He considered that position as the ultimate evil, since those views would be "poured into the receptive

minds of our young people to undermine their faith in the spirit of prophecy." Holmes interpreted the positions taken in 1919 to mean that the conference had concluded that Mrs. White selected relevant historical materials just as any researcher would; therefore if the facts selected happened to be erroneous, they should be rejected. Holmes' view of inspiration led him to totally reject this view and to assert, instead, that Mrs. White selected from divergent historical sources those items that she recognized as true and that thereby those items could be regarded as authoritatively and infallibly true. According to Holmes, everything dealt with by a prophet became authoritative. He continued:

If her historical writings are to be discredited because she is not an "authority on history, then the logic of the situation forces us to the conclusion that all her writings must be thrown overboard, for historical facts are inextricably interwoven in all her messages. . . One tells me her books are not in harmony with facts historically, another that she is wrong scientifically, still another disputes her claims theologically, and another questions her authorship, and others discredit her writings grammatically and rhetorically. Is there anything left? If these claims are all true, how much spirit of prophecy does the remnant church possess?

Holmes concluded this 11-page open letter by emphasizing his uncompromising stance on the absolute inspiration of Ellen White. He affirmed that he drew no line "between the so-called human and divine; they are all Scripture to me."⁵⁸

Holmes also issued a protest against the teachings of E. F. Albertsworth and H. C. Lacey, two of the three teachers from Washington Missionary College who had attended the conference. He advised certain students to protest, too. Although the student objections initially involved only Professor Albertsworth's alleged "light esteem" for counsels of Ellen White, the upshot of the episode was the severance, by mid-1920, of all three of the Washington Missionary College representatives at the 1919 Bible Conference.⁵⁹

Having been involved in the debate over the "daily," J. S. Washburn looked back on the 1919 meetings as the continuation of that "terrible controversy." In 1921 he wrote F. M. Wilcox, "You were in that secret Bible Council which I believe was the most unfortunate thing our people ever did, and it seemed to me you were losing the simplicity of your faith." He also noted that Wilcox had defended the three Washington Missionary College representatives when their teachings were brought into question before the college board. Bringing the issues of the "daily," the Washington Missionary College teachers, and the 1919 Bible Conference together in a 16-page open letter to Claude Holmes, dated April 8, 1920, Washburn implied that the conference participants had agreed that Ellen White was not inspired on history, and in some cases even concluded that she was uninspired regarding theology and health reform. He alleged that these positions led "inevitably to infidelity, as was demonstrated by Dr. Albertsworth. . . ."

Washburn also published the information that the Columbia Union Conference president, a year previously, had attempted to rid the college of the three "infidel" teachers, but that the General Conference had assisted them and instead had "forced out of office" that president. He noted that, although the three teachers differed in other beliefs, all three were united in advocating "the new doctrine of the daily as taught by Professor Prescott" and others. Washburn identified the denominational origins of the "new view" with E. J. Waggoner, A. T. Jones, and J. H. Kellogg. He pictured that view as "besieging and threatening to desolate and destroy the work of God's last message at its headquarters, at its very heart." Washburn assured the readers of his letter that the three teachers would not be teaching at the college the next year. The "Omega apostasy" had received a setback at Washington Missionary College, he affirmed.⁶⁰

While the controversy intensified from that point onward, it was to reach a still more volatile point at the 1922 General Conference session in San Francisco. Two open letters to A. G. Daniells, dated May 1,

1922, circulated among the delegates. In his letter Claude Holmes listed 12 specific areas in which, he said, Daniells ignored or subverted Ellen White's counsel. Holmes concluded:

I firmly believe that the deplorable conditions found in the church today are due largely to the course you have followed. In all seriousness I ask: Should men be leaders in our work year after year who neglect to follow God's counsel and persist in following their own way?⁶¹

"By 1932, F. M. Wilcox was noting the consequences of the division. He stated that entire churches were stirred up and that college students were lining up their teachers as to whether they were 'fundamentalist' or 'modernist.'"

Washburn's 36-page open letter was even more comprehensive. He again accused Daniells of seeking to destroy Mrs. White's testimonies in order to uphold his own views on the "daily," recalling an all-night conversation in 1910 that had shattered his faith in Daniells. Furthermore, Washburn said that the 1919 Conference had been a meeting of "doubters":

Two of our best writers told me that articles on the Turkish question were kept out of our papers since that secret council had thrown doubt on that question and many others. So while Islam is gathering her millions for the last great fulfillment of the prophecy of Daniel 11th and 12th chapter, our papers, our ministers, our sentinels are chloroformed to sleep, are muzzled into silence by this Council of Darkness, this Diet of Doubts. Was not this secret council a crowning act in the program of doubt and darkness and criticism that has been enveloping Washington recently? Will this bring the latter rain, the full assur-

ance of faith and the victorious life? And you and Professor Prescott were the leading figures in that Institute. No doubt you found it impossible to agree with all the new chaotic theology of that council, but Elder Daniells, how could you permit such a dangerous parade of doubts, and preside over such a cloud of misty higher criticism? Did that institute cure the criticism you tell me is destroying our work? No, it multiplied it a hundred times. And you more than any other man are responsible.⁶²

Washburn later claimed that his "Open Letter" was largely instrumental in defeating Daniells' bid for reelection to the General Conference presidency in 1922. Indeed, San Francisco newspaper accounts depicted Daniells emotionally defending his leadership, but decrying the bitter attacks against him and holding a "handful of written documents, which he said were the proofs of his charges of propaganda and villification."⁶³

Daniells' defeat did not end the basic alignments that had begun to solidify earlier. By 1932, F. M. Wilcox was noting the consequences of the division. He stated that entire churches were stirred up and that college students were lining up their teachers as to whether they were "fundamentalist" or "modernist."⁶⁴

Through these years of theological controversy, three broad approaches to Ellen White's writings had emerged. One, held by Jones, Ballenger, and Kellogg assumed a literal understanding of her work. It believed that a primary function of Ellen White was to resolve specific points of

theological conflict. When, after the turn of the century, Ellen White began to issue testimonies that questioned beliefs they held throughout the 1890s, that group decided that Ellen White was being influenced by others. They concluded that the writings could be divided into inspired and uninspired portions. Ballenger took an even stronger position. Because of her use of the phrase "within the veil," he came to the point of considering Ellen White a false prophetess.

A second approach, held by Haskell, Butler, and Washburn, also downplayed contextual considerations in its literal understanding of Ellen White's writings, but did not divide her work into inspired and uninspired portions. This group believed that positions that seemed to conflict with Ellen White's writings should not be advocated, lest confidence in her be undermined.

Finally, such men as Daniells, Prescott, and W. C. White emphasized the need for a non-literal, contextual approach to Ellen White's statements. Although they did not divide her work into inspired and uninspired parts, they did allow for the possibility of error in her writings. They did not consider that Ellen White had claimed exegetical authority for her writings, but believed that the Bible itself should be its own interpreter. By 1910 most literalists who rejected Ellen White had left the church. Proponents of the other two views, literalist defenders of all of Ellen White's work, and contextualists who assumed that some errors might be found in her writings and that the Bible must be its own ultimate interpreter, continued to struggle for supremacy. Today proponents of all three approaches continue to confront each other over Ellen White's work.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. *Review and Herald* (RH), Nov. 22, 1898, p. 752. See also E. J. Dryer, "God's Dwelling-Place"; Uriah Smith, "Body and Spirit are His"; C. H. Keslake, "The Place of Christ's Ministry," and "The Heavenly Pattern"; n.a. (selected) "The God-Man," and "The Living Temple"; RH, July 27, 1897, p. 467; Aug. 9, 1898, pp. 509-10; Sept. 20, 1898, p. 598; July 17, 1900, p. 453; July 31, 1900, p. 485. All unpublished materials cited in this article are housed in the General Conference archives except those cited WE which are housed at the White Estate.

The designation PC will refer to Personal Collections, DF to Document File, and RG to the Record Group number of the cited document, housed at the archives. RH will refer to the *Review and Herald*.

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

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

4. *Present Truth*, April 16, 1903, pp. 243-44

and Aug. 14, 1902, p. 516. See also *Present Truth*, Jan. 23, June 12 and 19, Nov. 6, 1902, pp. 51, 372, 388, 709.

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

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

7. S. N. Haskell to Ellen White, Nov. 10, 1899, RG 11, bk. 20, pp. 247-48, RH, Sept. 4, 1900, p. 570, Nov. 28, 899, p. 774, Oct. 9, 1900, p. 650; Underwood, RH, April 26, 1898, p. 262, May 3, 1898, pp. 278-79, May 17, 1898, pp. 310-11, May 24, 1898, pp. 326-27; Loughborough, RH, Oct. 18, Nov. 1, Nov. 22, Dec. 13, 1898, pp. 662-63, 695, 747-48, 794; Jones, RH, June 20, 1899, p. 392.

8. RH, June 21, p. 400-01, Oct. 18, p. 670-71, Nov. 8, p. 720, 1898, April 10, 1900, p. 237; R. S. Donnell to L. A. Hoopes, June 26, 1899, and to A. F. Ballenger, June 27, 1899, RG 21, 1899—D. A. J. Breed to Irwin, July 22, 1900, RG 9, Irwin, G. A. Haskell to Ellen White, Oct. 3, 1899, Haskell, S. N., 1899, WE.

9. Irwin to Daniells, July 19, 1903, RG 9, Daniells, A. D., folder 1. Irwin to Daniells, RG 11, 1903—I; W. C. Sisley to Daniells, June 23, 1903, RG 11, 1903—S.

10. Waggoner to Daniells, July 24, 1903, RG 11, 1903—W, fld. 1.

11. *Present Truth*, June 5, 1902, p. 355.

12. J. H. Kellogg to Ellen White, n.d., c. 1902-03, W. C. White Outgoing Letterbook 31, p. 227, WE.

13. Kellogg to Prescott, Oct. 25, 1903, RG 11, bk. 32, p. 132.

14. I. H. Evans to Irwin, Nov. 12, 1903, RG AU 11, 1903-04—E; Prescott to Haskell, Feb. 10, 1905, Prescott, W. W., 1905, WE; Daniells to E. H. Gates, March 20, 1904, RG 11, bk. 33, p. 491.

15. R. A. Underwood to Daniells, Jan. 2 and Sept. 18, 1903, RG 11, 1903—U; H. W. Cottrell, Statement, Mar. 28, 1903, at GC session, RG 1, Stenographic Report of 1903 GC Session, Mar. 28 Meeting; G. B. Thompson to Daniells, Aug. 11, 1903, RG 11, 1903—T.

16. Prescott to E. L. MacLafferty, April 9, 1905, RG 11, 1905—P; Ellen White, "A Peculiar People," July 6, 1902, RG 11, Special Testimonies, Testimonies Relating to Medical Missionary Work During the Year 1902, p. 216; Ellen White to "Brethren Magan and Sutherland," Oct. 9, 1903, RG 11, Special Testimonies, Testimonies on Various Subjects During 1903, p. 318; Ellen White, "Decided Action to be Taken Now," *Ibid*; Ellen White, "An Open Letter," May 1903, F. M. Wilcox PC, Miscellaneous Materials; Ellen White, "Teach the Word," RH, Oct. 22, 1903, p. 8.

17. Daniells to M. C. Wilcox, Oct. 26, 1903, RG 11, bk. 31, p. 949; Prescott to B. F. Anderson, Feb. 18, 1904, RG 11, bk. 33, p. 433.

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

19. John Harvey Kellogg, "Report of the Work of the Sanitarium," Transcript, Dec. 28, 1905, RG 17: M. L. Andreasen, Reference Files, Sanitarium Report by Dr. Kellogg Folder, pp. 27, 45.

20. A. T. Jones, Remarks at Berrien Springs, Mich., May 16, 1906, RG 11: Documents, 1901-50, Case Files, A. T. Jones Folder; Jones, Sermon at Battle Creek Tabernacle, Jan. 2, 1906, pp. 24-5, Pamphlet Files.

21. Jones to Ellen White, Apr. 26, 1909, p. 2, RG 11, Incoming Letters, 1910—J.

22. Jones to Daniells, Jan. 26-Feb. 13, 1906, RG 11, Incoming Letters, 1910—J.

23. Ellen G. White, "Testimonies to the Church, Series B, No. 2, pp. 21-2, 57, Pamphlet Files; Ellen White, "Testimonies to the Church, Series B, No. 7, pp. 31, 53-4, 63, *Ibid*.

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

25. E. W. Farnsworth to Daniells, Feb. 22, 1905, RG 11, 1905—F.

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

27. *Ibid*.

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

29. Ballenger, *Cast Out for the Cross of Christ*.

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

31. G. E. Fifield, "Cleansing of the Sanctuary," RH Sept. 21, 1897, p. 594. Address to Haskell, Nov. 12, 1900, RG 9, Haskell, S. N.

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

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

34. Daniells to W. C. White, Jan. 3, 1910, RG 11, Outgoing Letterbook 46, p. 393; Daniells, Transcript of Remarks Before Faculty of Fernando Academy, California, May 11, 1910, Document File (DF) 200: A. G. Daniells Miscellaneous Articles, WE; Daniells to Haskell, Mar. 10, 1908, RG 11, Outgoing Letterbook 42, pp. 969-79; Daniells, Transcript of Bible Study at Nashville, Tenn., Jan. 26, 1910, RG 21: "Special Files; A. G. Daniells, The Daily, Section 1.

35. Daniells, "Remarks Before the Faculty of Fernando Academy, California, May 11, 1910," DF 200: A. G. Daniells Miscellaneous Articles, WE; Daniells to W. C. White, Feb. 22, 1910, WCW Correspondence, 1910—Daniells, A. G., WE; Daniells to W. C. White, Feb. 1, 1910, RG 11, Incoming Letters, 1910—W.

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

37. L. A. Smith and F. C. Gilbert, "'The Daily' in the Prophecy of Daniel," pp. 2-3, 24. *Ibid.*, pp. 16-7, 30-1.

38. Haskell to W. W. Prescott, Nov. 15, 1907, RG 58: L. E. Froom, Reference Files, 1920s-30s, The Daily, Folder 1; Haskell to Ellen White, Dec. 6, 1909, DF 201: Daily Correspondence, WE; Haskell to Crisler, Mar. 30, 1908, RG 58: L. E. Froom, Reference Files, 1920s-30s, The Daily, Folder 1; Haskell to W. C. White, April 13, 1920, WCW Correspondence Bk. 146, 1920-22—H, WE.

39. Daniells to J. C. Stevens, June 26, 1909, RG 11, bk. 45, pp. 558-59; Daniells, Untitled Manuscript, c. June 1910, RG 21, Special Files, "The Daily," Section 2; Daniells to Conradi, Dec. 23, 1909, RG 11, bk. 46, pp. 317-18; Spicer to Clarence Santee, Dec. 28, 1909, RG 21, bk. 52, p. 870.

40. Daniells to W. C. White, Dec. 31, 1909, RG 11, Outgoing Letterbook 46, p. 374; Daniells to W. C. White, Feb. 8, 1910, WCW Correspondence, 1910—Daniells, A. G., WE; Daniells to W. C. White, March 31, 1910, *Ibid.*; Daniells to W. C. White, Aug. 4, Aug. 5, Aug. 7, 1910, RG 11, Outgoing Letterbook 47, pp. 442, 448, 466.

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

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

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

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

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

46. M. C. Wilcox to A. G. Daniells, March 23,

1913, RG 11, Incoming Letters, 1913—W. M. C. Wilcox to Daniells and I. H. Evans, Oct. 31, 1915, RG 11, Incoming Letters, 1915—W; Daniells to M. C. Wilcox, Dec. 15, 1915, *Ibid.*; Tait to W. W. Prescott, Dec. 1, 1916, RG 17: W. W. Prescott, General Files, 1916-17—T. W. C. White to Daniells, Jan. 29, 1917, WCW Correspondence Bk. 116, 1917-19—D-E, WE; Daniells to W. C. White, March 20, 1917, *Ibid.*

47. H. S. Prenier, "The 1260 Days," July 10, Discussion, pp. 32-3, 58-62c, RG 25: Stenographic Report of the 1919 Bible and History Teachers' Conference. The remainder of the citations in this section are from this stenographic report.

48. *Ibid.*, pp. 62d-64.

49. *Ibid.*, pp. 65-6, 71.

50. Daniells, "The Spirit of Prophecy," July 16, p. 72.

51. *Ibid.*, pp. 2, 6, 9, 11, 14.

52. *Ibid.*, pp. 16-7, 21, 22, 26, 27. L. E. Froom Personal Collection, W. W. Prescott notes of 1919 Bible Conference.

53. Discussion, "Inspiration of the Spirit of Prophecy as Related to the Inspiration of the Bible," pp. 3, 5-8.

54. *Ibid.*, pp. 12-8.

55. *Ibid.*, pp. 19-22.

56. *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5.

57. A. G. Daniells to W. C. White, July 20, 1919, WCW Correspondence Bk. 116, 1917-19—D, White Estate; J. S. Washburn, "An Open Letter to Elder A. G. Daniells and an Appeal to the General Conference," 1922, pp. 28-9, F. M. Wilcox Personal Collection, Reference Files, J. S. Washburn Folder, General Conference Archives.

58. Holmes to J. S. Washburn, April 1, 1920, "Have we an Infallible 'Spirit of Prophecy?'" DF 242: J. S. Washburn, WE.

59. Holmes to L. E. Froom, n.d./c. Oct., 1927/, RG 58: L. E. Froom, Reference Files, 1920s-30s, Holmes, C. E., Folder; Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Trustees of Washington Missionary College, Feb. 19, 1919 to May 17, 1920, Columbia Union College, Takoma Park, Md.

60. Washburn to F. M. Wilcox, July 3, 1921, *Ibid.*; Washburn to Holmes, April 18, 1920, "The Startling Omega and its True Genealogy," RG 58: L. E. Froom, Reference Files, 1920s-30s, J. S. Washburn Folder.

61. Holmes to Daniells, May 1, 1922, "Open Letter," p. 8, RG 33: Inactive Sustentation Files, J. S. Washburn Folder.

62. Washburn, "An Open Letter to Elder A. G. Daniells and an Appeal to the General Conference," 36 pp., F. M. Wilcox PC, Reference Files, J. S. Washburn Folder.

63. Washburn to A. L. White, Oct. 7, 1948, DF 242: Washburn, J. S., WE; RG 21: Documents, 1920s-50s, Clippings Regarding 1922 GC Session Folder.

64. F. M. Wilcox to C. H. Watson, April 17, 1932, RG 21: "Special Files," Columbia Union Folder.

Adventist Colleges in the U.S. Trim 1982-83 Faculties

by Harold Hopp and Rick Rubner

Seven of the ten SDA liberal arts colleges in the United States are trimming their faculties next year. None are adding teaching positions.

These reductions of faculty size are related to a drop of 3.8 percent in enrollment last year, more than a five percent difference from non-Adventist colleges in the United States which increased in attendance by 1.6 percent. Only three SDA colleges in the United States are even maintaining their present faculty size. Not surprisingly, the schools maintaining the size of their faculties—Oakwood College, Southwestern Union College and Union College—were the only ones to experience increased enrollment in 1981-82. The greatest total number of faculty reductions will occur at Pacific Union College and Loma Linda University.

Another school making significant reductions in faculty is Southern Missionary College, which suffered its first drop in enrollment in over a decade—a 14.2 percent decrease that was the largest in the system. Perhaps Southern Missionary College's misfortune is temporary, related to the current controversy at the school. Equally dramatic is the 14.1 percent rise in registration at nearby Oakwood College.

The following report looks at enrollment

changes at each of the Adventist colleges in the United States and the ways those which needed to reduce the size of their faculties did so. The term "full-time equivalent" will be used to describe faculty reductions. It must be recognized that comparisons are approximate since a definition of full-time equivalent may vary slightly from school to school.

Andrews University

Provost Roy Graham estimates a reduction of six to eight full-time-equivalent faculty positions for the 1982-83 academic year. He told the Andrews University *Student Movement* last March that eight people were not replaced last year, 17 faculty members will be retiring or leaving this year, and replacements will be limited.

Faculty members communicated with the administration about where to make reductions through department chairmen and standing committees in each school. However, some faculty members felt the decisions were announced to the chairmen rather than made after consultations. The nursing department faculty have agreed to accept 90 percent of the annual salary for teaching three of the four quarters of this coming year, according to Rilla D. Taylor, chairman of the nursing department.

In selecting specific programs and faculty members to be cut, Andrews University looked at demand for courses and majors,

Harold Hopp was a senior psychology major and Rick Rubner was a senior communications major, both at Pacific Union College, when this article was written.

job opportunities for students upon graduation, and the length of a teacher's contract, according to Graham. He points out that the university's Office of Institutional Research foresees steady enrollment, but Graham is unwilling to state whether even further cuts in faculty or programs will be necessary in the future.

Atlantic Union College

Atlantic Union College has planned for the smaller pool of potential college students by working to keep the size of the faculty small, according to Ronna Archbold, director of public relations, admissions, and recruitment.

Therefore, Atlantic Union College will be reducing the size of its faculty by the equivalent of only one full-time faculty member. Cuts in the number of part-time and contract teachers allowed reductions equivalent to three full-time faculty, but the school also added two full-time nursing faculty, as a two-year nursing program is expanding to a four-year program.

A college can be run effectively even with the small faculty Atlantic Union College has, Archbold believes. Although regular full-time faculty is less than 50, the college has received high ratings in recent accreditation reports.

Columbia Union College

Columbia Union College has cut 5.5 full-time-equivalent faculty positions. One resulted from elimination of a sociology major; another 2.5 faculty positions were eliminated when a one-year practical nursing program was terminated. The remainder of the faculty reductions were achieved by not replacing retiring faculty.

Columbia Union College has already eliminated some departments, combined still others, and is considering still further consolidations of departments so that fewer department chairmen will be needed. Better education with fewer Columbia Union College faculty members has resulted from formal agreements with the University of Maryland for cooperative degree programs in agriculture and engineering. A new

program in computer science has been approved by the college's board.

Joseph Gurubatham, dean of academic administration, said that a faculty committee was informed of the need for faculty reductions, but he did not believe that faculty members should be asked to carry out the difficult task of deciding which of their peers should not be re-hired. The administration of the college recommended the reductions voted by the Board of Trustees.

Loma Linda University

At the January meeting, the Board of Trustees declared that the university was in a "state of fiscal exigency," a condition an increasing number of colleges and universities in the United States have declared. It allows an institution to dismiss even tenured faculty. At the meeting, the trustees approved major cuts in faculty and staff, forced by increasing costs coming simultaneously with declining enrollment in several of the university's eight schools and loss of government support in the form of aid to students and capitation grants. The trustees approved eliminating the equivalent of 15.5 full-time faculty positions throughout the university. Beyond these cuts, the trustees also approved reductions in teaching time of another 12 faculty members. Since the January meeting of the board, the university has cut 55 full- and part-time (not full-time-equivalent) staff positions.

R. Dale McCune, provost of the La Sierra Campus, where the undergraduate College of Arts and Sciences is located, said that continuing to achieve a balanced budget for his campus for the 1982-83 fiscal year depends on cutting this year's level of spending by \$365,000.

Oakwood College

President Calvin B. Rock does not foresee any cuts in programs or faculty this year. However, he set up a task force to study how to handle these problems if Oakwood is faced by them in the future. The recommendations of the task force are not

available. Oakwood College had a 14.1 percent increase in enrollment last year, the highest in the Adventist system.

Pacific Union College

Pacific Union College, facing a decline in enrollment next year, will cut 12 to 14 full-time-equivalent faculty positions, according to Tom Hopmann, vice-president for financial affairs. Faculty cuts will make it necessary to eliminate three majors: agriculture, sociology, and speech pathology.

Formal communication between the faculty and administration was through an academic council and its curriculum and academic efficiency committee. The administration did not dictate a specific number of reductions. The faculty committee studied the college's financial situation as well as department reports and decided on a plan which was approved with few changes by the Board of Trustees.

The committee used a formula of enrollment and student/teacher ratios, based on a Board of Higher Education recommendation of a 15.5 student/teacher ratio. Specific reductions were decided by the administration after consulting with department chairmen. Departmental seniority was considered, as was student utilization of departmental offerings.

Even though the administration did not dictate to the academic council the specific number of reductions and retained final approval throughout, there were some faculty members who were not happy with the procedure followed. They wished that a formula for reducing the number of administrators—similar to that used for the faculty—could be developed. Although the procedure involved many faculty members and allowed for much discussion with administrators, the college may change the procedure because it consumed so much time.

Southern Missionary College

The faculty is being cut back a net total of four positions. Although an additional faculty member is being added to the mathematics and computer science program, one full-time teacher is being cut from three

departments: art, music, and religion. The program in English as a foreign language has been terminated, eliminating another full-time faculty member. The equivalent of another full-time post has been cut by reducing the history department by half a salary and generally cutting back on contract and part-time teachers.

In addition, Southern Missionary College is eliminating 12 staff positions. All persons not rehired will be paid for one year while they are looking for a job. Lawrence E. Hanson, the academic dean, says the school also will assist faculty and staff in finding jobs. The administration made all decisions on faculty reductions. Although faculty were not generally involved, according to Hanson, the ten divisional chairmen were consulted.

Southwestern Adventist College

Southwestern Adventist College will make no faculty or staff reductions, according to Donald McAdams, president. The college will replace all teachers who leave. In fact, in 1981–82 Southwestern Adventist College added four teachers. Enrollment is stable. The dropout rate was reduced, perhaps, by an active tutoring program geared toward freshmen students who score low on entrance tests. This program helps students in English, reading, mathematics, and personal psychology. McAdams feels this program not only helps enrollment but also gives the school a better program by not dragging down the level of instruction, making classes more vital and alive. Teachers are not slowing down for the slower students, he says.

Southwestern Adventist College has a director of career life and planning. This person becomes actively involved with freshmen through counseling, seeking out students who need help rather than waiting for students to seek assistance. The career life program was begun during the 1981–82 year, and it appears to have paid off. There was a drop of only 20 students in previous years. Despite this good fortune, the college is budgeting fairly conservatively for 1982–83, preparing for a 20-student drop in enrollment (even though applications are ahead of last year at this time).

Union College

Union College is one of the three schools where enrollment increased last year. Not surprisingly, it will make no reductions in faculty or staff for the 1982-83 year, according to John Wagner, academic dean. Enrollment is expected to hold steady for 1982-83. While salaries will increase by the planned 6.2 percent beginning January 1, the budget is balanced.

Walla Walla College

Walla Walla College is cutting back its faculty by more than seven full-time-equivalents. History, nursing, art, industrial technology, and library science are losing one full-time position. In addition, contract teaching is being reduced by the equivalent of one-half to one full salary. Although history's loss is temporary, all reductions are by attrition. Also, Walla Walla has cut at least six non-faculty staff positions. Decisions for the reductions were made through a

faculty master planning committee. The committee worked with departments, determining their needs, analyzing student/faculty ratios, and considering alternating classes on a year-by-year basis, according to Malcolm Maxwell, vice-president for academic affairs.

Maxwell says that preliminary reports indicate that there is a budget deficit possibly in excess of \$350,000, mostly due to interest, increased energy expenses, and lower than expected income. Much of the \$125,000 interest that the college paid last year resulted from debts the school had to incur because of poor cash flow resulting from students' delay in paying bills.

The future of Adventist education is not in doubt. However, the shape that the future will take remains to be seen. Combining programs or even institutions may be necessary to run a higher educational system open to the greatest number of Adventists. Whatever the course, everyone concerned—administrators, faculty members, students, and parents—must begin to plan now so that circumstances do not force hasty and ill-planned retrenchments.

SDA Colleges	Enrollment		Tuition '82/'83	Faculty Reductions '82/'83
	'81/'82	Change ('80/'81- '81/'82)		
Atlantic Union	534	- 9.5%	\$4,596	1.0
Andrews	1,692	- 7.3%	\$4,512	6-8.0
Columbia Union	575	-10.0%	\$4,448	5.5
Loma Linda	2,642	- 5.3%	\$5,220	15.5
Oakwood	1,280	+14.1%	\$3,663	0
Pacific Union	1,760	- 5.1%	\$4,725	12-14.0
Southwestern Adventist	650	+ 6.4%	\$4,084	0
Southern Missionary	1,481	-14.2%	\$3,920	4.0
Union	869	+ 6.6%	\$4,395	0
Walla Walla	1,724	- 2.0%	\$4,650	7.0

All enrollment and faculty figures are given in full-time equivalents.
Enrollment and tuition figures provided by the General Conference Board of Higher Education.

How Long Must Women Wait? Prospects for Adventist Church Leadership

by Janice Eiseman Daffern

It was one of those sultry days in Berrien Springs. I sat in the back row, leaning against the cool bricks of the seminary classroom wall while scratching out notes on Reformation theology. I liked this class. The professor came early each day, greeting the students and reaching out to shake hands. We often sang hymns for worship before the lecture. Sometimes while the rest sang, I closed my eyes and let the harmony of the male voices melt around me.

The professor warmed to his material: “The concept of the priesthood of all believers, perhaps more than any other Reformation idea, changed the practice of Protestant believers. The belief that each person is a priest before God with no special status reserved for a particular class of people is radical. Our Adventist pioneers continued to emphasize this important doctrine and particularly accented the gifts of the Spirit. Each member has a gift and an important role to play.”

I stiffened and looked at the men around me—still placid, taking notes. I raised my hand and the professor recognized my question: “What about Adventist women?

What does the priesthood of believers mean for them?”

Pens dropped and sixty men turned to look. There was silence and then a cold blast of laughter hit me. Just before the bell rang the professor inserted a reference to “work yet to be done on this thorny issue.”

The chill didn’t diminish until I stepped out into the sunlight. As I mounted the steps to the library, I heard running feet behind me. A divinity student from the front row of the Reformation class found me. I didn’t know him.

He was out of breath. “Are you some kind of crazy? Who told you that you belong here? You and the women’s libbers are trying to ruin the church! Why don’t you go home, get married and work out your problems some other way.”

Behind his pale face the sun stood frozen in the sky. I said nothing. He took huge breaths and talked on. All the while I imagined him pleasant—standing before his congregation, earnestly praying for his people, victoriously parting the waters of baptism. I saw him break the bread and bless the wine.

This experience vividly focused for me the dilemma facing all women in the Seventh-day Adventist church. Adventists affirm the priesthood of all believers, with each member of the body of Christ exercising his or her gifts. Meanwhile 60

Janice Eiseman Daffern, an associate pastor at Sligo SDA Church, is a graduate of Loma Linda University and is currently completing a master of divinity degree at Andrews University.

Adopted from a presentation to the Advisory Board of the General Conference Office of Human Relations.

percent of the membership remains virtually excluded from the church's administrative structure.

That paradox was underscored for me last spring when I took a course at Wesley Theological Seminary in Washington, D.C., on the history of women in the church. The class, composed mainly of Protestant women from several denominations, regarded me with a great deal of interest because I belong to a movement led by a woman. In our discussion, it became clear that although I belong to a church which had recognized female authority in the nineteenth century, I was the only woman present who was *not* a candidate for ordination.

Our history began with a group of disillusioned people in desperate need of guidance who came to recognize the gift of prophecy in a teenage girl. In 1982 we still find ourselves wondering if women can lead. We suffer from an odd sort of forgetfulness which allows us to consult the writings of this woman on almost any topic while we debate over a woman's "proper place."

Perhaps we have forgotten what it must have been like for the pioneers of our movement to accept a very young woman who married, had children, and at the same time preached, wrote, and led a people. Certainly this is a prime example of the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers taken seriously. But in the process of becoming institutionalized, we somehow have lost that sense of urgency which calls for every available vessel to be used in the service of the kingdom.

In the 1970's the issue of female leadership in the SDA church was discussed widely, from meetings of the Adventist Forum to General Conference committees, from the pages of SPECTRUM to the *Adventist Review*. The Biblical Research Institute spent four years studying the ordination of women and released a set of papers in 1976 available from the Institute for \$7.00. The papers are scheduled to be published in book form in the near future. In summary, the research indicated that there is no basis in the Bible or the writings of Ellen White for withholding ordination from women.

I was studying theology in college during the seventies, and I interpreted all the discussion as a sign of progress. Since then, I have nearly completed the master of divinity degree at the SDA Theological Seminary and for two years I have worked as an associate pastor at Sligo Church, Takoma Park, Maryland. Through my college and seminary years I not only had the continuing support of my husband, but I have been encouraged by a caring community of teachers and fellow students in these institutions. In my current role as a pastor, I am free to minister to the needs of the congregation in a way I had once thought impossible. My colleagues at Sligo Church, the Potomac Conference leadership, and the lay people I work with take my ministry seriously and affirm my call to pastoring.

But in spite of my delight with my own day-to-day work, I am distressed about the possibilities for all women whatever their role in the church. Only two percent of the students enrolled in the four graduate religion programs at Andrews University are women. Of the 245 enrolled in the master of divinity program, I am the only woman. Six women of a total of 53 are working towards the master of arts in religion and two women of 33 are candidates for the doctor of theology. No women are doctor of ministry candidates since one of the requirements for entrance is ordination. The February 3, 1982, issue of *Christian Century* reported that Protestant seminary women number between 30 and 50 percent of the total enrollment of their schools. A group which matches us sociologically and theologically more closely than mainline Protestants are Mennonites. The Associated Mennonite Biblical Seminaries in Elkhart, Indiana, reports that 38 percent of the students in their programs of study are women.

When the accrediting team from the Association of Theological Seminaries visited the SDA Theological Seminary, they made observations pertaining to the women on campus. While the team was pleased by the racial and ethnic pluralism among the students, they noted the scarcity of women. The report included quotes from seminary

women which revealed their high degree of isolation from the rest of the seminary community. The accrediting team recommended that Andrews University not only increase the number of women who enter the seminary, but work to improve the atmosphere for female students once they have arrived.

The church set up an associate in pastoral care internship in 1977 to allow women to function in ministerial positions without ordination. The church's awareness of this program, however, has not always been acute. Last year I was told that women are not being hired in the program in large enough numbers and therefore some administrators thought that it should be discontinued. Since I am an associate in pastoral care, I immediately called the ministerial department of the General Conference to inquire. An administrator in that department expressed surprise that associates in pastoral care existed and asked me to send him a copy of the policy concerning such roles for his department's files.

Of the 33 women graduates of college theology programs in the past five years who hoped to find ministerial positions, only eight have been successful, according to a study done by Roger Dudley at the Institute of Church Ministry, Andrews University. Of those eight, two have been hired immediately after completing undergraduate study. The others have gone on to graduate school or worked elsewhere while waiting for the positions to open.

Three conferences—Potomac, Upper Columbia, and Southeastern California, now employ women in pastoral care positions, and Dudley reports that a survey found only three other conference presidents interested in hiring associates in pastoral care. This offers little hope for the 20 women now studying theology in the colleges and universities in North America and who say they are looking forward to ministerial service in the church.

In a variety of settings, Adventists are being confronted with the fact that most Protestant churches ordain women. (For example, over a 1,000 women work as ordained ministers in the United Methodist

Church in America alone.) Yet, Adventist leaders exhibit an astonishing lack of awareness about these facts. A church official learned the hard way at a recent PREACH seminar (meetings held by the ministerial department of the General Conference for non-Adventist clergy in cities in North America). Welcoming the room full of non-Adventist ministers to the first session, the Adventist church official commented that he was pleased that so many of the ministers had brought their wives. He had to be informed that the women who had enrolled in the seminars were not wives of ministers but *the* ministers.

“Essentially the female pastor has permission to represent the church privately in preparing people for marriage and baptism, but she may not publicly represent the body of Christ at the deeply significant moments shared by the whole church.”

The issue of ordination is important for several reasons. Most importantly, for women in pastoral ministry the impossibility of ever becoming ordained creates a lack of balance in their relationships with the “official” church. Ordination symbolizes a mutual commitment on the part of the pastor and the hiring organization. The pastor is asked to commit himself to the task given him by the church. The leadership in turn makes a commitment to trust the pastor with the authority to do the task. Women are now in the uneasy position of accepting the task while the leadership remains unwilling to publicly commit themselves to trust women with pastoral authority.

Second, the relationship between a woman pastor and the members of her congregation is, to a certain degree, at stake as

well. Her inability to baptize or marry is more than a minor inconvenience. Essentially the female pastor has permission to represent the church privately in preparing people for marriage and baptism, but she may not publicly represent the body of Christ at the deeply significant moments shared by the whole church. This leaves both the pastor and parishioner with a profound sense of loss. On a broader level, the entire community suffers by seeing only male representatives participating in the events so important to the life of the church.

“The General Conference Executive Committee, which acts as the decision-making body between General Conference sessions, has approximately 365 members from around the world. Only eight are women. . . . This figure is not even respectable tokenism.”

Finally, ordination is access to decision-making in the church. Young pastors with whom I work are acutely aware of the fact that they will never be a conference, union, or General Conference president unless they are ordained. Many develop jitters if they are not considered for ordination on schedule. Withholding ordination from women ministers guarantees that they will be excluded from “line” administration in the church.

The paucity of women in responsible posts extends from the pastorate to the highest reaches of the Adventist church structure. Very few women now serve in local and union conference executive committees. Even fewer are part of union or conference administration. Sixteen women serve in North America as local conference associate departmental directors—almost all supervisors of elementary education. Interestingly, as late as the 1940’s, women served

as departmental directors in many departments, including sabbath school, publishing, and treasury.

At the General Conference level, six women serve as departmental associate directors. Three work in the Health and Temperance Department, two in Sabbath School, and one in Education. Two women serve in the General Conference secretariat as assistant secretaries, a position created in 1981. In a recent conversation, an official in that department emphasized their administrative function, pointing out that they meet with the men of the department in staff meetings. He said that neither have personal secretaries because one directs the department’s typing pool as part of her job description and the other one was previously a secretary. The official continually referred to the two women as “the girls.”

The General Conference Executive Committee, which acts as the decision-making body between General Conference sessions, has approximately 365 members from around the world. Only eight are women, including six departmental associate directors and two lay women. This figure is not even respectable tokenism. No women sit on PREXAD, the 14-member President’s Executive Advisory Committee composed of vice-presidents and secretaries of the General Conference.

The Office of Human Relations of the General Conference is giving some attention to the role of women in the Adventist church. However, the two men assigned to that department also carry the duties of representing the black and hispanic populations of the church. Both men have stated publicly their wish to have a woman appointed to the department, but no such appointment is on the horizon. There are only two women on the Office of Human Relations Advisory Board, a 30-member group of pastors, administrators, and lay people. Warren Banfield, director of the Office of Human Relations, recognizes the inconsistency of such poor representation of women on a board which is commissioned in part to study women’s issues in the church.

He states he is working to remedy the situation.

The dearth of women in positions of responsibility is not limited to pastorates, conferences, unions, and the General Conference. While women compose the vast majority of elementary school teachers in our educational system, only 11 women are elementary school principals, according to Roger Dudley's survey. Of 78 secondary schools in North America, three have women principals. Administration of Adventist higher education in North America is virtually exclusively male. Only two women sit on the 47-member Board of Higher Education which coordinates policies of all the senior colleges in the U.S. and Canada. The only women in a major administrative post among Adventist colleges and universities is Merlene Ogden, dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at Andrews University.

It is interesting to note routes to leadership on Adventist campuses. Some deans of student affairs and presidents of SDA colleges were formerly deans of men. However, a dean of women has never been named a dean of student affairs, let alone president. The other route of advancement to the presidency of an Adventist college is through the post of academic dean. Of the few women who have chaired departments of Adventist colleges, only two have been appointed academic dean.

In spite of the Adventist church's refusal to trust the leadership of women on almost all levels of our institutions, I see some hopeful signs. Women are beginning to gather strength from one another. While Adventist women do not have the history of women's missionary organizations which other Protestant church women have enjoyed for almost a century, they are beginning to realize they can work together simply for the joy of sharing talents and support and to initiate change. Women on the faculty of Andrews University have

begun to meet together to discuss common concerns. A group of women in the Washington, D.C., area recently met with Charles Bradford, president of the North American Division, to talk about the role of women in the church. A new national organization, the Association of Adventist Women, has just been formed to assume responsibilities for the newsletter *The Adventist Woman*.

Adventist women are not giving up on their church. While deeply committed Adventist women feel constrained to use their professional expertise elsewhere, others, despite inequities, continue in church employ. Both groups express frustration at not being able to serve their church more fully. When will the leaders of the church acknowledge their responsibility to accept the gifts of women? If the leaders do not assume this essential task, the church stands to lose the valuable resources of 60 percent of its membership.

The following recommendations were passed by the Office of Human Relations Advisory Board at its annual meeting, March 16, 1982. They have been submitted to the North American Division Committee on Administration.

- VOTED: That the North American Division administrators give study to ordaining women.
- VOTED: To elect a woman to the Office of Human Relations staff.
- VOTED: To add more women to the Office of Human Relations Advisory Board.
- VOTED: To have workshops for men on how to work with professional women.
- VOTED: To have a North American Division commission on women who would work with the Office of Human Relations.

The White Lie: Two Perspectives

Prophet or Plagiarist: A False Dichotomy

Walter T. Rea. *The White Lie*. Foreward by Jerry Wiley.
409 pp. Turlock, Calif.: M&R Publications, 1982.
\$15.95; \$12.50 (paper).

reviewed by Jonathan Butler

In *The White Lie*, Walter Rea argues—exclaims, really—that much of Ellen White's writings are the words and ideas of others, used as if they were her own, or God's. By claiming not only a deep literary indebtedness but a lack of integrity on the part of Mrs. White, Rea strikes at the root of her prophetic authority.

The charge of fakery, charlatanry, or dishonesty is the most serious of indictments against any prophet. Laying no claim to traditional, legal, or professional status, prophets answer to a personal, charismatic calling. Unlike other positions of authority, *prophetic* authority relies almost exclusively on individual ethos and credibility. Prophets "bear fruit" only as they are *believed*. There is no such thing as a prophet without honor from someone, somewhere. Prophetic writings are printed and circulated and preserved because someone has found them

inspiring. Prophetic predictions succeed as people that believe them set about to fulfill them. To lose trust in the prophets, then, is to lose them *as prophets*. For this reason, while they may be unembarrassed by their obscure origins, poor education, or lowly station, prophets cannot tolerate an assault on their "good name." In Shakespeare's words, it is "the immediate jewel of their souls." As any prophet might say to a detractor, he "who steals my purse steals trash. . . . But he that filches from me my good name, Robs me of that which not enriches him, And makes me poor indeed."¹

If the loss of credibility damages a prophet, it is the charge of plagiarism that has particularly hurt *nineteenth-century* prophets. Not only Ellen White but Joseph Smith and Mary Baker Eddy have been the objects of literary debunking, because they assumed a fundamentally literary identity. The Victorian period was an age of mass print. Magazines, novels, newspapers, and tracts proliferated as never before. Victorian women in particular found access to the age by a seemingly ceaseless literary outpouring. In a society that denied them direct political, ecclesiastical, and economic power, women exerted a vicarious "influence" from the writing lapboards of their bedrooms. In her own remarkably influential career, then, Mrs. White was not so much an ecclesiastical personna as a "*pen* of inspiration." For Victorians, inspired writing came "from the heart," which implied a kind of originality, extemporaneousness, prolixity, and, by the standards

Jonathan Butler is an associate professor of church history at Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, California.

of the day, elegance. For several generations of Adventists, Mrs. White has more than satisfied this Victorian index of inspiration. But a literary analysis that faults her according to any of these criteria is bound to call for a basic reexamination of either the inspired writer or the nature of inspiration.

All this is to say that Rea deserves credit for raising highly important questions. However, ineptly or cruelly he has framed them, or however baffled he remains personally in the face of them, his questions require careful consideration. It would be too easy and ultimately too costly to Seventh-day Adventism to dismiss Rea *ad hominem*. This would be to retaliate in kind to the unfortunate personal innuendo in his own argument. For just as psycho-history is commonly considered inappropriate among Adventists as a method of understanding their pioneers, it is as well a dubious method of accounting for the contemporary critics of Adventism. Nevertheless, it is impossible to ignore the strident personal tone throughout the book. Rea appears to be a man who has been emotionally hurt, perhaps tortured, by what he has uncovered. His book is a manifest effort to get others to experience what he has experienced, to share his pain, and thereby ease its burden for him. Nothing disturbs Rea more than the churchmen and theologians who reconcile themselves to evidence that they have found either less compelling or overwhelming than it has been for him. He reacts with the harshness of a man who feels not only misunderstood but abused. Unfortunately, his pain displays itself as anger—and an angry man attracts less sympathy than hostility.

Standing upon his exhibits of literary dependence as if they were a soapbox, he pontificates on the nature of God, man, sin, theology, the church, and even fiscal mismanagement. But what in his discovery of literary indebtedness or plagiarism equips Rea to speak on such a range of unrelated topics? Clearly nothing. Source criticism by itself is a conceptually narrow enterprise. Reading primarily Ellen White's writings

and, subsequently, titles listed in her personal library, Rea came upon literary parallels. Establishing ties between one author and others is a long, laborious, and tiresome process. Rea should be thanked for having undertaken this necessary and significant task. But the limited scope of his reading—and analysis—which especially qualified him as a source critic, left him decidedly unqualified to explore the significance of the parallels he found. Rea's footnotes expose a soft underbelly to his work. Aside from references to Ellen White and the authors from whom she borrowed, Rea relies mostly on in-house Adventist writings, tapes, minutes of meetings, and telephone conversations. Had he produced simply an anthology of his literary exhibits, with a brief introduction which adhered modestly to the topic at hand, the importance and impact of his study might have been enhanced considerably.

“It is impossible to ignore the strident personal tone throughout the book. . . . His book is a manifest effort to get others to experience what he has experienced, to share his pain, and thereby ease its burden for him.”

Instead, Rea erects a rather precarious model of interpretation on the literary material he has unearthed. He proposes that Ellen White's “lie” is only one example of the “white lies” perpetuated as myths, legends, and falsehoods by all institutions, especially religious ones. Drawing upon Sam M. Baker's *The Permissible Lie* and Eric Hoffer's *The True Believer*, Rea indicts all organized religion as a “con game” whose leaders are “supersalesmen of the psychic,” peddling their wares to naive and credulous “buyers.” The real issue of religion is “who is going to control the concessions in the here and in the hereafter” (p. 30). (Certainly Rea will not ingratiate himself to evangelicals with this line of argument.) But if

organized religion is an emperor without clothes, and if saints are hucksters, how does this explain the Reformers or the martyrs, Mother Teresa or Jesus Christ? Indeed, for Rea, Christ is in a category by himself, the "Saint of all saints." And yet why? Because there is still a spiritual dimension for Rea, however cynical he has become, which cannot be explained away in terms of power or greed. Turning his own argument back on him, someone might say Rea only wrote *The White Lie* for royalties. But this would be patent nonsense. Only the most spiritually insensitive of readers would fail to sense the passion and spiritual turmoil in Rea's book. Rea, like the object of his study, does not lend himself to an utterly crass and reductionist explanation.

What proves most unsatisfying about Rea's interpretation is that it betrays the same rigid fundamentalism of his earlier years, albeit now a *naughty* fundamentalism. Rea still can accept only an all-or-nothing solution. Either Ellen White is infallible or a fake. Either her writings are the immaculate conception of the Holy Spirit or they are a literary hoax. Even more absurdly, if Mrs. White is not an angel, then all religion is a deception. Like other fundamentalists, Rea is piqued by any suggestion of a solution that threads itself somewhere between these extremes.² The passion by which he now rejects Mrs. White reveals the absolute hold on him of his fundamentalist understanding of inspiration. If Mrs. White lacked originality, or was influenced by contemporaries, or was not a great literary stylist, then she could not have been inspired. Rea offers no new model of inspiration because he entirely embraces the old one. He agrees with Arthur L. White and quotes him approvingly on page 118 as follows:

If the messages borne by Ellen G. White had their origin in surrounding minds or influences; if the messages on organization can be traced to the ideas of James White or George I. Butler; if the counsels on health had their origin in the minds of Drs. Jackson, Trall or Kellogg; if the instruction on education was based upon ideas of G. H. Bell or W. W. Prescott; if the high standards upheld in the Ellen G. White articles and books were

inspired by the strong men of the cause—then the Spirit of Prophecy counsels can mean no more to us than some very good ideas and helpful advice!³

When Rea adds "How true" he expresses everything about his disenchantment with Mrs. White. She falls short of his unrealistic expectations. He reminds us of Othello who, in that tragic moment after killing the woman he loved, asks to be remembered as "one that loved not wisely but too well . . ."⁴

In so many ways, Rea has become his uncharitable caricature of Ellen White, transforming himself into his own uglier image of the prophet. He interprets historical developments as the conspiracy of an elite and immoral minority of people—in this case "the White boys." He eschews the academic argument for the jeremiad. He short-circuits historical explanations by casting moral blame. He slights issues in favor of personal gossip. In a perversely ironic way, he must be one of the few people in our time who has spent a "thoughtful hour each day on the life of Christ," though in his instance as a source critic of *The Desire of Ages*. And certainly he could have benefited from the literary assistants that he begrudges Mrs. White; his book is a tangle of unruly organization and unhappy style.

That Rea's book is an easy target for critics, however, should not truncate this line of inquiry into Mrs. White's literary sources. Nor should Rea's failure to offer an adequate interpretative paradigm of his own suggest that previous paradigms are any longer satisfactory in light of his discoveries.

How then might Ellen White's prophetic writings be understood? One characteristic of prophets which is evident here is their own realization that truth can never be fully communicated in words. Prophets experience truth more deeply and profoundly than their followers, and the effort to convey their insights inevitably involves distortion. Lesser minds expect prophets to provide the whole truth, and yet prophets themselves understand, at times painfully, that their message inevitably falls short of a higher

truth. Every prophet is to a degree a charlatan in the sense that he promises more than he can deliver. The writing process, then, difficult under any circumstances, may be agonizingly difficult for a prophet. In Truman Capote's words on writing, "When God hands you a gift, he also hands you a whip. . . ."

If Mrs. White's expressions of insecurity as a writer, her literary dependence first on her husband and then on a staff of assistants, and her borrowing from other authors are evidence of her human limitations, they indicate as well that common experience of prophets who seek as weak, earthen vessels to brim with as much of the truth as possible. Prophets can be expected to reach for literary assistance, not out of ill-motive or fraud, but out of the highest of spiritual motives and the securest sense of their own spiritual calling. Ellen White was so saturated with the consciousness that God was leading in a special way in her life that she looked for—and "was shown"—His hand everywhere: in her day visions, her night dreams, her personal readings, and her conversations with others. God was the fountainhead, and these were the streams of His communication. For her to concede to critics that her human "sources" were anything less than links to the divine Source itself would have been to deny something so fundamental to her self-understanding as to make her indeed a liar.

In this regard, the relationship of a prophet to a people brings to mind the analogy of a mother's relationship to her children. The mother who has been through the births of her children knows them beyond any doubt to be her own. Yet a six-year-old may have his own definition of a mother—she wears perfume, fixes him lunches, knows absolutely everything, and never uses profanity. His mother may try to fulfill these six-year-old expectations, even when they are unrealistic, not because of any insecurity in her own mind about the fact that she is his mother, nor certainly to mislead the child regarding what is in fact essentially true. The child may expect too much of mother, and mother may, at times, mistakenly though innocently fulfill her child's illusions. But here the image of

mother requires changing—as it invariably does over time—not the unalterable fact of her motherhood. So it is with prophets. The *perception* of them may require a dramatic maturation process that still acknowledges them *as prophets*.

"For her to concede to critics that her human 'sources' were anything less than links to the divine Source itself would have been to deny something so fundamental to her self-understanding as to make her indeed a liar."

As a result of Rea's indefatigable efforts, we have learned lately of the extent to which Ellen White's writings are part of a vast genre of Victorian devotional literature, much as Daniel and Revelation are the Scriptural remnants of a whole tapestry of non-canonical apocalyptic literature. The reason that Daniel or John of Patmos or Mrs. White are still known to us while their contemporaries have receded from the church's collective memory is because the church considered their writings, from the outset, special and worth preserving. An historical naiveté about their immediate literary surroundings was bound to develop with the authority they assumed. An ill effect of this is the artificial and misplaced sense of uniqueness that can occur over time, as well as the outright misunderstandings of texts that result when read in cultural and literary isolation. Rea's work should help free future Adventist generations from just this snare. The point here, however, is that inspired texts are with us at all, not due to some sort of dark conspiracy, but by means of canonization (not of course formally in Ellen White's case). God's hand in this process is not simply in the origins of the texts but in the preservation of them. One key difference between Henry Melvill's sermons and Ellen White's writings is that we *remember* her writings. Her impact on our

memory is one mark of her inspiration for us.

My own view is that the source and redaction criticism of Mrs. White's literary contribution cannot discredit her. She produced religious classics for a large, dynamic community of people. Higher criticism cannot possibly plumb the meaning of them. Like the phenomenologists tell us, it is not so much the text but what is "in front" of the text that engages us. Mrs. White's writings hold rich significance for the Adventist people. The whole is more than the sum of its parts for us. Why texts take on this religious authority for people is itself a fascinating—and inspiring—story, more so even than where they came from. Why people continue to reinterpret them from

generation to generation without ever wearing them out. Why in fact an Adventist pastor should devote almost 20 years to an exhaustive literary analysis of them. That in itself speaks of their significance.

Without Rea's extensive literary revelations, of course, much less of the really creative opportunities for the re-thinking of our doctrine of inspiration would be open to us in this generation of Adventism. And no doubt the next generation of Adventists will grow up at the knee of a different Ellen White than this one. Indeed, I look forward to the day that the church would no longer spawn either an early or a later Walter Rea. My hunch is that Rea himself shares the same hope.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. William Shakespeare, *Othello*, III, iii.
2. For example, Jack Provonsha's, "Was Ellen White a Fraud?" *Collegiate Quarterly*, July-Sept., 1981.

3. *Review and Herald*, May 1, 1959, as quoted in *The White Lie*, p. 118.
4. *Othello*, V. ii.

The Imperfect Speech of Inspiration

reviewed by Alden Thompson

After months of suspense, Walter Rea finally has unmasked *The White Lie*. The garish cover and earthy prose match its provocative title. Only its patrician price seems out of character. Whatever else one might say about the book and its author, Rea indeed has caught the attention of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. It is unlikely that Adventism ever has anticipated any publishing event with such intensity.

Formerly one of the church's most devoted believers in Ellen White, Rea relentlessly has sought to force a reluctant

community to come to grips with the human element in its prophetic gift. International newspaper coverage, numerous speaking appointments, and widely-circulated cassette tapes agitated the church to the point that rebuttals of the book began to appear before the book ever came from the press.¹ Partially as a result of Rea's agitation, the Ellen G. White Estate is taking source analysis seriously. The church has even funded a special two-year project to determine the nature of Ellen White's use of sources in her book *The Desire of Ages*.

Because of his flamboyance and high visibility, Rea left very few secrets to be revealed in the book. Nevertheless, many, at least in the academic community, had hoped that the spectre of publication would encourage Rea to be sober in his observations and to present his data in a form that would be helpful to the church. In that respect the book is a "great disappointment." In fact, the style—more than the content—raises unexpected questions as to the possible impact of the book on Adventism.

Alden Thompson, professor of religion at Walla Walla College, received his doctorate in Old Testament at the University of Edinburgh, Scotland.

The content deserves attention, but seldom have I read a book where style so thoroughly overwhelms content. In the foreword, Jerry Wiley² describes Rea's judgments as "deliberately harsh" (p. x/16),³ and the same is true of his style and vocabulary. The results of this lively approach are often biting and personal. Exaggerations are carried to the point of contradicting other assertions in the book. Thus Ellen White can be depicted as the victim of external domination, on the one hand; and, on the other, as the all-powerful determinant in Adventism. A couple of quotations may serve to illustrate:

No one can successfully challenge the fact that the White boys, from James to Arthur, have set the music, played the tune, and pulled the strings of the Ellen G. White marionette show. Ellen may or may not have done little to restrain her legend, but much evidence indicates that she was swept before its flood by her own supersalesmen (p. 193).

Adventism has stood at the crossroads before. Those poor children of the 1844 beginnings closed the door of mercy for all but themselves. Much evidence now says that, with very little help, Ellen herself shoved the door shut. Since then, that door has never really been opened wide, despite propaganda to that effect spewed out through the church's worldwide organization. The granting of mercy was just transferred to some heavenly courtroom, where believers would be selectively allowed access to Christ through Ellen and her writings (p. 258).

That passionate tone permeates the book, blurring the lines of organization and making it difficult to perceive how Rea understands some of the more significant implications of his research.

The prologue is autobiographical, sketching Rea's transition from devoted admirer of Ellen White to disillusioned author of *The White Lie*. The fourteen chapters that follow are very loosely organized and offer the reader an impressionistic sketch of Rea's research and experience. The initial chapters touch on Adventist origins and the development of what Rea describes as the Ellen G. White "myth" or "legend" (cf. p.

xvi/22). He raises the plagiarism issue and then devotes a chapter to each book in the Conflict of the Ages series. The remaining chapters deal with the further development of the Ellen White corpus, the church's use of Ellen White's writings, and the implications of Rea's research for the future of Adventism. Extensive appendices, containing parallels between Ellen White's writings and contemporary devotional literature, conclude the book. For someone heretofore unfamiliar with Rea's work, these parallels probably will constitute the most notable aspect of the book.

"The style—more than the content—raises unexpected questions as to the possible impact of the book on Adventism. The content deserves attention, but seldom have I read a book where style so thoroughly overwhelms content."

In terms of defining the purpose of the book, the final chapter (14) is the most revealing. There Rea draws on the imagery of the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse to portray his vision of the Adventist church. The rider of the white horse symbolizes the Davenport affair (pp. 263–67); the red horse is the "Glacier View puppet show" (p. 268), a phrase Rea uses to describe the church's handling of the Ford challenge (pp. 267–70); Rea himself is the rider of the black horse (pp. 270–72); the rider of the last horse, the pale one, is not clearly defined, but its symbolism is unmistakable: "The fourth horseman on the pale horse was the last to ride out. According to the Revelator, his name was Death" (p. 275). Glimmers of loyalty occasionally surface in the book, suggesting that Rea does not really want his church to die.⁴ But for now, as the rider of the black horse, Rea envisions his own role in Adventism as follows:

Rea, on the other hand, was a guerilla fighter. He seemed to be aiming for the

jugular. His studies were meant to tip the scales against the authority of Ellen and her writings—which as a consequence would bypass the authority of the super-salesmen of the system and would leave every man his own priest before God. Such an idea—if it ever really caught on—would be not only frightening but downright horrifying to a system based on the interpretation of truth by a prophet (pp. 270–71).

The writings of Ellen White have played a significant and positive role in my spiritual and intellectual experience;⁵ but, even without my bias, I would find it incredible to cast Ellen White as the villain rather than a hero of Adventist history.⁶ I am quite aware of many of the problems and frustrations with which Walter Rea has been struggling, and I believe his research will help Seventh-day Adventists deal more realistically with Ellen White and better understand the phenomenon of inspiration.

Many had hoped Rea could present his material in such a way that the church could perceive his labors in a positive light. At one point that may have been possible. In his book Rea suggests that if the White Estate had “circulated, or even leaked” a certain document to the church and the world “this book might not have been written” (p. 83).⁷ Yet the level of disenchantment that the book reveals suggests that it would not have been easy for him to give up his battle to “tip the scales against the authority of Ellen and her writings” (p. 270).

As the book now stands, it actually may be more valuable for the study of the psychology of religion than for Ellen White studies or for the study of Adventist history.⁸ The stage for the love/hate cycle is set by the very first lines of Rea’s story:

Almost from the first time I heard of her, early in my teens, I became a devotee of Ellen G. White and her writings. I learned to type by copying from her book *Messages to Young People*. In high school and college, I often went from room to room in the dormitory, gathering Ellen White quotations from others to use in

my preparations for becoming a minister in the Seventh-day Adventist Church (p. xiii/19).

That was Rea’s early experience. But now, when “Adventist divines” attempt to defend Ellen White’s literary approach, Rea responds: “Why drag God into it and insist that He sanctioned it?” (p. 164). Rea recognizes the problem as he explains in the prologue: “Much study remains to be done on the question of why some of us accept as much as we do from whomever we do. What thing is it deep within us that is tapped to make us react as unquestioningly as we do to unreliable information—so that we make it ‘truth’ and let it govern our thinking and our lives?” (p. xvi/22f). He then goes on to admit rather candidly: “At this stage in my thinking, if there is blame left to be assessed or portioned out, I must accept much of it for having been so gullible . . .” (p. xvii/23). Rea gives us glimpses of his transitional experience, but had he been more precise in tracing the sequence of events and key factors in his alienation, the value of the book would have been greatly enhanced for those interested in the dynamics of human religious experience.

Yet as interesting as Rea’s experience may be, it would be wrong to overlook the book’s arguments. Because Rea’s previous experience and attitudes find many parallels in the believing community, many will be threatened with the same disillusionment that he experienced should they see the data that contributed to his about-face. The church must take seriously both his experience and his arguments.

Turning to his arguments, I would summarize his primary contentions as follows:⁹ Ellen White made extensive use of human sources in the preparation of her books; Ellen White and her assistants did not always disclose the use of human source, choosing rather to attribute her insights directly to God; church leaders have used Ellen White’s authority to maintain their control of the church.

I would judge all three contentions to be at least partially true.¹⁰ But even if they were *completely* true, they would be irrelevant for determining Ellen White’s prophetic status—unless one assumed that a

prophetic authority should not use sources. That Rea makes this key assumption is remarkably clear from the following statement that Rea himself italicizes: "For its [sic] is obvious that if the church, or Ellen, or her helpers, had honestly revealed from whom and how much they were taking from others, *God their pretended authority, would be exposed as very minor, if not nonexistent in their program*" (p. 207).¹¹

Someone who holds this assumption must reject any element of humanity as no longer authoritative. Thus, Rea feels bound to discard the use of the term "authority" with reference to Ellen White (p. 168). He does speak of her "pastoral inspiration"; but, for him, that is a human not a divine quality (p. 170). He states that "the church has never come to grips with her authority over facts, policies and practices" (p. 168). Because of Rea's assumptions about inspiration, his research has led him to consider Ellen White as carrying no more weight than any other member of the Adventist community—a conclusion that is quite unacceptable to the church.

In Rea's case, an additional assumption is also evident that has deep roots in the minds of conservative believers: true prophets do not change.¹² If, then, in a weak moment, one discovers both *sources* and *change*, disillusionment and the "cover-up" argument almost inevitably follow.

The "cover-up" argument is clearly the most difficult for conservative believers to handle.¹³ But I am convinced that Rea's experience provides some of the best evidence as to why there has been a necessary and well-intentioned "cover-up" or, put in another way, why Ellen White and her assistants gradually—even reluctantly—revealed the human methods by which the prophet operated. Full disclosure would have led some to conclude that God was "*nonexistent in their program*" (p. 207).

The biblical precedent for a "cover-up" was established by Christ himself: "I have yet many things to say to you, but you cannot bear them now" (John 16:12). Every parent and teacher can testify to the truth of that statement. Awareness and growth only can come gradually. For those who are inclined to think in stark either/or terms,

any trace of humanity is enough to rob the Word of its divine credentials. In a community with just such inclinations, Ellen White emphasized that her message came from God, not man. To have done otherwise would have been a betrayal of her calling.

"Rea is still gripped by the authority of Scripture. As long as he can avoid questioning Scripture in the way that he has questioned Ellen White's writings, his faith is secure, albeit ill-informed."

But as time went on, both she and the community came to the place where it was possible to understand more of the human element without denying the divine. Yet "true believers," to use Rea's term, tend to resist the evidence. Thus the love/hate cycle remains a threat in the community.

Adventists attempted to face the problem in 1919, but turned back. After four decades in the "wilderness" we are again at the borders of Canaan, deciding whether we will enter. God is always ready to lead.

Rea has refused to come to grips with the human element in Scripture, such as the differences in parallel accounts and the use of noninspired sources by the biblical writers, but I am convinced that the Adventist community as a whole must be prepared to deal reverently yet honestly with the one document that we all agree is the foundation for any theory of inspiration: the Bible.¹⁴ Once we have done our homework there, the evidence relative to Ellen White's writings no longer will appear devastating, shocking, or disturbing, but will be seen to be quite in keeping with the methods that God always has used to communicate to man.

No one can predict the kind of impact *The White Lie* will have on the work of the Adventist church, but a few observations

are in order. The academic community both within and without the church will cringe at the level of scholarship evident in the book. It is simply too passionate, too vindictive, too careless.¹⁵ The popular media, however, likely will have a field day with the book. The secular press relishes the agony of a disenchanted believer. The conservative Christian community also will make use of the book, though its harsh tone may tend to limit its circulation to the far right.¹⁶ Should the price come down, Rea's book may find a place alongside Canright's books in the Christian warfare against "cults."

Within the Adventist community, I see four basic reactions to Rea's material. First, the "true believers" will continue to deny the evidence, just as Rea did for many years. Vigilantes may even seek to malign some of the scholars whom Rea cites as supporting his position. Many scholars quoted favorably by Rea differ sharply from him in that they by no means reject Ellen White's prophetic status, and it would be tragic if their ministry were to be hampered as a result of the distortion of their position.

A second reaction to Rea's material is the position that Rea himself seems to have adopted. It involves a critical stance towards Ellen White and a non-critical stance towards Scripture. Rea is still gripped by the authority of Scripture. As long as he can avoid questioning Scripture in the way that he has questioned Ellen White's writings, his faith is secure, albeit ill-informed. Those

who are deeply steeped in the Christian tradition are often able to maintain this position for themselves without recognizing how vulnerable it is for open and enquiring minds. When college students read their Bibles, such a dichotomous approach is hardly the answer to the inspiration question.

A third reaction is possible, generally at more sophisticated levels, and often involves those with deep Adventist roots. They see the implications of critical studies both for Scripture and for the writings of Ellen White and struggle against the spectre of agnosticism and atheism.

A fourth reaction is the one that I hope will win the day, but it is a position that does not come easily. It seeks to retain the human element in inspiration, but does not allow humanity to rob an inspired word of its divine power.¹⁷

With reference to Scripture, Ellen White wrote in 1901: "The Lord speaks to human beings in imperfect speech, in order that the degenerate senses, the dull, earthly perception, of earthly beings may comprehend His words. Thus is shown God's condescension."¹⁸ When Walter Rea wrote *The White Lie* he was not yet willing to let the Lord speak in imperfect speech. His experience has been painful and bitter. If the Seventh-day Adventist Church is to blame, then perhaps we are all guilty. For who can share the truth except those who believe?

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. The following rebuttals have been most visible, given here in the order in which they appeared: Robert W. Olson, *One Hundred and One Questions on the Sanctuary and Ellen White* (Washington, D.C.: Ellen G. White Estate, March 1981).

"Was Ellen G. White a Plagiarist?" A reprint of articles published in the *Adventist Review*, Sept. 17, 1981, featuring an interview with attorney Vincent L. Ramik.

John J. Robertson, *The White Truth* (Mountain View: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1981).

Olson includes a number of parallel exhibits and is remarkably candid when commenting on Ellen White's literary practices. The *Adventist Review* articles addressed the legal aspects of the plagiarism issue, though an interview with Ramik (a Roman Catholic) revealed the positive spiritual impact of Ellen White's writings on Ramik's own experience. Robertson's book constitutes a popular defense of

Ellen White's prophetic ministry along traditional lines. In spite of certain inconsistencies, many church members will undoubtedly find the book helpful, especially the first two chapters dealing with sources and plagiarism.

2. Jerry Wiley is an Adventist attorney identified in the book as Associate Dean and Professor of Law at the University of Southern California School of Law.

3. References to the foreword and prologue in *The White Lie* are complicated by the absence of page numbers. Beginning with the first title page, preliminary matters occupy pp. i-xxii (my numbering). Formal pagination begins thereafter, however, not with page 23, but with page 29. Hence I indicate references to the foreword and the prologue by two systems, one numbering forward from the title page (pp. i-xxii) and one numbering back from chapter 1 (pp. 7-28). The starting point is always p. i/7.

Presumably an earlier foreword and prologue were replaced by a shorter one just prior to publication.

4. Rea frequently speaks sarcastically, ironically, or flippantly about biblical matter (e.g., pp. 43, 45, 51), Adventist doctrine and experience (e.g., pp. 30, 57–58, 194–95), and Adventist standards or life-style (e.g., pp. 37, 251). But a lingering and deep-seated loyalty is suggested by his selection of quotations from *The Desire of Ages* at the close of chapter 14 (p. 275) and from *Christ's Object Lessons* in the Epilogue (p. 279). After referring several times to the near-impossibility of the Adventist life-style (cf., pp. 43, 62, 251), he surprisingly reveals a more positive sentiment when he says: "It wasn't the Adventist lifestyle that the people wanted to overthrow" (p. 272).

5. The positive role of Ellen White's writings in my own experience and theology is revealed indirectly in the five-part series, "From Sinai to Golgotha," published in the *Adventist Review* (Dec. 3, 10, 17, 24, 31, 1981), and in the article, "Even the Investigative Judgment Can Be Good News," *Westwind* (Walla Walla College alumni journal), Vol. 2, No. 1 (Winter 1982).

6. From Rea's book, an otherwise uninformed reader would learn virtually nothing of the crucial General Conferences of 1888 and 1901, to say nothing of Ellen White's significant role in supporting creative change at both conferences.

For a concise and balanced treatment of both events, see Richard Schwarz, *Light-bearers to the Remnant* (Mountain View: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1979), pp. 183–197, 267–281. An earlier work discussing both events has recently been reprinted: A. V. Olson, *Thirteen Years of Crisis: 1888–1901* (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1966, 1981). Pp. 1–335. Formerly: *Through Crisis to Victory*. An appendix includes Ellen White's devotional addresses given at the 1888 General Conference.

7. Reference is to Robert W. Olson's article, "EGW's Use of Uninspired Sources," photocopied (Washington, D.C.: EGW Estate, Nov. 1979). An interesting glimpse into Rea's attitude towards negotiation and advice is given in the Prologue: "Despite much good counsel to the contrary, I have chosen the title *The White Lie* for my book" (p. xvi/22).

8. Besides the problems of simple carelessness (cf. note 3 above) and omission (cf. note 6 above), other problems seriously detract from the book's usefulness. For example, Rea often relies on secondary sources for his conclusions. He is particularly fond of Ingemar Linden, *The Last Trump* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1978) and Robert D. Brinsmead, *Judged by the Gospel* (Fallbrook, Calif.: Verdict Publications, 1980). Even more frustrating from a researcher's point of view is his occasional practice of citing primary material without indicating its present location and availability. The 1883 Uriah Smith—D. M. Canright correspondence (pp. 60–61) is fascinating. But where can the correspondence be located? The history of the development of the Introduction to the 1888 *The Great Controversy* is highly significant for Rea's argument. Yet there is merely an allusion to the "controversy" on p. 50, a quote from John Harvey Kellogg on p. 116, and further discussion on pp. 138–39. The only documentation refers to an

"authentic interview" with Kellogg held on Oct. 7, 1907. Rea records it as a "notarized stenographic report" (p. 75, note 9). But where is it available to the researcher?

A further scholarly flaw is Rea's tendency to generalize with reference to his sources. After referring to one article from *SPECTRUM* in 1971, he lists no further articles, but simply states: "Others have appeared in *SPECTRUM* each year since 1971" (p. 97, note 3). In another instance he describes circumstances which indicate that "disaster of large proportions inevitably waits in the wings." He adds in the next paragraph: "That is what many Adventists think is now the situation in the Seventh-day Adventist Church" (p. 263). For documentation he states: "The articles published in *SPECTRUM* from 1978 to 1981 bear out this observation about the condition of the Seventh-day Adventist Church" (p. 275, note 1). Such generalizations enhance neither Rea's reputation nor *SPECTRUM*'s.

Rea does cite a great deal of primary material, and much of it is cogent. But when he deliberately cites confidential letters and tapes, it is a "Matter of Ethics," to quote his own title of Chapter 11. Some of the "stolen" material he frankly labels as confidential (e.g. a Robert Olson letter of Nov. 29, 1978; p. 83 and pp. 101–105). He does not indicate, however, that the tapes of the Glendale meeting of Jan. 28–29, 1980 (see report by Douglas Hackleman, "GC Committee Studies Ellen White Sources," *SPECTRUM*, Vol. 10, No. 4 (March 1980), pp. 9–15) were to be released only by joint agreement of Rea and PREXAD, an agreement reported by Hackleman (*ibid.*, p. 15). Hackleman carefully avoids quoting participants by name. Rea, however, does not hesitate to name names (e.g. Don McAdams, notes 8 and 9, p. 98, with reference to quotes given on p. 85).

Finally, the lack of bibliography and index makes it extremely difficult to locate material in the book. That disadvantage would not be felt so keenly if the book followed a coherent plan of organization. But failing both organization and index, the book presents a headache for researchers.

9. On pp. 199–200 Rea gives his own nine-point summary of the "evidence" as he sees it.

10. The first point is clearly proven: Ellen White did make use of nineteenth century authors in the preparation of her material. The second point as I have stated it is also largely true: gradual disclosure is certainly evident. The third point is much more problematic, for leaders provide what the larger part of the community expects. Culpability is almost impossible to assign.

11. At the root of the difficulty is the desire to clearly distinguish between that which is divine and therefore absolute and that which is human and relative. When Ellen stated that she was, "dependent" on God, she immediately added that the words were her own, i.e., not God's words (*Selected Messages*, Vol. 1, p. 37). But Rea takes this statement to mean that she got all her information from God and nothing from man (p. 52). Her concern, however, was to guard God's reputation, not to eliminate contact with her environment. Rea is quite right, though, when he observes Ellen White putting heavy emphasis on the divine rather than the human element in the inspiration processes.

Rea's tendency to see a dichotomy between the

human and the divine is evident in several passages. He speaks of the "imagination and creative evolution" that went into the development of Ellen White's books and adds: "all of it capable of being done by man not God" (p. 122). In another instance he states that the members were unaware "how substantially helpers other than God" had made Ellen White's writings possible (p. 162).

12. The clearest illustration of Rea's assumption that prophets should not change is found on pp. 71-74 where he discusses the three-stage development of the Conflict of the Ages series. His specific example involves two accounts of Jacob's struggle with the angel. He describes the picture as "almost opposite in its details" (p. 73). A 1943 letter from Arthur White suggested a comparison with the synoptic gospels, to which Rea comments: "the early apologists for Ellen began to sound as if God does not have to be truthful or accurate" (p. 74). Clearly, Rea has not dealt with the remarkable differences between parallel passages in Scripture.

His assumption that a true prophet does not change means that improvement of prophetic writing by whatever means constitutes "damaging evidence" (p. 92). This is the precise phrase he uses even when describing Ellen White's "uncanny ability" to add and delete material "in such a way that the color of the new thread did not clash with the ultimate pattern of the fabric woven through the years" (p. 92).

13. Rea quotes Ron Graybill of the White Estate as saying: "While we have no problem with the fact that Mrs. White did borrow, we do wonder why she appears to have denied her borrowing" (p. 171, citing Graybill's presentation to the AAF Board, November 1981). Graybill's approach to the "cover-up" question is similar to the suggestion that I give in the text.

Any cover-up theory must take Bert Haloviak's research into account. A shortened form of his paper, "In the Shadow of the 'Daily': Background and Aftermath of the 1919 Bible and History Teachers' Conference," originally presented at the meeting of SDA Biblical Scholars in New York City on Nov. 14, 1979, is in this issue of SPECTRUM. Rea briefly mentions Haloviak's paper but gives it no credence. Haloviak quotes one worker who described the 1919 Conference as "the most terrible thing that had ever happened in the history of this denomination" (J. S. Washburn, "An Open Letter to Elder A. G. Daniells and an Appeal to the General Conference," 1922, pp. 28-9, F. M. Wilcox personal collection, Reference Files, J. S. Washburn Folder, General Conference Archives, as cited by Haloviak, p. 1). Haloviak also documents the views of A. T. Jones and John Harvey Kellogg on inspiration. Both of them apparently refused to "interpret" or "explain" the testimonies. They simply "believed" them (see Haloviak, pp. 13-18).

14. Reluctance to come to terms with parallel texts in Scripture (see note 12 above) is understandable. One of my professors at the University of Edinburgh described the collapse of his Christian faith into agnosticism as beginning with his study of parallel accounts of the Gospels.

15. In addition to the problems detailed in note 8, biblical scholars will observe fascinating parallels between Rea's reaction to his data and the nineteenth century reaction to the "critical" study

of the Bible. In the nineteenth century, initial reaction to the discovery that the biblical writers used sources was violent. Only after many decades did it become possible for mainstream scholarship to emphasize the finished product as being more meaningful than the bits and pieces. As part of that concern with the finished product, biblical scholars today emphasize the importance of what the author added *and* deleted (redaction criticism). Rea betrays his lack of awareness of modern research methods when he exclaims in evident disbelief that the defenders of Ellen White are finding it significant to study "that which she *didn't* include when she copied" (p. 70).

A second remarkable parallel is Rea's attempt to diminish Ellen White's authority by giving a "natural" medical explanation for her visions (pp. 207-213). The terms "ecstasy" and "catelepsy" cited with reference to Ellen White (p. 210), are the same ones that some scholars would use to describe the prophet Ezekiel (e.g., E. Andrews, "Ecstasy," in *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, G. A. Buttrick, ed. (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), Vol. II, p. 22).

A third parallel is to be found in the emotive language that some biblical scholars still use to describe the biblical data. Although more common at the height of the critical period, such phenomena are still to be found. A readily accessible example is provided by R. H. Pfeiffer in his article on "Chronicles," in the *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. I, pp. 572-580. He speaks of "miraculous interventions" being "freely invented by the author" and refers to "graphic fictitious stories" (p. 574). When describing the Chronicler's omissions (in comparison with the books of Samuel and Kings) he speaks of items being "glibly forgotten" (p. 577). He even refers to one biblical passage (Isa. 44:9-17) as a "viciously unfair caricature" (p. 578). A believer is appalled at such language, and rightly so. Inspired texts are to be treated with reverence. Perhaps Walter Rea's experience can shed some light on the mysterious elements that lead to such intense reactions.

16. Two weaknesses of Rea's book, i.e., the harsh language and the frequent reliance on secondary literature, may not prove a serious distraction among some conservative Christians. Those who describe their Jehovah's Witnesses neighbors as "snakes," as I heard a self-proclaimed "fightin' Baptist" pastor describe them recently, would not be at all offended by Rea's vocabulary. As for scholarship, even Zondervan's 1974 edition of the *New International Dictionary of the Christian Church*, edited by J. D. Douglas, reveals a tendency to rely on secondary literature when describing Adventists. The article "Seventh-day Adventist" contains the following remarkable comment: "When the Adventist message has been proclaimed throughout the world and their church has grown to its predetermined size, then the end of the age will come" (p. 899, article by Robert G. Clouse). The article "Ellen Gould White" is even more notable, for even though birth and death dates are indicated (1827-1915), the final statement reads: "She wrote several volumes dealing with Adventist doctrines, notably *In Defense of the Faith* (1933)" (p. 1043, article by Robert C. Newman). That particular book, published 18 years after Ellen White's death, is actually W. H. Branson's response to D. M. Canright,

certainly the most famous of all former Adventists.

17. My optimism stems from the broad general consensus that was clearly developing at Theological Consultation II (Sept. 30–Oct. 3, 1981). See report in *SPECTRUM*, Vol. 12, No. 2 (December 1981), pp. 40–52. In my teaching experience, I have found that Ellen White's writings, especially her statements on inspiration in the Introduction to *The Great Controversy* (pp. v–xii) and in *Selected Messages*, Vol. 1 (pp. 13–58), are extremely helpful in contributing to an awareness of the problems and a stabilization of faith.

18. Ellen White, *Selected Message*, Vol. 1, p. 22.

A Believer's History of the Adventist Denomination

C. Mervyn Maxwell. *Tell It to the World: The Story of the Seventh-day Adventists*. Revised Edition. 287 pp., ill. Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1976. \$4.95 (paper).

reviewed by Benjamin McArthur

Adventist history, the subject of much recent scholarship, receives further attention in a book by a leading Seventh-day Adventist historian. C. Mervyn Maxwell, professor of church history at the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, gives a lively account of the Advent movement from the call of William Miller in 1831 to the 1901 General Conference session. The nineteenth century was the heroic age of the Seventh-day Adventist church, and Maxwell is at his best when recounting tales of sacrifice and triumph of the pioneers. The book, in fact, is primarily a collection of stories and anecdotes held together by a narrative line and interspersed with theological digressions on Adventist doctrine, such as the sanctuary and the investigative judgment.

Tell It to the World is also a "believer's

history." Maxwell writes in the great tradition of Adventist apologetic history, confidently tracing the Providential guidance of the church's leaders. This stance of faith controls both the assumptions and method of the book. And in an interesting way, he shares a common vision with America's New Left historians, who hold that history cannot be a dispassionate quest for some objective truth about the past, but demands commitment. Such history strives to move the reader to action.

Likewise, Maxwell hopes that his history will inspire the believer to greater devotion to the cause of the Third Angel's Message. He assumes a readership that shares his faith, and moves freely between history and theology, using each to support the other. This, of course, was precisely what the Adventist pioneers did, and Maxwell's ability to empathize so completely with the pioneers and to convey their outlook to the reader is a strength of the book.

But even acknowledging the apologetic-polemical genre to be a legitimate form of history, *Tell It to the World* has serious flaws. The book desperately needed a firm editorial hand. Maxwell, well-known as a storyteller, strives for an informal, conversational style, but too often lapses into an irritating sentimentality or a glimpse that undermines confidence in the account, as when he looks at what Adventists owe to other Christians in a distressingly superficial and tendentious survey of Western Christianity.

Further, there is the problem of a tightly compartmentalized view of the relationship of Ellen White's work to that of the official Adventist church leadership. Maxwell gives an evenhanded portrayal of the Adventist patriarchy, willing to point out intelligence and dedication as well as flaws of judgment or character in James White, Uriah Smith, John Harvey Kellogg, A. T. Jones, and others. But to Ellen White he can admit no fault (a prevailing strain in Adventist thought). She stands apart from the institutional battles, ready in moments of crisis to offer inspired counsel. This dichotomized view makes her appear something of a divine troubleshooter rather than an ongoing participant in the decision-making

Benjamin McArthur, a professor of history at Southern Missionary College, Collegedale, Tennessee, received his doctorate in history at the University of Chicago.

arena. She somehow seems above history, and even though Maxwell devotes nearly an entire chapter of human interest sketches to Ellen White, she still comes across less as human being than as icon. Perhaps it is time (if Seventh-day Adventists are secure enough in their concept of inspiration) to examine her in her political role.

For the most part the book adds little to our knowledge of Adventist history. One might have expected more from a man so knowledgeable of the Adventist heritage, yet in two areas the book does reflect recent scholarship and social change. The chapter on health reform mentions the several sources that contributed to the Adventist health teachings, and with a polite bow to feminism, Maxwell devotes a chapter to the "Leading Ladies" of the nineteenth-century church.

Tell It to the World will serve as an able introduction to church history for the Adventist lay person. The serious student, though, must consult Richard Schwarz's recently published denominational history textbook and await the multi-volume *Studies in Adventist History* which is still in preparation.

Parochialism, Educators, and the Courts

Dale E. Twomley. *Parochialism and the Courts*. ix + 165 pp., bibl. Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews University Press, 1979. \$7.50 (paper).

reviewed by Robert G. Higgins

Twomley anticipates that his readers will be private school administrators who need "to know not only what forms of aid have been allowed or disallowed, but also the rationale for the court's decisions and the

legal trends such aid is likely to follow. Limiting his focus to United States Supreme Court decisions through 1978, with a sprinkling of lower court cases, Twomley examines government aid exclusively in the context of primary and secondary schools.

In the first three quarters of the book, Twomley outlines the court's attempts at balancing two competing first amendment requirements—that government avoid the establishment of any religion and that government protect the right of free religious exercise. The courts have resolved this constitutional dilemma by developing a three-part test that is applied on a case-by-case basis: (1) the aid must have a secular purpose; (2) the effect must neither be to encourage nor discourage religion; and (3) the aid must not lead to excessive entanglement between government and religion. By tallying the number of consistent cases and the rank of the court issuing the opinions, the author identifies what he calls legal trends.

For all but the most indomitable administrators, the summary chapter is ample. It should be read, however, with several caveats in mind. First, as the author points out, many state constitutions are more stringent on the question of government aid than the United States Constitution, making Supreme Court rulings less relevant in those states. Second, given the division of the Supreme Court justices on the question of parochial aid, as demonstrated by the combined plurality and majority opinion in *Wolman v. Walter*, 433 U.S. 229 (1977), it is surprising that Twomley ventures to suggest trends at all. In fact, a recent United States Supreme Court case, *Committee for Public Education v. Regan*, 444 U.S. 646 (1980), contravenes Twomley's specific prediction by permitting the state to reimburse private schools for auxiliary services. Finally, contrary to Twomley's suggestion that the Supreme Court is becoming less receptive to all parochial aid programs, the *Regan* case is read by some as marking a shift toward accommodation.

Robert G. Higgins received a bachelor of arts degree from Loma Linda University and a J.D. degree from Willamette University, Salem, Oregon.

Homosexuality

To the editors: I read with some interest your April 1982 issue (Vol. 12, No. 3) on homosexuality. It was mostly of high quality. I think, however, that it did not really get a grip on the basic issues.

I am troubled by the statement found on pages 35 and 36 that "while there is mention of certain homosexual *acts* unacceptable in the Christian community, none is defined (in the new Testament) with sufficient specificity for us to know exactly what is being described". Isn't this a form of legalism? Do we *need* to know "exactly what is being described?" Are we looking for a line to see how close we can come to what is forbidden without crossing the line?

Homosexuality is more a symptom than it is a disease. The disease is our separation from God, our rebellion against Him, our choosing our own way. Homosexuality (as well as adultery, fornication, and most other sins) are the natural result of the basic disease, and its symptoms as well.

I think that the church should have a ministry to homosexuals. But it must not excuse this sin any more than any other. Paul says, in I Corinthians 6:9 and 10, that no homosexual shall enter the kingdom of Heaven. A part of the ministry to the homosexual must include facing that fact.

Kenneth Harvey Hopp
Attorney at Law
Redlands, California

To the Editors: In considering three articles printed in the Vol. 12, No. 3, issue of SPECTRUM, I have to wonder what the official position of Seventh-day Adventism is on homosexuality. Really, does something of this nature need individual treatment via special organizations such as Seventh-day Adventist Kinship International, Inc., or the Quest Learning Center in Reading, Pennsylvania? Since it is Scripturally classified as an evil, must we give it any more attention than to the evils of indulgence in heterosexual lusts involving adultery or incest that are also present within our ranks?

Some of the personal testimonies of the unfortunate victims of this unnatural lust seemed to be a cry for others to understand and accept them as they are, rather than a plea for prayerful support in attempting to overcome and be spiritually healed of this evil.

"Christ was in all points tempted like as we are . . ." (Heb. 4:15).

To look down the nose on homosexuals any more than any one else is not Christ-like. The way some of the experiences were related to be handled [sic] by even clergy is embarrassing and not Scripturally acceptable. On the other hand, setting homosexuality apart for "special understanding" gives it a dignity that it does not deserve. To defend or understand sin would justify it so that it would then no longer be sin.

If other denominations recognize homosexuality for what it is—a sin and not a physical condition—it seems that we too should be able to call sin by its right name and deal with it accordingly—not to condemn but to encourage the struggling sinner. How *can* we condemn when Christ Himself came not to condemn (John 3:17).

Frederick E. Kent, M.D.
Lancaster, California

To the Editors: Your three articles on "Adventism and Homosexuality" in the last issue of SPECTRUM (Vol. 12, No. 3) were read by me with great interest even though I too am "hopelessly heterosexual."

It should be obvious to everyone reading "Growing Up Gay Adventist" that many of our homosexually oriented members have been hurt deeply and alienated by SDA Christians and church leaders. The church has much to learn and change so that more gays and lesbians will not be adversely affected.

The approval church administrators gave to Benton, Cook, Cox, Geraty, Guy, and Londis to attend the first Kinship "camp meeting" should be applauded as should the clergy's nine proposals. It is unfortunate that the General Conference officers could only give "qualified" approval to the first seven and that they rejected the last two. I think that Kinship should be related to the church in a similar way to that of the Association of Adventist Forums. I would also hope that the subcommittee suggested in proposal 1 would have representatives from the gay and lesbian community as well as from the field of sexology and sex therapy.

PREXAD extending a three-year grant to Quest Learning Center was apparently done in haste and without consultation with experts in the field of human sexuality and homosexuality in particular. Quest's

premise that they can help people find freedom from homosexuality and be "healed" is contrary to all research on the subject. We have learned in the field of sex therapy that a person can only change one or two points and no more on Kinsey's Heterosexual-Homosexual rating scale. This scale is a continuum from zero to six (zero being totally heterosexual and six totally homosexual). Masters and Johnson claimed in their recent book *Homosexuality In Perspective* that they could convert homosexuals to heterosexuals; however, they have bowed to criticisms of their research and now state that all their successes were ambisexuals not homosexuals. An ambisexual is equally satisfied with and oriented to the same and opposite sex.

Therapy for sexual orientation problems is valuable for Kinsey's "2"s, "3"s, and "4"s who happen to be trapped at either end of the scale in their own minds. These bisexuals quite possibly could be helped out of their confused state by some of Quest's methods. Other persons with ego-dystonic homosexuality can be helped by therapy, but only to be comfortable in their homosexual orientation.

You can see from the above that I feel rather uncomfortable with the message of "healing" that the Quest Learning Center gives to homosexuals and their loved ones. Many will be given false hopes and will suffer from guilt feelings.

Lastly, I must give my support to SDA Kinship International and plead for the recognition it deserves from the church. Its address should be published in all church papers as well as in SPECTRUM.

Roy G. Gravesen, M.D.
Associate Clinical Professor
Director, Sex Therapy Clinic
University of California, Irvine

To the Editors: I wish to congratulate you, on behalf of the officers of SDA Kinship International, for your fair coverage of "Adventism and Homosexuality" in Vol. 12, No. 3 of SPECTRUM. I hope that your discussion will help Adventists recognize that they have many gay sons and daughters. The church has ignored, and indeed contributed to, our problems for too long. Meanwhile, most gay Adventists have either left the church, having failed to find love there, or have tried to live double lives within the church, hiding their homosexuality, a course which exacts a great cost from them.

It is a pity that SPECTRUM failed to publish a means of contacting Kinship. Kinship was formed to minister to gay Adventists, to encourage them when necessary, to assure them of the love and acceptance of Jesus. We have been credited with preventing several suicides. Our Kampmeetings have been especially exhilarating experiences. Adventist lesbians and gays, previously isolated, have found joy and acceptance with each other and with the remarkable clergy who have ministered to us. Finding acceptance here, many have felt strengthened to return to church. Meanwhile, the acceptance we found at Kampmeetings allowed us then to explore the ethics of being gay Christian Adventists. We invite potential members and friends (gay and non-gay alike) to join us, to support us, and to come and share with us our third Kampmeeting, which is to be held near San Diego from August 15 through 22. Write to SDA Kinship International, P.O. Box 1233, Los Angeles, CA 90028, or call us at (213) 876-2076, (212) 662-8656, (212) 729-1698, or (415) 921-1662.

I would like to comment on the decision of the General

Conference and the Columbia Union to fund the Quest Learning Center, Colin Cook's program to "deliver" homosexuals, which was reported in the same issue of SPECTRUM. While Kinship has serious misgivings about this program, the decision to fund it does have positive as well as negative aspects:

Positive. (1) The General Conference (GC) has now recognized that there are large numbers of homosexuals within the Adventist church. Cook's plans for 1,000 chapters of "Homosexuals Anonymous" in the U.S. in ten years, for eight regional Quest centers processing say 160 persons with homosexual orientations at one time, suggest a considerable potential constituency. It will be more difficult for church leaders to ignore Adventist homosexuals and their issues in the future.

(2) The GC wants to do something for its homosexual members—we are not by definition beyond the pale, but are at least potential members of the community of faith. Moreover, church leaders are willing to finance a program (however ill-advised it is specifically) to serve such people.

(3) It is legitimate that maladjusted homosexuals should be offered help to change their orientation if possible if there is some chance that this will bring them happiness.

(4) To the extent that Cook's plans are realized, the presence of groups of Quest "counselees" in churches near the Quest centers will both test the acceptance of local churches and make them used to having known homosexuals in their midst.

Negative. (1) The scholars and pastors whom the GC sent to the Kinship Kampmeeting in 1980 brought back a series of recommendations to PREXAD. First among these was that the church "study thoroughly the whole question of homosexuality and the church." It is unfortunate that the GC has now rushed into funding one kind of program without first conducting a study which would consider what should be done.

(2) It is distressing that this initiative has been taken without any attempt to consult with Kinship, the organization of gay Adventists, in spite of several offers from us. Would the GC make decisions effecting, for example, the women of the church after consulting only one woman, and that one who had undergone a sex change? Colin Cook seems to have become the GC's token gay who is listened to attentively because he says what they want him to say.

(3) Most distressing of all is the fact that both the experience of Kinship members and the vast bulk of serious research indicate that Quest's slogans offer a hope that will prove false to most of those who try them, so that their pain will be heightened and lengthened. Kinship members have generally responded to meetings presented by Colin Cook with deep depression, sometimes to the point of considering suicide. He insists dogmatically that we resume struggles we have long found to be bitter and fruitless, and allows no alternative. Cook rejects the conclusions that the few Adventist scholars who have seriously studied the issue are reaching on what the Bible says about homosexuality, and attempts to impose rigid rules of celibacy and to uphold the chimera of "deliverance" to heterosexuality. Yet the bulk of the evidence suggests that most of the "counselees" will find disillusionment, that at best they will live lives where every effort has to focus on controlling one narrow area, and that those who marry are likely to wreak havoc with the lives of their spouses. What will the church do with those who do everything to find "deliverance", as so many of us have, but do not find it? While there may be a place for an organization with the aims of Quest, it is

dishonest to present Quest as the only option, or as a viable option for many. When Colin was a delegate to Kampmeeting 1980, he promised us that he would send those for whom Quest failed to Kinship where they could learn the gay Christian alternative. However, he told me recently that although a number of counselees had already pulled out of his program, he felt he could not direct them to us. I fear that he prefers to let such "failures" fend for themselves. Until the GC backs other alternatives also it too is endorsing this situation.

Should Quest succeed to any notable extent, it will be making history in the area of homosexuality. Any results need to be documented carefully and independently, and followed up for ten years. Since Cook is choosing his own board, any results he issues will be suspect, even if received with enthusiasm by church leaders. I urged Colin to give an independent social scientist with recognised expertise in the area of homosexuality access over time to the first enrollees. But he replied nervously that he did not trust social science. I would suggest that unless objective monitoring of the program is allowed that any homosexuals thinking of trusting their lives to Quest should give pause, and any church officials providing funds do likewise. If Colin believes his own propaganda, surely he must be willing to open his program to systematic, objective monitoring and analysis.

Meanwhile, it is essential that Kinship do all that it can to inform the thousands of Adventists who are in despair because they realise that their sexual orientation is homosexual, and those who minister to them, that there is a "gay Christian" alternative to the official choice of either an elusive "deliverance" or giving up on Christ and their church. I would urge the GC to help us reach those who need us by at least publishing our mailing address in *Insight*, the *Review*, and *Ministry*. And I invite SPECTRUM readers to help pass the word.

Ronald Lawson
General Conference Liaison
SDA Kinship International
New York City

Cook Responds

To the Editors: I should like to correct certain distortions that arise out of Dr. Ron Lawson's letter. He says I changed my mind about referring counselees to Kinship. Kinship members assured me at the 1980 campmeeting that they did not advocate committed gay relationships. Since then Kinship has adopted a statement of beliefs, one of which states that same-sex intimate love can be to the glory of God. Although I always encourage counselees to act according to their own convictions, I cannot recommend people to Kinship when it holds a view that I believe is contrary to Scripture and inimical to personality development.

Ron says I reject the conclusions of the few Adventist scholars who have "seriously studied the issue." It would be no disrespect to the scholars who attended the 1980 campmeeting to say that they themselves stressed the tentativeness of their positions and the fact that their study reflected the pressure of having to study several thousand pages of material for the Glacier View meetings which convened the week following the Kinship campmeeting.

Ron speaks of the "vast bulk of serious research" and "the bulk of the evidence" that suggests that Quest counselees will find disillusionment. I can only take this to be a polemical statement rather than an objective one. In the last decade and a half, greater credence has been given to statistical and biochemical research, and many assume that this is the only "serious" kind. But there is another "vast bulk" of clinical research which, of late, is almost totally ignored because it assumes a value system. This latter kind of research still carries great weight among experts. Rather than hormonal or early developmental causes, it points to interpersonal relationships and intra-personal distortions. Furthermore, the research to which Ron probably refers in no way allows us to draw from it the conclusion that change is impossible, nor is there any research in existence that examines the effects on homosexuality of the vast resources of grace opened up to us by reformation theology and received by a trained faith in the context of a supportive Christian community.

Ron states that I nervously replied that I do not trust social science. Ron and Kinship make disproportionately frequent appeals to science and infrequent appeals to the power of the Christian gospel. As a Christian I cannot accept the non-value systems upon which the social sciences operate. Entirely different meanings are given to words like "normal" and "natural" by these disciplines, meanings which ignore the Christian values of reason, freewill, and choice, simply because these are not subject to empirical observation. Bio-psychosocial determinism pervades the social scientific interpretation of man. This kind of non-value secular presupposition influences the interpretation of scientific data. Values can never be determined from the results of scientific investigation. This is the role of Scripture.

Quest has never been averse to opening its program to systematic, objective monitoring as long as the research group is prepared to place proper value on the full range of Christian influences, namely, the cognitive, spiritual, psychic, and social effects upon behavioral change and intra-psychic resolution. In fact, plans are presently being worked out for the Department of Psychiatry at Hershey Medical Center (Hershey, Penn.) to do a ten-year study on Quest counselees with careful observation of the Christian influence on psychic and behavioral change.

According to Ron, Quest counseling will only "heighten and lengthen the pain" and lead to "the resumption of bitter and fruitless struggles." Neither Ron nor Kinship give evidence of perceiving the real issue behind Quest, that of righteousness by faith. Counselees are urged to see that God does not charge any of their homosexual responses against them because of His acceptance of them through the atoning work of Christ.

Through this atonement, applied in counseling, both cognitive and affective, people develop motivations stemming from gratitude towards the kindness of God, instead of motivation from guilt and fear. It is expected that Ron and Kinship misunderstood the purpose of Quest precisely because they perceive its message of deliverance as a call to return to the guilt-producing perfectionism from which they have just escaped. The message of Quest is just the opposite.

I hope that continued dialogue will lead to better understanding of how the gospel brings healing to homosexuals.

Colin Cook
Quest Learning Center
Reading, Pennsylvania

SAWS

To the Editors: Some of your readers may be interested in further information about Seventh-day Adventist World Service (SAWS) which became available after the publication of an article on the subject in the last issue of SPECTRUM. The following table produced in 1980 by the U.S. government's Agency for International Development (AID) provides a picture of the

size and source of funds of various voluntary organizations. Only the best known organizations in the table have been selected as a means of comparison. As you will notice in the accompanying table, SAWS compares very favorably with other organizations receiving aid from the U.S. Government.

More detailed information in the table concerning the kind of governmental and private support SAWS and the other organizations receive can be obtained by writing to the Agency for International Development and asking for the booklet cited below.

Harrison John

Agency	US Government Support	Private Support	Grand Total
Catholic Relief Services	298,666,000	50,614,000	349,280,000
CARE	154,624,250	40,790,821	195,415,071
Agricultural Missions Foundation	185,029,533	598,577	185,628,110
American Jewish Joint Distribution Comm.	22,627,652	40,270,255	62,897,907
Church World Service	20,370,000	25,250,000	45,620,000
HADASSAH	1,111,715	32,368,792	33,480,507
Domestic & Foreign Society for Protestant Episcopal Church in the USA	1,080,000	27,825,000	28,905,000
Seventh-day Adventist World Service	11,291,115	4,663,314	15,954,429
Internal Rescue Committee	9,925,984	5,410,140	15,336,124
Save the Children	4,885,425	9,586,536	14,471,561
The Population Council	5,045,989	8,595,855	13,641,844
Mennonite Central Committee	2,200,261	11,132,499	13,332,760
Girl Scouts of the USA	238,246	13,013,861	13,252,107
Lutheran World Relief	2,859,162	9,031,801	11,890,963
Note: These data taken from <i>Voluntary Foreign Aid Programs, 1980: Reports of American Voluntary Agencies Engaged in Overseas Relief and Development Registered with the Agency for International Development</i> , Agency for International Development, Washington, D.C., pp. 21-27.			

Guy Favors Theological Elite?

To the editors: I read Fritz Guy's article on the future of Adventist theology (Vol. 12, No. 1) with a great deal of interest since I am presently a theology student. I appreciated Dr. Guy's evenhanded analysis of the current situation and his presentation of theological options for the church to pursue.

I was, however, shocked that he would advocate the idea that without theologians and biblical scholars, the Adventist community "would have lost the possibility of discovering 'present truth.'" Since when have theologians and biblical scholars been the only ones with access to present truth? This certainly was not the case during the early development of the Adventist church, with no apparent disastrous consequences. Why has the truth been suddenly concentrated in the hands of an elite group of scholars?

Perhaps my interpretation of Dr. Guy's words is

incorrect. But when Dr. Guy defined the role of the theologians (in encouraging openness within the church) as *initiating* "responsible theological discussion," while describing the role of the "great majority" of believers as merely to *participate* (however nebulous that may be) in these discussions, Dr. Guy effectively relegated most Adventists to the backwoods of theological inquiry.

Of course, Dr. Guy's article focused on theologians and not on the complete church body. It was thus fair and understandable for him to be biased in his treatment of these scholars. We *do* need a group of men and women to—in some sense—control the potential for damaging theological "eruptions" while providing the church with ongoing theological education.

Also, Dr. Guy nicely defined openness as the opposite of insecurity, obscurantism, and dogmatism. But elitism contains all three elements: it is the result of insecurity, the cause of obscurantism, and the bulwark of dogmatism. Openness is the opposite of elitism. The subtle drift towards an elitist attitude within the church must be stopped.

Ross Winkle
Student Missionary
Tokyo, Japan

Guy Responds

Although Mr. Winkle does misinterpret the article, he is surely correct in insisting that theology is the task of the whole church. This task must not be confined to "an elite group" of professional theologians, or to administrators, or to ordained ministers. Every member of the church has a contribution to make to its total understanding and experience of truth. It is the continuing *activity* of theology, not a special category of persons, that is essential to the possibility of discovering "present truth."

Fritz Guy
Professor of Theology
SDA Theological Seminary
Andrews University

Volunteers International

To the Editors: Thank you for the fine article on Volunteers International and Robert Bainum in the last issue of SPECTRUM. It was one of the most comprehensive and informative articles on the subject of Indochinese refugees that I have read. Mr. Bainum is now in Thailand evaluating the projects of Volunteers International and the needs of the refugees. If you wish further information on the work of Volunteers International, please write us at 10701 Main Street, Fairfax, Virginia 22030, or call (703) 385-1435.

Glenn Rounsevell
Vice-president
Volunteers International

British Union Crisis

To the Editors: Please allow me to comment with reference to the article, "Crisis in the British Union," which appeared in the June issue of SPECTRUM. As a founder member of the London Layman's Forum, as well as its first secretary, I believe I can offer insights that may, to some degree, reflect what was the thinking among some of the "articulate immigrants" which resulted in the formation of the Forum at that time.

No problem can be adequately understood apart from its history, and Mr. Porter has attempted to show that what resulted in a crisis for the British Union had its origins in a hurricane in Jamaica, the passing of a U.S. Immigration Act and the economic situation in the West Indies. He suggests that the root causes of this crisis are socio-economic in nature. Large scale emigration from the West Indies to the United Kingdom in particular being suggested as a major factor.

I submit that Mr. Porter has not gone back far enough in history to seek reasons for the crisis. I believe we need to be reminded that black/white relationships have had a much larger and long-lasting effect on the history of Great Britain than some may care to admit, or remember. I am not only referring to the trade in blacks in which Britain eventually had the largest slice of this "human cake," and finally relinquished with an acute feeling of

racial guilt. I speak also of the fact that emerging societies in North America and the Caribbean at this period in history were, to a large extent, influenced by the political norms and cultural mores of 17th-century Britain. Deeply implanted in their racial consciousness was the belief that God appointed white to rule black. The British slave trade was one result of this theory of race, and the political and economic life of the American and Caribbean colonies further entrenched these attitudes.

While some other European powers participated in the slave trade, there was a difference between their treatment of slaves and their attitude on race and that of Great Britain. It is a matter of record that the humanity of the black man was in serious doubt by Christian Britain right up to the end of the 18th-century. He was not even considered a suitable receptacle for the Christian religion.

Generally speaking, the British Adventist was not very different from the rest of British society in his acceptance of certain assumptions and attitudes concerning Britain's black colonies and their inhabitants. These assumptions equated technological superiority with moral excellence. In addition, a cultural nationalism, carefully cultivated by the popular media, as well as by church paper articles and even returning missionaries, served to reinforce these patterns of thinking regarding non-whites. The fundamental conviction that whites always ruled was transferred to relationships between the indigenous and the immigrant within the denomination. The British, it was felt, was enlightened, and the black colonial not so. Consequently, the British Adventists continued to set the parameters for everything that concerned the churches because they claimed they knew best how things should be done. Religious ethnocentricity and arrogant racial attitudes went hand in hand.

I strongly believe that it was black reaction to the above that made the indigenous Adventist feel threatened. An examination of the attitudes of most whites in the larger British society at this time would have turned up striking parallels among the indigenous Adventists. One would have heard the same prejudiced references and generalizations about blacks, and one would have been measured against the same black stereotypes. The British Adventist saw the denomination as national, rather than international, and this, perhaps, was contributory to their denial of any meaningful role to their West Indian brethren in the political life of the churches. It was the reaction of black Adventists who were no longer prepared to accept second-class membership that brought things to a head. The London Layman's Forum was one result of black reaction to the prejudice they knew to exist within the denomination.

Perhaps some British Adventists will need to accept the West Indians as "people" first, before they can accept them as brothers in Christ. It is not consistent with the Gospel to say, "We are all one in Christ," when by their attitude and behaviour they say to the same persons, "You do not belong here." Perhaps it might be worth considering that West Indian Adventists can be equally qualified to know how to put things right racially. Could it be that they possess a better judgement and perspective on this issue because of their past colonial experience?

As I see it, hope for a lasting solution to the crisis lies only in a return to the ethics of the Gospel. It will then mean both sides going forward as new creatures in Christ, members of a forgiven and a forgiving community. It will mean incorporating this new unity in Christ into church community life: worshipping together, listening to each other, and accepting and encouraging each other's leadership at all levels of church life. It will require an understanding of, and a sensitivity to, the history of the

colonial West Indian. It will mean that the men in leadership strive to produce a framework in which both sides can understand one another. It will mean a Gospel-centered reappraisal of the factors that brought the crisis into being.

It will be only by this material expression of His kind of love and of His new community, that the world will truly know that we are His followers and are serious about spreading His Truth.

L. M. Kellawan
London, England

Adventists in the USSR

To the Editors: Amnesty International, an organization concerned with the plight of prisoners of conscience in countries known for their frequent violation of human rights, has tried for the past year to free Maria Mikhailovha Zinets from imprisonment in the Soviet Union. She and her step-sister were arrested when they distributed leaflets which contained a rebuttal to articles that had appeared in the Soviet press which attacked their spiritual leader, a member of the True and Free Seventh-day Adventist Church, who was then on trial for his religious activities. Amnesty International learned that Maria M. Zinets was sentenced to three years imprisonment in a labor colony, and that her health has badly deteriorated since her arrest. In consequence, Amnesty International in the United States has been appealing for her release on the grounds that her imprisonment constitutes a violation of her right to freedom of expression, guaranteed under Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to which the Soviet Union is a signatory.

Sincerely,

Werner T. Angress
Amnesty International
Group 129
20 Hartwell Drive
Mt. Sinai, New York 11766

To the Editors: In his letter in SPECTRUM (Vol. 12, No. 3), Mr. Dabrowski says that Vladimir Shelkov, the very famous leader of The True and Free Seventh-day Adventists in the Soviet Union, was *not* a Seventh-day Adventist nor a Christian. This is very surprising.

Let me tell you an experience Swedish Adventists had with Soviet embassy authorities concerning Shelkov. Some months after the confinement of Shelkov, the

Swedish Union of Seventh-day Adventists had its annual meeting. During the Union meeting many members got printed cards, and sent 2000 to Premier Brezhnev in Moscow, asking him to liberate Shelkov. A year later, but before Shelkov died in prison, the Soviet embassy in Stockholm responded by sending an article written by Pastor Kulakov to the Seventy-day Adventist Swedish Union office. The embassy asked that the article be printed in the church paper, and it was.

In the Soviet response, Pastor Kulakov described the situation of the officially recognized Seventh-day Adventists in very favorable terms. This clearly shows that while the Soviet government classified V. Shelkov as an "illegal Seventh-day Adventist," they nevertheless regarded him as a Seventh-day Adventist. Furthermore, such notable authors as Solzhenitsyn, Ginsburg, and Orlov; General Grigorenko; Nobel prize winner Sacharov and many other persons know that Shelkov was not only a Seventh-day Adventist but also a very sincere Christian. A few years ago, I also had an interview with Pastor Kulakov. He did not say that Shelkov was not a Christian believer.

It is very remarkable that it was not Pastor Kulakov from the Soviet Union, but a Czech SDA leader who is quoted as saying Shelkov was not an Adventist or a Christian. I regret that Mr. Dabrowski and other people have been misled. He and others would do well to read accounts of the actions of the Soviet government against Shelkov that were sent to the Madrid Peace Conference, and which are available for study.

Rune Blomdhal, Ph.D.
Professor at Blackeberg College
Stockholm, Sweden.

Correction

In SPECTRUM, Vol. 12, No. 3, the story titled "The Davenport Bankruptcy and Recent Litigation" reported that Gertrude Daniels, one of the plaintiffs in a suit against the North Pacific Union Conference (NPUC) and other Adventist organizations, had met with attorney John Spencer Stewart about funds she had placed in irrevocable trust with the NPUC that may have been lost in the Davenport bankruptcy. The report stated that Mr. Stewart told Mrs. Daniels her money was gone and she had no claim on the NPUC.

Since publication of the article, one of Mrs. Daniels' advisors has stated to the author that the meeting was not between Mrs. Daniels and Mr. Stewart, but between the advisor and James Hopps, the in-house attorney for the NPUC. According to the advisor, Mr. Hopps said he could do nothing about the problem and that Mrs. Daniels would have to contact Mr. Stewart, who was and is the NPUC's attorney for all legal matters related to the Davenport case. Mr. Hopps has refused to confirm or deny that the meeting took place.

Davenport

Three plaintiffs are continuing action against the church over handling of funds in the Davenport case despite the refusal of Portland, Oregon, Judge Clifford B. Olfen to certify a class action lawsuit against the denomination last April. On June 15, Judge Olfen ordered the church to produce records of the minutes of the North Pacific Union Conference committee from 1968 to the present and the report of the General Conference audit of the North Pacific Union for the same time period.

So the suit which many thought had ended in April proceeds in the "discovery" stage. Sources close to the case indicate that the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Internal Revenue Service, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation also are studying the case.

Documents from the Davenport estate are providing the press with an abundance of material. The *San Bernardino Sun* published a four-part series in June which said that 13 church officials at local conference, union, and General Conference levels loaned Davenport money while sitting on governing boards of church entities that made loans to him. The personal deals those officials negotiated with Davenport not only violate the church's conflict of interest guidelines, but were made at substantially higher interest rates (up to 80 percent interest) than the church entity received.

In the meantime the elders at Davenport's local congregation, the Loma Linda University Church, chose a committee on May 29 to study the matter and make a recommendation to the church membership committee on whether action should be taken on his membership.

Pacific Press Case

The old Pacific Press cases also saw action in California court recently. In the case brought by the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission involving Lorna Tobler (Merikay Silver having settled out of court), the U.S. District 9th Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed the judgment of the district court that the Pacific Press Publishing Association violated the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by denying Lorna Tobler monetary allowances paid to similarly situated male employees. The press was held in violation for terminating Tobler's employment in retaliation for her filing charges against them. The Pacific Press is considering whether to take the case to the Supreme Court, the only remaining avenue of appeal.

In its ruling the Appeals Court said the legislative history shows that "although Congress permitted religious organizations to discriminate in favor of members of their faith, religious employers are not immune from liability for discriminatory action against employees who exercise their rights under the statute." It also noted that discharging Tobler from her position at the Pacific Press does not constitute one of the recognized forms of church discipline.

In the separate class action suit also filed by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission in the federal district court for Northern California, the judge has not yet rendered a final opinion, although the magistrate, a lower court official to which the case was referred, has reported his finding to the court. The Pacific Press totally objected to his findings, and oral arguments were presented to the court in early June. The Equal Employment Op-

portunity Commission says the interest due as of February 1, 1982, on the aggregate monetary relief for head of household under payment is not less than \$291,315. That is a point of contention as is the method suggested for distributing the money to the entitled party. The Pacific Press lays its basic objection to all of the magistrate's determination on the ground that the burdens imposed on the Pacific Press entangles the government in religious affairs in violation of the first amendment and impermissibly inhibits the free exercise of religion. That argument failed in the Tobler case. If the Press loses on this level, it may appeal to the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals.

EGW Project Extended

July 1 of this year the General Conference Committee officially voted to approve the recommendation of the General Conference Officers that Professor Fred Veltman's E. G. White Life of Christ Research Project, be extended a third year until June 30, 1983. Neal Wilson, president of the General Conference, notified John Cassell, Jr., president of Pacific Union College, at the May meeting of the school's Board of Trustees, that Veltman would not be returning to the college's theology department for the 1982-83 school year. The General Conference Officers had changed their earlier decision to terminate the project this summer at the end of the two years initially approved for the study.

Veltman, chairman of the theology department before undertaking this project, randomly chose 15 chapters in *Desire of Ages* to study in detail, in order to analyze how Ellen White used the writings of others to produce her own works. Because of the latest action of the officers, his final report will be submitted by June 30, 1983, to an 18-person committee appointed by the General Conference and chaired by Gordon Madgwick, dean of Pacific Union College.

The study had been approved July 1, 1980,

on the recommendation of the White Estate, particularly its executive secretary, Robert Olson. When James Cox, originally selected to head the project, accepted the presidency of Avondale College in Australia, the General Conference invited Veltman to undertake the study, providing him with a budget of \$40,000 each year, that includes his own salary, funds for assistants, scholarly materials, and office supplies. At first, Veltman planned to investigate how Ellen White used sources in the entire *Desire of Ages*, as well as several other volumes. He soon discovered his study would have to be illustrative, not exhaustive. Even with the study limited to fifteen chapters in *Desire of Ages*, Veltman had to tell the president of the General Conference in January, 1982, that the research could not be completed by the end of the two years approved. Veltman submitted a request for a one-year extension of the project and an increase of his budget to \$55,000.

However, the officers of the General Conference had questions about the adequacy of Veltman's scholarly methodology, recurring doubts about the basic necessity of such a project (since, among other things, borrowing by Ellen White had already been acknowledged in denominational publications), and a few raised eyebrows at Veltman's frequent speaking engagements describing his research well before it had been completed. In the spring of this year the officers decided Veltman should submit whatever research he had by August, 1982.

Nevertheless, the President of the General Conference was instrumental in extending the project another year. After the officers' decision, Wilson, during an April visit to Pacific Union College campus, reviewed more closely Veltman's work in progress. Also, in a subsequent research trip to Washington, D.C., Veltman provided further information about his work to Kenneth Wood, chairman of the board of the White Estate, to Robert Olson, and to others. Within a month, Veltman's college president had received word from the General Conference president announcing the extension of the E. G. White Life of Christ Research Project.

—Bonnie Dwyer

SPECTRUM ADVISORY COUNCIL

Charlene and Floyd Anderson	Dorane and William King
Lucille and Alan Anderson	Claire and Richard Knierim
Ramona and Len Bierlein	Ruth and Edward Komarniski
Ben R. Boice	Doreen and Irwin Kuhn
LeJean and Allen Botimer	Verla and Alvin Kwiram
Neridah and Bernard Brandstater	Karen and Mel Lake
Betty and Bruce Branson	Roberta and Bradley Litchfield
Mary and Floyd Brauer	Ewald Lonser
Merrilyn and Ray Brown	Heidi and Richard Ludders
Marilyn and Robert Burman	Thelma McAdoo
Dos and Molleurus Couperus	Irene and Kenneth McGill
Eryl Cummings	Marguerite and Robert Marsh
Walter Cummings	Iola and Julius Martin
Elsie and Raymond Damazo	Neva and Bill Meek
Thelma and Lloyd Dayes	Jacqueline and Robert Moncrieff
Mary and James Dunn	Lyla Neumann
Mary and Wilfred Eastman	Valerie and Glenn Patchen
Juanita and Richard Engel	Marilyn and Daniel Patchin
Nancy Engeset	Cecilia and Ernest Plata
Janine and Wilmer Engevik	Verna and Winslow B. Randall
Mary and Rene Evard	Martha and Alfredo Rasi
Lois and Walt Fahlsing	Arlene and Merlin Reeder
Erika and Jim Fallbeck	Carole and Gordon Rick
Marjorie and Albert Farver	Anieta and William Rippey
Karen and Ronald Fasano	Thais and James Sadoyama
Beth and Jack Fleming	Ursula and Donald Shasky
Joy and Gerry Fuller	Gordon and Lovina Short
Joyce and David Grauman	Grace and Walter Stilson
Nadine and Gordon Hale	Carlene and Leonard Taylor
Deanne and David Hanscom	Dort and Nancy Tikker
Cheryl and Milford Harrison	Mareidith and Rudy Torres
Sally and Robert Hasselbrack	Ken Tucker
Donald Hawley	Nancy and Robin Vandermolen
Hanna and Hjaltar Helmersen	Nancy and John Vogt
Claudette and Jack Hennemann	Carol and Bruce Walter
Margaret and Wilfred Huse	Karla and Kenneth Walters
Marjorie and John Jacobson	Janice and Harry Wang
Liv and Eugene Joergenson	Barbara and Rodney Willard
Genevieve and Paul Johnson	Vicki and Chuck Woofter
Katie and Richard Johnson	Morton Woolley

The SPECTRUM Advisory Council is a group of committed SPECTRUM supporters who provide financial stability and business and editorial advice to insure the continuation of the journal's open discussion of significant issues. For more information, contact:

Dr. Raymond S. Damazo, Chairman
855 106th Avenue N.E.
Bellevue, WA 98004

(206) 454-2722 Office
(206) 455-4522 Residence

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARY

6771
744
L.S.