BONUS HISTO

God's Last Choice: Overcoming Ellen White's Gender and Women in Ministry During the Fundamentalist Era | BY KEVIN M. BURTON

Introduction

Seventh-day Adventism was wholly reinvented in the 1920s and 1930s.[1] Though the organizational structure did not change much after 1918, the church prior to this time was fundamentally different from the church that was created during the interwar years. Most Adventists are unaware of this reinvention and George R. Knight has correctly argued that many Adventists in the early twenty-first century incorrectly look back to "the years between 1920 and 1960 . . . as the era of 'Historic Adventism.'"[2] This article supports Knight's assessment through the lenses of unity, authority, and gender. Simply put, there was a time in which Adventists were united by a simple covenant: to keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus Christ. There was a time in which local churches were governed congregationally and in which a local conference, a union, or the General Conference, had no authoritative control over their daily operations. There was a time in which church policy did not prohibit women from serving as conference presidents or forbid their ordination to the gospel ministry. This was a time in which Adventists, and their churches, were autonomous *and* united.

In addition to items voted at General Conference sessions, the Seventh-day Adventist Church recognizes four sources of authority that outline policy for governance.[3] Though the General Conference Constitution was adopted in 1863 and its bylaws outlined in 1889, the other three sources of authority have their genesis in the twentieth century. Between 1926 and 1932, the General Conference

adopted a *Working Policy* (1926), a list of Fundamental Beliefs (1931), and a *Church Manual* (1932). In this article, I analyze the adoption process of the *Working Policy* and *Church Manual* and demonstrate the impact these sources of authority initially had on Seventh-day Adventist women.

Change regarding policy was intimately related to an evolving understanding of unity and authority. As the meaning of these concepts changed in the Adventist Church, the dynamics of power and governance shifted. Karen Orren and Stephen Skowronek advise,

> To ask where and when shifts in authority occur, why and by what process, and to inquire into their consequences is to place exacting demands on the description of change in governance over time, on the identification of causes and the weighing of their relative significance, and on the accurate portrayal of the new historical patterns they produce. In all of these ways, it encourages scholars to sidestep a priori logics of development, to question stylized treatments of history, and to anchor theory building more firmly in empirical evidence.[4]

This article illustrates how unnoticed shifts in denominational policy produced a "new historical pattern" of governance that took away women's right to serve as ministers and conference officers. Since at least the early 1980s, scholars have recognized that "[s]omething happened to women in the Seventh-day Adventist Church, beginning in 1915 and sharply accelerating in the mid-1940s, that led to the almost total exclusion of women from leadership positions in the church."[5] Bertha Dasher, Patrick Allen, Kit Watts, and Laura L. Vance have analyzed the decline of women in leadership positions post-1915,[6] but the only policy changes thus far noted were the establishment of term limits in 1931, and the Annual Council's 1923 decision that it was preferable that "the future home missionary and mis-

RY LESSON

sionary volunteer secretaries" be "ordained ministers."[7] This article provides a fresh analysis prompted by recently discovered documentation that further clarifies the "what" that "happened" to female leadership in Adventism.[8] Though multiple factors were involved, I argue that Adventist male leaders of the Fundamentalist era intentionally used denominational policy to exclude women from conference leadership positions and the ordained ministry.

Unity and Authority: 1840s to 1932

Seventh-day Adventists were hesitant to organize as a denomination because they were part of the Restoration Movement, which sought to return the church to its original purity before institutional hierarchies were introduced. Leaders of this movement, such as Alexander Campbell, "called for local church autonomy, exclusively biblical requirements for church membership, the unity of Christians around biblical essentials, and an end to sectarian creeds and ecclesiasticism."[9] Because Adventists held these beliefs so fervently, they organ-

ized in the 1860s with extreme caution and intentionally established a simple ecclesiastical structure designed to protect local church autonomy and individual conscience.[10]

When the General Conference was established in 1863 to ensure that ministers and missionaries were equitably distributed in all regions of the field, it had a very limited jurisdiction—it only had authority over wage and labor distribution.[11] The constitution specified that the General Conference served two purposes: first, it had "the purpose of securing unity and efficiency in labor." The key phrase, "securing unity," was restricted to *labor*—an important and intentional limitation of power. The type of labor was clearly outlined, indicating that the General Conference jurisdiction included "the general supervision of all ministerial labor" and "the special supervision of all missionary labor." Aside from this, the General Conference treasurer ensured that church laborers were paid and the executive committee organized and oversaw the regular meetings, which initially met annually.[12]

The General Conference's second purpose was "promoting the general interests of the cause." The work of "promoting" was very different from "securing unity" in that it denoted no relationship of authority. The phrase, "general interests," was intentionally broad. While it initially included just the Publishing Association, many other ministries were added to the church in subsequent years. These ministries were not governed directly by the General Conference and were organized as independent entities with their own constitutions and governing bodies. In the nineteenth century, the General Conference counseled the "general interests" of the church, but these ministries were not technically within its jurisdiction.[13]

The General Conference was "higher in authority than State Conferences," but this meant that it could only "mark out the general course to be pursued" by these conferences.[14] If the General Conference adopted a resolution that related to these conferences, then the state conferences had the authority to ratify, amend, or reject the resolution.[15] As James White explained, the state conferences chose "to carry out the decisions of [the] General Conference" only "*if it be* the[ir] pleasure." This system of checks and balances was set in place so that "unity . . . [would] be secured" and autonomy maintained.[16]

This system of checks and balances also guided the relationship between the state conferences and the local churches. If a state conference adopted a resolution that fell outside of its jurisdiction, then the local churches in that territory had the authority to ratify, amend, or reject that resolution.[17] The local church was "congregational in its government" and strictly protected by Adventist Church policy. The General Conference explained the relationship between these two organizational units as follows: "The State conference . . . has general supervision of the churches and their work, though it exercises no authority over the local church, except as particular questions are submitted to it for decision."[18]

Understanding the limited jurisdiction of the General Conference clarifies an often-misinterpreted resolution that the Adventist Church adopted in 1877. It stated,

> Resolved, *That the highest authority under God among Seventh-day Adventists is found in the will of the body of that people, as expressed in the dicisions [sic] of the General Conference when acting within its proper jurisdiction; and that such decisions should be submitted to by all without exception, unless they can be shown to conflict with the word of God and the rights of individual conscience.*[19]

At this time, the jurisdiction of the General Conference was limited to wage and labor distribution, which indicates that the "all" who were to "submit" referred specifically to denominational employees, primarily ministers and missionaries.[20] At this time, the General Conference did not have the authority to establish theological beliefs for the denomination or institute policies that governed the local church directly.[21]

Seventh-day Adventists considered altering this policy a year later. During the 1878 General Conference session, the General Conference Executive Committee was authorized to "take immediate steps toward the publication of a Manual" that outlined church policies and parliamentary procedure.[22] Though the "Church Manual" was again discussed a year later,[23] no further action was taken until the church decided, in 1882, to publish the manual in the *Review and Herald* so that it could be peer-reviewed.[24] It was printed between June and October 1883,[25] but when the General Conference met in annual session a month later the Church Manual was unanimously rejected for four reasons: first, the Adventist Church was already united without one; second, it might lead to established creeds or disciplines; third, ministers and church officers would consult the Church Manual on matters of polity rather than the Bible and the Holy Spirit; and fourth, Adventist leaders reasoned and asked, "It was in taking similar steps that other bodies of Christians first began to lose their simplicity and become formal and spiritually lifeless. Why should we imitate them?"[26] Seventh-day Adventists at this juncture ultimately upheld their conviction that denominational organization must remain simple and that local church autonomy was a critical component of denominational unity and spiritual vibrancy.

Women in Ministry: 1840s to 1932

Early Adventist understandings of unity and authority enabled women to play a critical role in church life and work. The most preeminent example was Ellen White, one of the founders of the Adventist Church. Though she began her prophetic ministry in 1844 and served as a public minister until her death in 1915, she never held a formal position of authority within her denomination and was never ordained by the laying on of human hands. She did claim that God had ordained her,[27] however, and Adventist administrators affirmed this ordination and gave her the same ordination credentials that men carried.[28] Adventists recognized that this ordination enabled Ellen White to speak publicly, to teach, and to have authority over men and women. Adven-

tists were influenced through her teaching and work to be open to women serving as ministers of the gospel.[29] Early Adventists also used Ellen White's gender as justification for other women teaching and having authority over men.[30]

Scholars have highlighted several notable women who served the church in official capacities.[31] Adelia P. Van Horn was the first woman to serve in the Seventh-day Adventist Church in a formal position. Between 1864 and 1867 she was the editor of the *Youth's Instructor* and in 1871 she was elected treasurer of the General Conference.[32] Sarah A. Lindsey was the first woman to receive a ministerial license, which was issued to her through the New York and Pennsylvania Conference in 1869.[33] A ministerial license enabled men and women to prepare for the ministry as itinerate preachers and evangelists, but did not authorize them "to celebrate the ordinances, to administer baptism, or to organize a church."[34] These licenses were given to "[a]pplicants for ordination to the ministry" and after "a limited term" the licensing conference would recommend that individual for ministerial ordination.[35] Dozens of women received ministerial licenses between 1869 and 1930 but, unlike their male counterparts, these women were not ordained to the gospel ministry, even though a few were given ministerial credentials.

In the 1850s and 1860s, Adventist leaders unanimously refuted the notion that the Bible commanded women to be silent in the churches.[36] Though Adventist ministers and theologians all affirmed that women could preach, prophesy, exhort, and pray publicly, the majority did not acknowledge that Phoebe was a deaconess[37] and rejected the notion that a woman could hold a position of authority within the church.[38] In 1866, Uriah Smith argued that women could preach and teach publicly, but qualified his stance by adding, "The *leadership and authority* is vested in the man. 'Thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee.' Gen. iii, 16. This order is not to be reversed, and the woman take *the position* which has been assigned to the man; and every action on her part which shows that she is usurping this authority, is disorderly, and not to be allowed."[39]

D. T. Bourdeau also argued, "Paul does not suffer a woman to teach, or to usurp authority over the man; and we do not learn from the Scriptures that women were ever ordained apostles, evangelists, or elders; neither do we believe that they should teach as such. Yet they may act an important part in speaking the truth to others."[40]

Adventist administrators and theologians began to alter their perspective in the 1870s, shortly after the Seventh-day Adventist Church began to grant women ministerial licenses in 1869. These licenses affirmed that women could serve as ministers but also raised an important question, Did the Bible allow women to be ordained? Adventist leaders apparently wrestled with this question throughout the decade.

By late 1878, Adventist discussions of women in ministry had taken a subtle, yet significant turn. In December, J. H. Waggoner, a leading minister and resident editor of the *Signs of the Times*, published an editorial, titled, "Woman's Place in the Gospel." Waggoner offered nothing new, however, and rehashed the same argument that Adventists circulated in the 1850s and 1860s. He argued that women could publicly serve as gospel laborers through prophesying, praying, edifying, and exhorting, but denied their right to serve in positions of authority. "A woman may pray, prophesy, exhort, and comfort the church," he wrote, "but she cannot occupy the position of a pastor or a ruling elder. This would be looked upon as usurping authority over the man, which is here [in 1 Tim. 2:12] prohibited."[41] As Nancy J. Vyhmeister has demonstrated, Waggoner also considered the office of deaconess to be illegitimate.[42]

Waggoner's article may have sparked a debate. About this time, James White had requested that S. N. Haskell study the topic of women in ministry. Haskell responded by letter about the time that Waggoner wrote his article, but came to a different conclusion. He noted the examples of women who had positions of authority in the Bible, including Miriam, Deborah, Abigail, Huldah, Anna, and others, and concluded that women could serve in the church as deaconesses and elders. Women could also, according to Haskell, serve as ministers and

Simply put, there was a time in which Adventists were united by a simple covenant: to keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus Christ.

traveling preachers who baptized female converts.[43] Other Adventist leaders supported Haskell on these points, rather than Waggoner, and argued that Scripture allowed for women to hold positions of authority in the churches.

Shortly after Haskell's letter was written and Waggoner's article was published, several others wrote on the topic of women in ministry for the *Review and Herald*, which was edited by Uriah Smith. In January 1879, Ellen White wrote, "Women can be the instruments of righteousness, rendering holy service. It was Mary that first preached a risen Jesus. . . . If there were twenty women where now there is one, who would make this holy mission their cherished work, we should see many more converted to the truth."[44] At this time, Ellen White apparently sidestepped any debate and affirmed the point upon which Haskell and Waggoner agreed: women were called to preach and teach the gospel publicly.[45]

Others openly challenged Waggoner's view of women in ministry. In the same issue of the *Review* in which Ellen White's article appeared, leading Adventist theologian, J. N. Andrews, affirmed that the Bible supported women holding certain positions of authority. "Romans 16:1 shows that Phebe was a deaconess of the church at Cenchrea," he wrote, "and Acts 18:26 shows that [Pricilla] was capable of instructing Apollos." It is important to recognize that Andrews' statement about Phoebe broke new ground: J. B. Frisbie was the only Adventist minister to acknowledge in print that she was a deaconess prior to Andrews. But Frisbie's article had appeared in 1856 and it took over twenty years for other Adventist ministers to support his conclusion in print.[46] Therefore, it is significant that Andrews publicly rejected the old argument that Waggoner rehashed and concluded that women could hold certain church offices and positions of authority—this was a significant advancement in Adventist theological understanding.[47]

A few months later, James White revised his previous position on the subject as well. In the 1850s, White had affirmed that women could speak publicly, but did not affirm that they could hold positions of authority in the church.[48] In 1879, however, White supported Haskell and Andrews' new perspective by stating that women could hold positions of authority. He analyzed numerous examples in the Bible of "holy women [who] held positions of responsibility and honor" and built upon Haskell's research. His first example was Miriam, of whom he stated, "Here we find a woman occupying a *position equal* to that of Moses and Aaron, God's chosen servants to lead the millions of Israel from the house of bondage." Next, White analyzed the position of Deborah and declared, "She was a judge in Israel. The people went up to her for judgment. *A higher position no man has ever occupied.*" In addition to several other examples of godly women, White concluded, on the basis of Joel 2:28–29 and Acts 2:17–18, "The Christian age was ushered in with glory. Both men and women enjoyed the inspiration of the hallowed hour, and were teachers of the people. . . . And the dispensation which was ushered in with glory, honored with the labors of holy women, will close with the same honors."[49]

Several Adventist churches began to elect deaconesses after Haskell, Andrews, and White concluded that this office was biblically based. In 1883, W. H. Littlejohn stated that it was now "the custom of some of [the] churches to elect one or more women to fill a position similar to that which it is supposed that Phebe and others occupied in her day."[50] In addition, more women began to serve the church as licensed ministers throughout the 1870s and into the early 1880s. By 1881, at least sixteen women had received a ministerial license[51] and the majority of Adventist leaders, including the Whites, Andrews, Haskell, Littlejohn, and Smith, had affirmed that these women could hold positions of authority within the church.[52] By contrast, Waggoner seemingly had few supporters and his old perspective apparently became the minority view by this time. Though none of these articles overtly addressed *ordaining* women to the ministry or to the deaconate, they did stress that women did have authority to teach and labor publicly. Since the subject was soon addressed formally, it is evident that church leaders were thinking about women's ordination.

During the General Conference session of 1881, W. H. Littlejohn, B. L. Whitney, and Uriah Smith were elected as the Committee on Resolutions.[53] This trusted standing committee was tasked with thoroughly considering all propositions to be presented to the conference delegates in the form of resolutions that reflected their definite recommendation. As David Trim has noted, the men on the 1881 Committee on Resolutions were among the group of Adventists who "saw no objections to ordaining women to gospel ministry."[54] This led them to formulate the following resolution: "*Resolved*, That females possessing the necessary qualifications to fill that position, may, with perfect propriety, be set apart by ordination to the work of the Christian ministry."[55] After this resolution was presented, some delegates discussed the matter and it was then referred to the General Conference Executive Committee, which included G. I. Butler, S.

N. Haskell, and Uriah Smith.

Adventists have wrestled with this resolution for decades, unsure if it was adopted or rejected. Three interpretations have emerged in the historiography: 1) that the resolution was directly adopted by a vote of the delegates; 2) that the resolution was indirectly adopted, but never implemented; and 3) that the resolution was indirectly rejected because it was referred to the General Conference Committee. David Trim has categorically refuted the first option—the official minutes do not explicitly state that the resolution was voted or adopted and the word "resolved" does not mean that it was approved. Still others have cautiously suggested either option two or three, but thus far no consensus has emerged. Only one of these options is correct and the matter must be settled, as Trim has affirmed, by clarifying "what 'referral to the GC Committee' actually meant."[56]

After thoroughly analyzing the documentation currently available, I have concluded that the 1881 resolution was *indirectly* adopted and referred to the General Conference Executive Committee for implementation. I hold this perspective for four primary reasons (see Appendix on page 163): first, this interpretation is supported by the rulebooks Seventh-day Adventists used for parliamentary procedure in 1881; second, analogous referred resolutions were, in fact, all indirectly adopted and implemented; third, the report of the 1881 General Conference in the *Signs of the Times* states that the resolution was adopted; and fourth, this outcome provides a more convincing explanation of subsequent statements on policy. Though I argue that this resolution was indirectly adopted, it is important to stress that it was never officially implemented—no women are known to have been ordained as ministers prior to 1930. Nevertheless, I argue that after 1881, the question for Seventh-day Adventists was not *could* women be ordained, but rather, *would* they be ordained—a question that remained unsettled until 1930–1932.[57]

Though there is no known documentation that explicitly explains why the resolution to ordain women was presented at the General Conference in 1881, it seems that it was connected to both the growing number of female licentiates and the new practice of electing deaconesses in local churches. Perhaps early Adventists were concerned with the gender question and not with questions about role or function. In other words, it may be that they reasoned, if a woman can hold an office she can be ordained to that office, and if she can be ordained to one office she can be ordained to any office. What is clear is that Adventist leaders considered ordaining women to the ministry at the time that the churches began to elect deaconesses and it is unlikely that this timing was coincidental.

James White was the first Adventist minister to ordain a woman. On July 27, 1867, he set apart Phillip Strong as a minister and ordained his wife, Louisa, "as his helper." James White reasoned, "My views and feelings are that the minister's wife stands in so close a relation to the work of God, a relation which so affects him for better or worse, that she should, in the ordination prayer, be set apart as his helper."[58] As Denis Kaiser states, "It does not seem, however, that this procedure became a general practice in the church."[59]

Though women were not typically ordained as ministerial helpers, Adventist women were frequently ordained as deaconesses after 1895. Scholars have assumed that these ordinations only occurred for a few years, were limited to certain regions of the world, and were very rare. Further investigation proves that this was not the case, however. Since the resolution to ordain women as ministers was not implemented, it is not surprising that W. H. Littlejohn admitted in 1883 that it was not "the custom" of Adventists to ordain deaconesses.[60] This changed in 1895, however, when Ellen White stated in the July 9 issue of the *Review*, "Women who are willing to consecrate some of their time to the service of the Lord should be appointed to visit the sick, look after the young, and minister to the necessities of the poor. They should be set apart to this work by prayer and laying on of hands."[61] This statement prompted several Adventist ministers to ordain women as deaconesses; the first known ordination took place about a month later, on August 10, 1895.

Unnoticed shifts in denominational policy produced a "new historical pattern" of governance that took away women's right to serve as ministers and conference officers.

deacons and deaconesses are also elected annually to care for the financial and administrative work. In the case of large congregations, particularly in cities, ordained ministers are sometimes appointed as pastors, but usually they act as itinerant evangelists, having supervision of a number of local churches, and directing their chief effort to missionary work in the development of new fields.

All the churches in a State form a State conference, to which they elect delegates in the ratio of 1 to every 15 members. The State conference meets annually and has general supervision of the churches and their work, though it exercises no authority over the local church, except as particular questions are submitted to it for decision. In some large States there are two or more of these conferences, and as a matter of convenience the term "local conference" is coming into use. The State conferences are united into groups of five or six, to form union conferences, which hold sessions quadrennially, and to which delegates are elected by the State conferences on the basis of 1 for every 200 church members. The union conferences throughout the world are united in the General Conference, which holds sessions quadrennially, and is composed of delegates from the union conferences in the ratio of 1 to every 1,000 church members.

Each conference has an executive committee for the conduct of its business along the lines of the different departments of the church's work. The presidents of the State conferences and chairmen of State departments are ex officio members of the executive committees of their union conferences, and the presidents of the union conferences, together with the chairmen of union departments, constitute the executive committee of the General Conference. Membership in the conferences or the ministry is open to both sexes, although there are very few female ministers.

Applicants for church membership, not already members of a church, appear before the elders of the local church for examination. If approved, they are recommended for baptism at some public service, usually when the ordained minister in general charge can be present, though this is not essential. After baptism, either at the same or a subsequent service, they are presented to the church by the elders, and received by vote of the members present.

Applicants for ordination to the ministry are licensed to preach, for a limited term, by a conference, either State, union, or general. At the expiration of that term, on approval by the conference, they are recommended for ordination, and are ordained, under supervision of the conference, by ministers selected for that service. This ordination is for life, but ministers are expected to renew their papers at each meeting of the conference which ordained them.

Local church expenses are met by special contributions, and collections are made during the year for the different departments of denominational work. An effort is also being made to collect a sum amounting to 60 cents per week per member for foreign mission work. The expenses of the ministry are met by the tithing system, each church member being expected to contribute a tenth of his income. The tithes are paid through a deacon to the treasurer of the State conference, who pays the salaries of the State conference ministers and remits one-tenth to the treasurer of the union conference. Of this amount the latter treasurer appropriates nine-tenths for the expenses of union conference ministers and remits one-tenth to the treasurer of the General Conference. Any surplus in the treasury of a State or union conference is voted to the treasurer of the General Conference for the foreign missionary work of the denomination. Associations for the holding of property belonging to the denomination have been formed in nearly every country in which work is carried on. The jurisdiction of these associations is generally coextensive with that of a conference, State, or union, and their officers are usually the officers of the conference, while their membership

the wicked are raised in the second resurrection; led by Satan they come up against the Lord and the city. Final judgment is pronounced upon them, and fire consumes them utterly. Death itself is destroyed, and the grave. Satan is no more. All traces of sin are removed by the purifying fires, and the earth comes forth, recreated, restored to the purity and beauty of the original Eden. "The meek shall inherit the earth." It becomes the eternal home of the redeemed of Adam's race. (Rev. 20: 7–15; 21: 1–5.) There is then no sin or pain in all the universe, and every creature gives praise to God. (Rev. 5: 13.)

ORGANIZATION

The local church.—The local church is congregational in its government, although under the general supervision of the conference of which it is a member. One or more elders—generally laymen—are elected annually to care for the spiritual interests of the church, conduct services, and, in the absence of an ordained minister, to administer the sacraments. One or more deacons and deaconesses are also elected annually to care for the financial and administrative work. In the case of large congregations, particularly in cities, ordained ministers are sometimes appointed by the conference as pastors, but usually they act as evangelists, having supervision of a number of local churches, and directing their chief effort to evangelistic work in the development of new churches.

Local, union, and General Conference.—A number of churches are united to form a conference or mission. The conference meets biennially and is composed of delegates elected by the churches. The conference has general supervision of the churches and their work. In some large States there are two or more of these conferences, and as a matter of convenience the term "local conference" has come into use. The local conferences or missions are united into groups to form union conferences, which hold sessions quadrennially, and to which delegates are elected by the local conferences. The union conferences and union missions throughout the world are united in the General Conference, which holds quadrennial sessions composed of delegates from union conferences and union missions throughout the world. For convenience in administering the work of the General Conference, the world field is divided into 12 divisions, each with its staff of division officers, presided over by a vice president of the General Conference.

Executive committees.—Each local conference and local mission has an executive committee for the conduct of its work, composed of its officers and other elected or appointed members. The union conference president, secretary, and treasurer, together with the presidents of the local conferences and superintendents of local missions and other elected members, compose the executive committee of the union conference. The president, secretary, and treasurer, the field secretaries of the division, the presidents of union conferences, and superintendents of union missions, with division departmental secretaries, and other appointed members, constitute the executive committee of the division. The president of the General Conference, and other officers of the General Conference and the divisions, the field secretaries, together with General Conference and division departmental secretaries, the union conference presidents and superintendents of union missions, and other elected members, constitute the General Conference executive committee.

WORK

Membership and work.—Applicants for church membership appear before the pastor or officers of the local church for examination. If approved, they are recommended for baptism and church membership.

Candidates for the gospel ministry are licensed to preach, for a limited term, by a conference, either local, union, or general. At the expiration of that term, on approval by the conference, they are recommended for ordination.

Local church expenses are met by special contributions, and collections are made during the year for the different departments of denominational work. An effort is also being made to collect a sum amounting to 40 cents per week per member for foreign mission work. The support of the ministry is provided by the tithing system, each church member being expected to contribute a tenth of his net income for this purpose. The tithes are paid through a church treasurer to the treasurer of the local conference. The conference supervises the work of ministers and pays the salaries. Associations for the holding of property belonging to the denomination have been formed in nearly every country in which work is carried on. The jurisdiction of these associations is coextensive with that of a conference, local, or union, and their officers are the officers of the conference,

Records indicate that these ordinations were not localized or uncommon. Many women, in fact, were ordained as deaconesses between 1895 and the 1920s in several different countries, including Australia, Borneo, India, the United Kingdom, and all throughout the United States.[62]

Recently discovered statements on policy suggest that the Adventist Church remained open to the possibility of women's ministerial ordination as long as women were ordained as deaconesses. At the turn of the twentieth-century, the United States Census Bureau initiated a census of religious bodies every ten years, beginning with the year 1906. The Bureau began to collect the data for the first religious census in 1907 and published the results in two volumes in 1910. The first volume included numerical data about the various religious bodies that worshipped in the United States. The second volume, however, was comprised of the beliefs, history,

and polity of each religious group. According to Charles Nagel, the director of the census, "The descriptive statements were prepared, wherever possible, by competent persons in the denominations, who were appointed by the bureau as special agents for this purpose."[63] The "general statement covering the history, doctrine, polity, and work of the Seventh-day Adventist denomination" was prepared by the General Conference, under the direct supervision of Harvey Edson Rogers, General Conference Statistical Secretary and member of the General Conference Executive Committee.[64]

Since the General Conference prepared this statement, its description of the church and its work was authoritative. This statement did not introduce new concepts, but rather explained how the church operated to a non-Adventist audience. Seventh-day Adventist leaders were thrilled with the opportunity to share their faith in this manner and re-

sponded enthusiastically to these censuses because it gave them a chance to "place [their] work in proper light."[65] Therefore, the censuses of religious bodies gave Adventist leaders a voice and occasion to portray their movement in the manner they believed the most accurate.

Since the General Conference wanted to present Adventism in an accurate manner, it is particularly interesting to note the sections of polity that dealt with the ministry and ordination. In a paragraph that outlined the different types of conferences—local, union, and General—and the function of the presidents and executive committees, the General Conference wrote, "Membership in the conferences or the ministry is open to both sexes, although there are very few female ministers."[66] The context of this paragraph makes the meaning clear: it was possible for a woman to be elected to any office of a local conference, union, or the General Conference, including the office of president, and serve as a gospel minister. Though no women had served as conference, union, or General Conference presidents, policy did not prohibit this possibility. Furthermore, this statement affirms that there were some female ministers and that the title, "minister," was given to both men and women—no distinction was made upon the basis of gender between those who filled ministerial positions.

The topic of ministerial ordination was addressed a paragraph later. Since this statement on polity declared that the ministry was open to both sexes, the wording of the clause on ordination was crucial. *If* Adventist Church policy did restrict ministerial ordination to men, it was necessary to clarify that point explicitly. However, this was not the case. Though the ordination paragraph did not explicitly state that ordination to the ministry was open to women, it was intentionally written in gender-neutral terms. The statement reads in full:

> *Applicants for ordination to the ministry are licensed to preach, for a limited term, by a conference, either state, union, or general. At the expiration of that term, on approval by the conference, they are recommended for ordination, and are ordained under supervision of the conference, by ministers selected for that service. This ordination is for life, but ministers are expected to renew their papers at each meeting of the conference which ordained them."*[67]

The imprecise language of this statement is significant. James E. Anderson, political scientist and expert on policymaking, articulates the importance of clear language in relation to policy as follows: "Public policies in modern political systems do not, by and large, just happen." Rather, policy is linked "to purposive or goal-oriented action rather than to random behavior or chance occurrences." The language of policy statements, whether description or prescriptive, is thus crucial. Explicit policies require definite, clear, and precise language; policies intended to be open are written in ambiguous terms. According to Anderson, "The goals of a policy may be somewhat loosely stated and imprecise in content, thus providing a general direction rather than precise targets for its implementation. Those who want action on a problem may differ both as to what should be done and how it should be done. Ambiguity in language then can become a means for reducing conflict, at least for the moment."[68] The descriptive policy statement on ministerial ordination in the religious census was written in ambiguous terms, which implies that the Adventist Church tacitly allowed that women's ministerial ordination was possible, even though it had not yet been officially practiced. Though other details regarding policy were altered, it is important to note that these statements about the openness of ministry and ordination remained unchanged when the 1916 and 1926 censuses of religious bodies were published. Once again, Harvey Edson Rogers oversaw these censuses and the General Conference approved the statements.[69]

The significance of these statements is accentuated by a comparison with another document prepared by the General Conference shortly before the third religious census was taken for the year 1926. The *Manual for Ministers* was published in 1925, but was not an authoritative guide in a strict sense. Rather it was "printed as suggestive, and . . . not necessarily to be exactly followed" in all of its details. Unlike the policy statement printed in the reli-

In the 1850s and 1860s, Adventist leaders unanimously refuted the notion that the Bible commanded women to be silent in the churches.

gious censuses, the *Manual for Ministers* described ministerial ordination with gender-specific terminology. Words like "brother," "him," and "man" appear numerous times.[70] Adventist administrators were therefore inclined to use gender-specific terms to describe ministerial ordination, which highlights the significance of the policy statements in the religious censuses—particularly the one prepared for 1926, which was updated after the *Manual for Ministers* was published. The General Conference officers did not use gender-neutral terms in those statements accidently. Rather, it seems that they were aware that denominational policy had been open to women's ordination since 1881. To be sure, the statements on polity provided in these religious censuses were not prescriptive—the documents did not serve the same function as a codified working policy. Nevertheless, these statements did provide an accurate description of Adventist policy prior to 1930, especially since the General Conference wrote it for a non-Adventist audience—people completely unfamiliar with Adventist policy and procedure. In the early 1930s, Adventist administrators deliberately removed the clause, "Membership in the conferences or the ministry is open to both sexes, although there are very few female ministers," from the polity statement in the religious censuses when an official declaration on ministerial ordination was finally made gender-specific in 1930—once policy stated that ordination was for men only, the ministry was no longer open to both sexes.

Unity, Authority, and Women in Ministry: Post-1932

As Seventh-day Adventism grew in size and spread to new countries and regions, the General Conference increased its authority and jurisdiction. The first significant step in this direction took place in 1889. The Constitution was heavily revised during this year and bylaws were added to it. Most significantly, the purpose of the General Conference was redefined: whereas it initially had the "purpose of securing unity and efficiency in labor" the Constitution now specified that its object "shall be to unify and extend the work of the Seventh-day Adventist denomination throughout the world." This newly stated purpose required increased authority and jurisdiction. Prior to this time, the General Conference only supervised ministerial and missionary labor. In 1889, however, these statements were revised so that the General Conference had "the general supervision of all denominational work." In spite of this significant change, denominational ministries remained independent and retained much of their autonomy. This changed about a decade later.[71]

Adventists also began to meet in regular session biennially after 1889, which meant that the elected officers now served longer terms. The General Conference Executive Committee was also granted "full administrative power during the intervals between the sessions" and a new administrative tradition was initiated: the Annual Council, which met for the first time in the autumn of 1890.[72] The Annual Council soon became "one of the most important meetings of the General Conference Committee" because it acquired the authority to establish policies for church governance—a privilege previously reserved for delegates at General Conference sessions.[73]

Seventh-day Adventists began to institutionalize as the church expanded into foreign lands, but these changes also transpired in concert with the centralization of authority in the United States. As Ian Tyrrell has argued, "the late nineteenth century to the end of World War I was a crucial period for the growth of the federal state." During this time America began to build an empire by acquiring several territories beyond its continental borders.[74] Federal authority continued to centralize in other ways between the 1910s and 1930s. Historians often interpret the presidential election of 1916 as "a foreshadowing of the New Deal coalition"[75] because Americans "argued that state and federal officials must work to regulate business, prevent labor abuses, create an educated populace, build a transportation infrastructure, ensure public health, and regulate private behavior."[76] Ultimately, Americans got their wish in the 1930s when the New Deal was established. This "gave rise to Social Security, unemployment compensation, federal welfare programs, price stabilization programs in industry and agriculture, and collective bargaining for labor unions." Previously, "these policy areas seemed to belong exclusively to the states," but the New Deal centralized this power in the Federal Government.[77]

The concept of big business also emerged in the latter part of the nineteenth-century and by the early twentieth-century the "giant corporation proved to be the seedbed of a new social and economic order." A new "managerial class" arose in America that was "governed by the engineering values of efficiency and systematic approaches to problems." As Glenn Porter has stated, "soon almost the entire society would fall under the influence of corporate ways of doing things."[78] Amanda Porterfield has observed the impact big business had on religion. As citizens in the Roaring Twenties "endorsed corporate organization as the path to social progress," denominations, attracted by "centralized hierarchy," began to translate "religion into business."[79]

The Seventh-day Adventist Church was one of the denominations that began to translate itself into a big business in the early twentieth-century. A significant step in this direction was taken in 1901. Though some historians have focused on organizational decentralization during the 1901 General Conference session,[80] it is important to recognize that centralization ultimately triumphed. As Benjamin McArthur states, "The 1901 General Conference . . . offers a nearly perfect case study of the larger trends toward rationalized bureaucratization occurring in American society."[81] Perhaps the clearest example of the General Conference's increased authority was its takeover of the independent ministries. According to Richard W. Schwarz and Floyd Greenleaf, "By 1902 the old independent associations had been replaced by four separate departments: Education, Publishing, Religious Liberty, and Sabbath School. By 1922 the church added eight more as the effectiveness of departments and the need for a broader range of activities became apparent." The reorganization in 1901 therefore facilitated the centralization of authority, though decentralization was intended. As Schwarz and Greenleaf note, "By bringing all church activities under the ultimate control of the General Conference, church leaders produced a new centrality to the organization."[82]

Adventist administrators disagreed with the pioneers before them who had insisted that the denomination's organizational structure remain simple. They began to reason (incorrectly) that "[t]he leaders of the church who developed a simple organization (1863) did not yet see the world field as a part of it."[83] In point of fact, the Whites recognized the world as the church's mission field when Ellen White received a vision in November 1848 about "streams of light that went clear round the world."[84] Nevertheless, the church did rapidly expand in the 1870s and 1880s and, by 1921, there were more Seventh-day Adventist members in other countries than in the United States.[85] As the church grew, General Conference officers reasoned that big businesses functioned best when authority was centralized at the top.

Theological innovations and the threat of

"Modernism" also influenced conservative Christians to centralize authority in fundamental doctrines. Fundamentalists arose militantly to defend their "new form of 'old-time religion'" in the 1910s.[86] Seventh-day Adventists were likewise distraught by the signs of the times and, as Paul Mc-Graw has demonstrated, "During the first half of the twentieth century, Adventism produced various church leaders who began to seek common ground with the wider Christian community."[87] Adventists of the twentieth century craved respectability and believed that an alliance with the Fundamentalist camp was the surest way to achieve it.[88] In 1926, I. A. Crane asked Seventh-day Adventists, "Are you really a fundamentalist?" He then answered for them, stating firmly, "Yes, when it comes to the Bible we are all strong for taking it to mean what it says. We are fundamentalists of the fundamentalists. We all thank God that this is so."[89] Following Crane's lead, Adventist leaders throughout the 1920s and 1930s repeatedly boasted that they were "the fundamentalists of the fundamentalists."[90]

Fundamentalists were not favorable to women in ministry. According to Margaret Bendroth,

The events of the [1920s] finally put to rest the old stereotype of women as the true guardians of religion, replacing it with a new one emphasizing their moral weakness and theological shallowness. In the new formulation, fundamentalist men forsook their previously passive role in religion and, in theory at least, assumed full responsibility for guarding orthodoxy.[91]

Many of the new taboos were focused on women. Liberal women of the era—known as flappers—smoked cigarettes, listened to jazz music, bobbed their hair, wore shorter skirts, and painted their faces with cosmetics. Such women were a sign of moral decay and became the foil for the Fundamentalists' ideal woman—one whose identity was intricately linked with modesty, propriety, motherhood, and homemaking. This new Cult of Domesticity stressed that women were not to assert themselves in the public sphere because a "plain" reading of Scripture indicated that the Apostle Paul's proscriptions on women in

Several Adventist churches began to elect deaconesses after Haskell, Andrews, and White concluded that this office was biblically based.

public in were not "culturally conditioned." As Randall Balmer has stated, "fundamentalist women are expected to be submissive, to demand no voice of authority in the church or in the home."[92] Laura L. Vance notes the impact this new perspective had on Seventh-day Adventism, stating, "Whereas nineteenth-century Adventist women had been depicted as independent, competent, and intelligent workers (especially prior to 1880) whose responsibilities included, but were not limited to, domestic work, the woman portrayed in the Review of the 1920s and 1930s appeared to have little knowledge, experience, or ambition outside of the domestic sphere."[93]

Fundamentalists raised a new criticism of Seventh-day Adventism that related to gender as the two groups came into closer contact with one another. In 1917, William C. Irvine became the first to declare in print that Seventh-day Adventism was a cult, in his book, *Timely Warnings*.[94] Irvine believed that Adventism was a cult for a variety of reasons, but the issue of gender was central to his attack. He began his chapter on Adventism with these words: "SEVENTH-DAY [sic] ADVENTISM, Christian Science, and Theosophy have one thing in common at least—they all had hysterical, neurotic women as their Founders!"[95] Other Fundamentalists soon joined the counter-cult movement and railed against Seventh-day Adventism as a religion founded by "the incontrovertible logic of a woman."[96]

It was much more difficult for Seventh-day Adventists to be perceived as honorable and to maintain self-respect once they had been designated a cult.[97] Since the designation was intricately connected with Ellen White's gender, Adventists found ways to minimize her significance, or at least her gender. To call Ellen White the church "Founder" was particularly deplorable to Adventists of this period. The term itself was a big business label that pointed to the person(s) who established an institution. A woman, especially one who claimed to have visions, was incapable of legitimately possessing this status in the business world— particularly if the business was a religion—and the charge invalidated current Adventist managers and the rapidly growing institution they operated. It is not surprising, then, that Adventists of this period quickly responded to their critics that Ellen G. White "was not the founder of Seventh-day Adventism." Those unwilling to give White founder status either remarked that she "was a great pioneer and leader in it" or merely "the leading writer."[98] Others more generously admitted that she was "one of the founders of the Seventh Day [sic] Adventists."[99]

But if White was only one of the founders, who else could be honored with this status? Accounts initially varied. Some stated that James White was "the [only] founder of the denomination,"[100] but more frequently a coterie was granted this status, including the Whites, Joseph Bates, Hiram Edson, Frederick Wheeler, and S. W. Rhodes.[101] The definitive answer eventually came from Everett Dick, a trained historian who published *Founders of the Message* in 1938. Dick specified that "three strong characters, two men and a woman" had emerged from the Millerite disappointment to found the Seventh-day Adventist Church— "Joseph Bates, James White, and Ellen White."[102] Though Dick's claim was not necessarily historically inaccurate, it is important to note that it answered a nagging criticism raised by other Christians. Adventists of the Fundamentalist era were relieved that they could call Ellen White just a co-founder *and* place her name at the end of the list behind two men. A two-thirds male majority ensured the legitimacy of Seventh-day Adventism and enabled it to more credibly grow into a big business capable of missionizing the world.

Adventists now had a response to the founder question, but they also needed to answer the charge about a hysterical female visionary. Seventh-day Adventists published their first book-length apologetic works on Ellen White and the gift of prophecy during the 1920s and 1930s,[103] but a subtler, yet remarkably more potent response also arose at this time—one that specifically excused White's gender. In the 1890s, J. N. Loughborough introduced a three-part story about William Foy, Hazen Foss, and Ellen Harmon. As the story goes, Foy was the first to receive a vision, but since he didn't understand it he refused to share it. Next, Foss was given the same vision, but stubbornly resisted God's command to tell it to others. Finally, the vision was given to Harmon—someone unafraid to share it despite the fact that prolonged illness had made her "the weakest of the weak."

Most Adventists know this story, but do not realize that it has evolved over time into a complete myth. Loughborough occasionally presented his narrative as one connected story,[104] but typically mentioned the three persons in disconnected fashion.[105] Specifically, in his most popular works, he introduced Harmon some twenty pages after Foss, which obscures the cause and effect nature of the story— something other storytellers made explicit.[106] Furthermore, Loughborough's story did not focus on gender. He never re-

ferred to Ellen Harmon as a woman or young girl, but gave her the proper title, "Sister Harmon" or "Miss Harmon." Furthermore, he always connected the phrase, "the weakest of the weak" with her poor health. This, however, began to change in the 1920s. During this decade, storytellers added three elements to the story: first, Ellen Harmon was now presented as "a young woman," or "a young girl";[107] second, the phrase "the weakest of the weak" was detached from Harmon's poor health and connected to the phrase "young woman" or "young girl";[108] and third, Harmon's first vision was typically situated within a room of "five women . . . praying earnestly for light," which amplified the femininity of Harmon's prophetic call.[109]

In the 1920s and 1930s, Adventists concluded that Ellen Harmon White was God's last choice to receive the prophetic gift. One author prefaced the story in this manner: "Throughout the history of the human race, God has used *men* as channels through which He has communicated His will to other *men*. So, early in the history of this movement, God chose a *special* messenger." This messenger was considered to be "special" because of her gender. The tale was now told with explicitly causal language and the gender of each subject was emphasized. God first turned to "a young *man* by the name of William E. Foy. . . . Because William Foy had failed to do the work that God had desired him to do, Hazen Foss, a young *man* . . . was chosen." After Foss refused to deliver God's message, the story continued, "the Lord called Ellen Harmon." In what setting did this occur? "It was during a morning prayer meeting when she, with five *women*, was kneeling in prayer, that she was taken off in [her first] vision."[110] In a more concise version of this tale, A. W. Peterson wrote, "On two different occasions two different *men*, William Foy and Hazen Foss, were given messages . . . but both shrank from the burden and the humiliation which has always been the part of God's prophets. Then it was that God called a *young girl*, 'the weakest of the weak,' to speak for Him." Peterson's paragraph ended with this sentence, suggesting that a woman was

weak, but Ellen Harmon was "the weakest of the weak" because she was a young girl.[111] By the mid-1930s, this newly gendered narrative had become entrenched within the collective Adventist consciousness. The moral of the story was simple: God failed to find a man who would serve Him so He was forced to find a weak little girl to relate His message to the people.[112] Unlike Dick's selection of Adventist founders, this myth is riddled with historical inaccuracies.[113]

Adventists created ways to respond to the founder and visions questions, but they also had to contend with the fact that the Adventist Church had employed women preachers for decades and still had a policy open to women's ordination. In *Bobbed Hair, Bossy Wives, and Women Preachers*, John R. Rice railed against "Mrs. White and Seventh Day [*sic*] Adventism" because she was partially to blame for "the rise of women preachers" in America. According to Rice, "women preachers" promoted false "doctrine, radical emotionalism, 'speaking in tongues' and trances . . . [and] false pretenses of healing—these things surely should warn us that there is infinite harm in women preaching."[114] Seventh-day Adventist policy in the 1920s still implicitly allowed women to serve as conference presidents or ordained gospel ministers because it was not explicitly forbidden. If they were to gain the respect of Fundamentalists and maintain self-respectability, this policy had to be altered.

The *Working Policy* and *Church Manual* changed this policy in 1930/1932. To be sure, Seventh-day Adventists had policies of procedure prior to this time, but they were not systematized into a single document until the Autumn Council approved the first *Working Policy of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists* in 1926.[115] It is significant that Adventist policy on ordination did not change when the *Working Policy* first appeared: if policy had limited ordination to men prior to this time, this should have been reflected in the first edition of *Working Policy*. However, this was not the case. In fact, when the General Conference revised its descriptive policy statement in 1927 for the 1926 Federal Census of Religious Bodies, ordina-

What is clear is that Adventist leaders considered ordaining women to the ministry at the time that the churches began to elect deaconesses and it is unlikely that this timing was coincidental.

tion to the gospel ministry was still open to both sexes. This changed three years later, however, when the Adventist Church officially specified in the 1930 edition of *Working Policy* for the first time that "ordination to the ministry is the setting apart of *the man* to a sacred calling."[116] It is therefore important to recognize this point: prior to 1930, church policy statements on ordination were written in gender-inclusive language, but this changed in 1930—from this point onward church policy has explicitly restricted ministerial ordination to men.

This change was intentional. According to James E. Anderson, "a policy is defined as *a purposive course of action or inaction followed by an actor or set of actors in dealing with a problem or matter of concern*."[117] Adventist administrators in the 1920s and 1930s recognized that church policy implicitly allowed for the ordination of women. Though no women prior to the 1930s are known to have been ordained as ministers, many had been ordained as deaconesses and some had been ordained as elders and performed the functions of that office. During the Colorado camp meeting held in 1922 at Rocky Mountain Lake Park, someone asked if women were allowed "to officiate at quarterly meeting" and "be ordained as church elder." The question was answered in the negative at this time, but the respondent reluctantly admitted that he was cognizant of "[o]ne or two instances" in which women had

been ordained as elders and officiated at the Lord's Supper. Apparently, ordinations of this nature occurred frequently enough for the writer to plead with his brethren and sisters to cease and desist. Who was at fault? According to this writer, it was the women who were ordained. "[N]o woman should allow herself to receive ordination," the writer implored, "much less to officiate [at the Lord's Supper] even though she might have been ordained by someone who exceeded his authority." Though the writer assured his readers that these ordinations were "not recognized by the denomination," it is important to note that his claim was only supported by a general consensus, not church policy.[118] Administrators in the Fundamentalist era therefore dealt with this "problem" by making the policy statement on ordination explicit—it was, after 1930, for men only.

It is significant to note that a General Conference session did not approve this decision. When the revisions to the *Working Policy* were suggested at the 1930 session, the changes were not presented to the delegates and the matter was referred to the General Conference Executive Committee for implementation without discussion.[119] The delegates were completely unaware that denominational leaders were planning to restrict ordination to the gospel ministry to the male gender. Though it is likely that the delegates would have approved this change in 1930, they were not given the

opportunity. The concept of authority had changed since the issue was first addressed—in 1881 a General Conference session decided the question of gender and ordination.

Since very few people read the *Working Policy*, the General Conference ensured that Adventists would follow this new policy by including it in the *Church Manual* (1932).[120] This publication completely changed the nature of Seventh-day Adventism and its very adoption represents a new perspective on unity and authority.[121] Whereas the 1883 Manual was presented to a General Conference session for adoption, the 1932 *Church Manual* was not—the Executive Committee simply authorized and published it. Whereas Adventists in 1883 realized that they were united without a Church Manual, Adventist administrators in the early twentieth-century determined that unity could not be achieved or maintained unless they had one. Whereas nineteenth-century Adventists rejected a Manual because they wanted people to rely on Scripture alone, the 1932 *Church Manual* was advertised to church members as "the *final word regarding the Church, its Officers and its work*."[122] Whereas the autonomy of the local church had been intentionally guarded and protected, the General Conference now dictated what these bodies could and could not do in regard to matters of polity.

Between 1930 and 1932, Seventh-day Adventist administrators took authoritative action to bar women from ministry with three (if not more) policies.[123] First, the *Working Policy* and *Church Manual* officially stated for the first time that ordination to the gospel ministry was reserved for men only. Between 1906 and 1926, the descriptive policy statement in the Federal censuses included this clause: "Membership in the conferences or the ministry is open to both sexes, although there are very few female ministers." Prior to 1930, General Conference policy allowed for women's ordination to the ministry by not prohibiting it, but this changed when the *Working Policy* and *Church Manual* were published. The United States Census Bureau completed its final census of religious bodies for the year 1936 and

this change was reflected in it. Harvey Edson Rogers oversaw this project once again and the General Conference approved it. Though other policy details remained essentially unchanged, the clause that specified that "[m]embership in the conferences or the ministry [was] open to both sexes" was stricken from the record.[124] Once the General Conference dictated that ordination was for men only, this statement no longer accurately described Seventh-day Adventist policy of ministry. According to Patrick Allen, between 1931 and 1933 "the number of female pastors dropped from six to zero."[125]

Second, the 1932 *Church Manual* also took away the right of women to be ordained as deaconesses. As stated previously, many women had been ordained as deaconesses between 1895 and the 1920s but, in spite of this fact, the first *Church Manual* stated, "the practice of ordaining deaconesses is not followed by our denomination"[126] and women were not officially granted this privilege again until the eighteenth edition of the *Church Manual* was approved in 2010.[127] The topic of women's ordination to the gospel ministry arose when Adventists began to elect deaconesses in their churches in the late 1870s and early 1880s, and in the early 1930s ordination to both of these offices was officially disallowed, even though women had been ordained as deaconesses around the world for more than three decades.

It is evident that Adventist administrators of the Fundamentalist era were focused on the gender question—if a woman could not be ordained to one office, she could not be ordained to any office. In 1936, the Home Missionary Department planned to reprint Ellen White's 1895 article that specified that women should be ordained as deaconesses "as a leaflet."[128] J. A. Stevens, head of the department, was alarmed to read from Ellen White's pen that women "should be set apart . . . by prayer and laying on of hands" and brought the article before the General Conference officers because it seemed "to recommend the ordination of women." As David Trim has noted, "The emphasis is on the gender question, not the role or function question (home mission-

Though no women had served as conference, union, or General Conference presidents, policy did not prohibit this possibility.

ary versus minister, elder or deacon). The Officers seem not to have identified that Ellen White was writing about the function of a deaconess." Trim's observation is strengthened by the fact that these administrators concluded that "this matter has never been acted upon during the years." These men must have known that women had been ordained as deaconesses because it had happened frequently and, at times, by the hands of church administrators. The General Conference officers therefore apparently believed that White endorsed women's ordination to any office. They had disallowed this just a few years prior to this time and now chose to silence their dead prophet by voting "[t]o recommend that the entire paragraph be eliminated from the leaflet."[129] The General Conference did not republish Ellen White's statement on women's ordination until 1995.[130] This incident reveals that these Adventist administrators believed that if a woman was ordained to one office, she could be ordained to any office—something they could not accept, even if a prophet of God advocated it.

In 1931, Adventist administrators adopted a third policy that impacted women directly. At this time, the General Conference set term limits that fixed General Conference positions to twelve years, unions to eight, and local conferences and missions to six. Though term limits also impacted men, this new policy enabled church administrators to eliminate women currently employed in church leadership positions. In 1905, some twenty women served as conference treasurers while another thirty held the post of conference secretary. In 1915, about thirty-two women served as educational departmental leaders while the same number served as educational department secretaries. Also in 1915, about fifty-eight women were employed as Sabbath School Department leaders, while the same number served as Sabbath School Department secretaries. By 1950, men held all of these offices exclusively.[131] Though terms were limited, this policy protected the careers of men through transfers—the men were moved from one conference to another or promoted to a higher position. As Patrick Allen has noted, however, "The *Seventh-day Adventist Yearbook* statistics for the period 1920 to 1940 seem to indicate that women might have fallen victim to this policy, for there is virtually no record of such transfers."[132] Not only were women officially refused the rite of ordination, but the unordained women who served the church were also excised from their leadership positions. Men were to lead the church and the women were only God's last choice.

Conclusion

Adventist administrators in the 1920s and 1930s deliberately changed church policy to ensure that no women would be ordained to any office. Though no women were elected to a conference, union, or the General Conference presidency, or known to be ordained to the gospel ministry prior to 1930, if one had been set apart by the laying on of hands the act would have been in harmony with the policy indirectly adopted in 1881. Any local conference or union had the authority to ordain women between 1881 and 1930 and if they had done so they could not have been censured by the General Conference for an act that policy implicitly allowed.

By the 1920s, the Seventh-day Adventist understanding of unity had changed. In the nineteenth century, Adventists were united and autonomous—nothing infringed upon the agency of the local church. Yet, in the early twentieth century, Seventh-day Adventists began to assume that they could be united only if all members adhered to an orthodoxy *and* an orthopraxy. The *Church Manual* was published to establish such uniformity. The *Church Manual* also gave the General Conference direct control over the local churches and, after it was published, the clause that specified that "State conferences . . . exercise[] no authority over the local church, except as particular questions are submitted to it for decision" was removed from statements on policy.[133]

These new understandings of unity and authority directly impacted Seventh-day Adventist women. For nearly fifty years, church policy implicitly allowed that women could serve in any church position and be ordained to the gospel ministry. Though none were apparently ordained as ministers, several did serve in this capacity. Numerous women were employed by the denomination in leadership positions, some were ordained as elders, and dozens served their local churches as ordained deaconesses. This changed between 1930 and 1932, however, when male administrators altered church policy.

By the 1940s, very few women served in leadership and Adventists were beginning to forget their history. For this reason, Ava M. Covington wrote a book on the topic of women in ministry—the first Adventist book devoted exclusively to women who had served the church. Published in 1940, she gave it the perceptive title, *They Also Served*. Covington featured fifteen different Adventist women in her book including, strikingly, Ellen G. White. This was not an act of banality—the fact that Covington included White suggests that she believed that her contemporaries were forgetting that Ellen White was a *woman* who had also served the

church.[134] To be sure, Covington knew that Adventists had not forgotten that Ellen White existed, but she was apparently aware that White's femininity was excused. Ellen White was not the founder of Seventh-day Adventism, but only one of the founders. She was not supposed to be a prophet, but since God could not find a man who would accept the prophetic gift, He reluctantly gave it to a woman. Ellen White and all women who served the church were merely God's last choice.

Appendix: The 1881 Resolution to Ordain Women to the Gospel Ministry

As indicated in the main article, the 1881 resolution to ordain women to the gospel ministry has been widely misunderstood. Most interpreters have assumed, or argued, that the resolution was indirectly rejected, but a more comprehensive analysis suggests that it was indirectly *adopted*, even though it was never implemented. I evaluate the three main factors upon which this question rests within this appendix: Seventh-day Adventist parliamentary procedure, General Conference Committee practice, and the *Signs of the Times* report.

Seventh-day Adventist Parliamentary Procedure

Though scholars have wrestled with the 1881 session of the General Conference for decades, none of the works I have reviewed consulted *Robert's Rules of Order* or *Key to Smith's Diagram of Parliamentary Rules*. Henry M. Robert's *Pocket Manual of Rules of Order* was first published in 1876. In 1877, Adventist leaders began instructing Adventist ministers, missionary workers, and local church leaders on the rules of parliamentary procedure[135] and by 1879 the subject was taught at Battle Creek College. As stated in the *Review*, "Robert's Rules of Order, for sale at this Office, is the text book used."[136] In 1881, Uriah Smith published a simplified version of *Robert's Rules of Order* that he titled, *Key to Smith's Diagram of Parliamentary Rules*.[137] Though Smith simplified Robert's work, there is no substantive difference between parliamentary rules outlined in each text. It is therefore evident that by 1881 Adventists followed these texts for rules of order in their deliberative assemblies.

In 1881, the delegates of the General Conference took the action to commit, or refer, the resolution to ordain women to a committee. According to *Robert's Rules* and *Smith's Diagram*, this action was a subsidiary motion. Uriah Smith explained that subsidiary motions "are such as are applied to other motions for the sake of disposing of them in some other way than by direct adoption or rejection."[138] Subsidiary motions therefore enabled delegates at deliberative assemblies to take action in regard to a resolution by indirectly adopting or rejecting it.

A motion or resolution could be indirectly rejected in a number of ways. For example, the delegates could lay it on the table, which "remove[d] the subject from consideration till the assembly vote[d] to take it from the table."[139] A resolution could also be postponed to a certain day, but at the specified time the resolution could not be "taken up except by a two-thirds vote."[140] If a resolution were taken from the table or reconsidered at a later date, it could be either adopted or rejected, but the two-thirds vote required to reconsider the matter made this difficult, if not unlikely. If delegates wished to reject a resolution in an indirect manner with no possibility for adoption, they took the action to postpone it indefinitely. The effect of this action was "to entirely remove the question from before the assembly for that session."[141]

Delegates could indirectly adopt a motion or resolution by referring the matter to certain committees. Committees were not empowered to indirectly reject resolutions, however, and usually had the purpose to present a report to the deliberative assembly. The action to commit, or refer, was taken when the particular item at hand was debatable. The type of the debate can be determined by noting the type of committee to which the debatable resolution was referred. First, if the subject of the resolution was controversial, then the resolution would be referred to a committee of the whole. A temporary committee would then be composed of representatives from the larger body of dele-

At this time, the General Conference did not have the authority to establish theological beliefs for the denomination or institute policies that governed the local church directly.

gates and be empowered to adopt, amend, or report on the resolution at hand. Second, a disputed topic could be addressed by referring it to a special (or select) committee. In such cases a temporary committee would be elected and asked to report on the item at hand, but it was not empowered to indirectly adopt or amend the resolution. Third, if the wording of a resolution was debatable, then it would be referred back to the Committee on Resolutions—a standing committee elected at each regular meeting (e.g., a General Conference session). In such a case, the Committee on Resolutions would rephrase the resolution and resubmit it to the entire assembly for adoption or rejection. Fourth, if the matter needed further study it would be referred to a committee for deliberation or investigation (e.g., a theology of ordination study committee). If this were done, Robert outlined that it was "of the utmost importance that all parties be represented" on a large committee so that when it reported to the full assembly "unpleasant debates" would be avoided.[142]

Just as there was one action to intentionally reject a motion indirectly, so also was there one action specifically designed to indirectly adopt resolutions—to refer the matter to a committee for action. According to *Robert's Rules of Order*, "A committee for *action* should be small, and consist only of those heartily in favor of the proposed action." If the delegates found a resolution to be acceptable, but debated its implementation, then it was referred to a committee for action. The committee was small because the resolution itself was not controversial; debatable resolutions had to be addressed by larger committees. Furthermore, committees for action were composed of people "*heartily in favor* of the proposed action" because the question related to implementation, not approval.[143] Unlike the other committees described, the small three-person General Conference Committee was a permanent *executive* committee—a committee for action.[144]

If the 1881 General Conference delegates wanted to indirectly reject the resolution to ordain women, they would have postponed it indefinitely, or possibly tabled it or postponed it to a certain day.[145] If the resolution itself were debatable, then the delegates would have referred the matter to a temporary committee, such as a committee of the whole, special committee, or the Committee on Resolutions.[146] If the resolution needed further study, a large committee for deliberation or investigation would have been organized and the question referred to that body.[147] These things did not

happen, however. Rather, the matter was referred to the General Conference Committee—a committee for action. It must be stressed that, according to *Robert's Rules of Order* or *Key to Smith's Diagram of Parliamentary Rules*, committees did not have the authority to reject motions or resolutions. Committees of the whole and committees for action were empowered to adopt resolutions, but even these committees did not have the authority to reject resolutions. Therefore, an analysis of Adventist parliamentary procedure suggests that the delegates indirectly adopted the resolution and expected the General Conference Executive Committee to determine a way to tackle the challenge of its implementation.

General Conference Committee Practice

As stated previously, Seventh-day Adventists had followed *Robert's Rules of Order* since the late 1870s and it is clear from denominational practice that they sought ways to implement items referred to the General Conference Committee. After poring through the first twenty-five years of General Conference minutes, David Trim found only two other "draft resolutions proposed by the Resolutions Committee that were referred to the GC Committee."[148] In addition, Denis Kaiser has located another example worthy of comparison.[149] A thorough analysis of these three analogous draft resolutions reveals that they were all indirectly adopted. All of these resolutions were referred to the General Conference Committee because there was a question about implementation, but after the questions were addressed, each resolution was implemented.

The first example relates to an action taken at the Tract and Missionary Society in 1879. Though this action did not occur during a General Conference session, it is still worthy of comparison. On this occasion, the Committee on Resolutions reported fourteen different resolutions. Resolution 11 stated, "*Resolved*, That we recommend that the *Stimme der Wahrheit*, from the beginning of next year, be issued monthly instead of quarterly." After various remarks from some of the brethren, the resolution "was referred to the General Conference Committee."[150] It is evident that this resolution was indirectly adopted and later implemented because W. C. White stated a short time later, "The *Stimme der Wahrheit* . . . will hereafter be issued monthly."[151]

Second, during the twenty-fifth session of the General Conference held in November and December 1886, the Committee on Resolutions presented a number of resolutions to the delegates. Resolution 35 stated, "*Whereas*, The provi-

dence of God has seemed, in a special manner, to open the way for distributers to be used in New York City, and for missionary work to be done in Castle Garden among those of all nationalities; therefore—*Resolved*, That Bro. Robert Sawyer and wife be requested to connect themselves with the work in that city." After its presentation, this resolution "was referred to the Conference Committee."[152] Since the Sawyers did not move to New York and since Adventists did not work in Castle Garden, scholars have assumed that this resolution was indirectly rejected. This was not the case, however. In January 1887, the General Conference Executive Committee met with the New York Tract Society and discussed the topic of city missions.[153] The General Conference had organized the Brooklyn, New York, Mission in January 1886 and wanted Robert and Mary Sawyer to work among the immigrants that passed through Castle Garden, which was America's largest immigration station prior to the opening of Ellis Island in 1892. Since the Sawyers were unable to move to New York City, presumably due to Mary's poor health,[154] Daniel Thomson was selected to take their place. Thomson arrived at the Brooklyn Mission in March 1887 with the intention of working at Castle Garden. Unfortunately, the plan could not be executed as the General Conference originally intended. As stated in the 1888 *Year Book*, "Bro. Thomson was disappointed in not being able to obtain the privilege of working as a missionary in Castle Garden." Though Adventists were not allowed to work within Castle Garden itself, Thomson "immediately laid plans to reach the immigrants as they landed from the steamers or left on the railroads" and within nine months he had distributed some 10,000 tracts.[155] Though the 1886 General Conference resolution was challenging to implement, the General Conference Committee found ways to distribute literature among the immigrants of New York City.

The third example took place at the twenty-second annual session of the General Conference in November 1883. The Committee on Resolutions reported eighteen resolutions and number 14 stated,

Whereas, *It is evident that it will soon be necessary to take advance steps in the way of establishing publishing interests in Europe; and*—Whereas, *Bro. W. C. White has had experience in this branch of work ; therefore*—Resolved, *That we recommend that the said W. C. White so arrange his business, the coming year, as to be at liberty to render the requisite assistance another season.*

Upon motion, the matter was then "referred to the General Conference Committee."[156] Since W. C. White did not go to Europe at this time, scholars have assumed that this resolution was indirectly rejected. However, further analysis reveals that it was indirectly adopted and implemented. White was apparently unable to travel to Europe at the time, but the Executive Committee found someone else to do the work. Shortly after the General Conference session closed, the Executive Committee met to take care of unfinished business. According to G. I. Butler, current General Conference president, several "cases were referred to the General Conference Committee. This committee, after the close of the Conference, considered some of them." The resolution presented by the Committee on Resolutions was on their agenda and Butler explained that they "advised that Eld[]. M. C. Wilcox, of New York . . .arrange to go to England to labor,"[157] as a replacement for W. C. White. In February 1884, M. C. Wilcox stated, "In harmony with the request of the General Conference Committee, I have been, up to Feb. 1, working in the REVIEW office, trying to obtain experience and knowledge to enable me to assist in the publishing work elsewhere [i.e., England]."[158] Wilcox helped to establish Seventh-day Adventist publishing interests in England shortly after his arrival and the first issue of a new periodical, *The Present Truth*, rolled off the presses in April 1884. According to G. I. Butler, this was in harmony with the "well known . . . vote[] at the last General Conference."[159] Since the matter was indirectly adopted through its referral to the Executive Committee, they were empowered to implement the resolution by finding an alternative person to go to Europe in White's stead.

It is evident that Adventist administrators of the Fundamentalist era were focused on the gender question— if a woman could not be ordained to one office, she could not be ordained to any office.

The *Signs of the Times* Report

Adventist parliamentary procedure and practice suggests that the 1881 resolution to ordain women to the gospel ministry was indirectly adopted and a contemporary interpreter affirmed this conclusion. On January 5, 1882, a full month after the General Conference action on the resolution to ordain women to the gospel ministry, the *Signs of the Times* printed a partial list of "the resolutions adopted."[160] The resolution to ordain women to the gospel ministry was the second item on that list. Some scholars have dismissed this report as a simple mistake, but further analysis discredits that notion.

First, it is important to take into consideration the credibility of the resident editor for the *Signs of the Times*. J. H. Waggoner held that position in 1881 and 1882.[161] He did not go to Battle Creek for the 1881 General Conference, but stayed in California at his post during the annual meetings.[162] Waggoner was a veteran editor, administrator, and minister—someone who, without question, was well versed in Seventh-day Adventist parliamentary procedure and practice. He had served on the General Conference Executive Committee for two years and understood what it meant for a resolution to be referred to this committee.[163] Since the report was printed as an unsigned article, Waggoner not only approved the report for publication, but likely authored it.

Second, it is necessary to analyze the General Conference report itself. It is actually quite significant that the report is an unofficial "partial account of the proceedings." The wording of the resolutions in the report and the official minutes is identical, which reveals that the report was copied from the original source, not from a letter or telegram. Further comparison reveals that certain items were intentionally excluded from the report, including items that were not adopted as well as some that were.[164] This indicates that the *Signs* intentionally featured items interpreted to be adopted *and* important. Since the report is not an official record it should be read as a contemporary interpretation of Seventh-day Adventist parliamentary procedure—one that was approved and/or written by a capable and informed individual, J. H. Waggoner. The report is, therefore, a reliable source for historical analysis.

Third, it is significant to note that J. H. Waggoner was not favorable to women's ordination. As mentioned in the main article, Waggoner did not believe women should occupy any office in the church. Waggoner's son, E. J. Waggoner, also held this view of women in ministry. He wrote, "It is a sad fact that infidelity is creeping—no, not creeping, but stalking boldly, into the church." He then listed some examples, including a reference to the Methodist Church, which was considering "the admission of women as delegates to the General Conference, and their ordination as ministers."[165] Father and son were both opposed to the ordination of women, whether to the deaconate or to the ministry. This point is significant because it reveals that Waggoner was not likely to accidentally include a resolution he found heretical in his list of items adopted at the General Conference.

Finally, Denis Kaiser has noted that "the *Signs* did not print a correction regarding this resolution in subsequent issues."[166] Adventist editors maintained high standards and when significant mistakes did appear in Adventist periodicals, a published correction or retraction was typical.[167] No such statement was ever offered in any Adventist periodical in regard to the 1881 resolution to ordain women.

In summary, J. H. Waggoner was not likely to make, or allow, a simple mistake to appear in the *Signs of the Times* report. Waggoner was not only an experienced Adventist administrator, but had "learned the printer's trade" as a boy and was co-owner and senior editor of the Baraboo, Wisconsin, *Sauk County Standard* before he accepted the Adventist faith in the early 1850s.[168] He was a veteran editor and his *Signs* report remains a valuable contemporary interpretation of Adventist parliamentary procedure.

It is therefore unlikely that the 1881 resolution to ordain women was indirectly rejected. Rather, the weight of the evidence supports the

Kevin M. Burton (M.A. Andrews University, 2015) is a Ph.D. student in the American Religious History program at Florida State University. His research concentrates on Seventh-day Adventist history, with particular interest in the issue of authority. He has lectured at Andrews University and Florida State University and filmed a series of lectures on reading historical shorthand for an online course. He has presented several papers at scholarly conventions and published a number of critical book reviews. His M.A. thesis is titled, "Centralized for Protection: George I. Butler and His Philosophy of One-Person Leadership."

interpretation that the resolution was *indirectly adopted*—a conclusion substantiated by Adventist parliamentary procedure, General Conference Committee practice, and the *Signs of the Times* report. As the main article also demonstrates, subsequent statements on policy issued by the General Conference itself also support this interpretation. ■

References

1. Many examples, which cannot be included in this paper, could be mentioned. I will include two notable changes, however, in this footnote. First, Seventh-day Adventists began to settle pastors in local churches in the 1920s. This was a significant shift in mentality and practice. As late as 1912, A. G. Daniells explained,

We have not settled our ministers over churches as pastors to any large extent. In some very large churches we have elected pastors; but as a rule we have held ourselves ready for field service, evangelical work, and our brethren and sisters have held themselves ready to maintain their church services and carry forward their church work without settled pastors. And I hope this will never cease to be the order of affairs in this denomination; for when we cease our forward movement work, and begin to settle over our churches, to stay by them, and do their thinking and their praying and their work that is to be done, then our churches will begin to weaken, and to lose their life and spirit, and become paralyzed and fossilized, and our work will be on a retreat.

A. G. Daniells, "The Church and Ministry: An Outline of Lesson No. 5," *Pacific Union Recorder* (April 4, 1912): 1. It is important to note that the General Conference Executive Committee initially balked at this change, and at the Autumn Council of 1923 they expressed their "concern [with] the rapidly increasing practice of placing ministers over churches as settled pastors" and urged local conference executive committees "to give careful study to this question." General Conference Committee Minutes, October 15, 1923, 486; cf. F. M. W[ilcox], "Standing by the Preacher," *Review and Herald* [hereafter *RH*] (June 4, 1925): 5; G. A. Roberts and W. C. Moffett, "Building the Home Base," *RH* (November 11, 1926): 7; H. E. Willoughby, "Stress Evangelism," *The Ministry* 1, no. 4 (April 1928): 28–29. The "insistent cry" from local congregations "for pastoral help" proved too great, however, and voices of protest quickly died out in the 1930s and 1940s as Adventist views regarding ministry took on this new trajectory. J. L. McElhany, "A Greater Evangelism," *The Ministry* 4, no. 1 (January 1931): 7; cf. F. D. Wells, "More Workers," *Atlantic Union Gleaner* (January 8, 1930): 4; Charles O. Franz, "Alabama: A Trip Through the Alabama Conference," *Southern Union Worker* (July 16, 1930): 2; H. A. Lukens, "666," *Canadian Union Messenger* (January 23, 1934): 3.

Second, the rise of settled pastors in local churches occurred in tandem with the rise of a standardized church program. As Theodore N. Levterov states, "At the center of early Sabbatarian worship was the studying of the Bible and doctrines. Since most churches lacked the presence of a regular minister, Bible study was usually substituted for traditional preaching. It was also not uncommon for believers to read the *Review and Herald* and learn biblical concepts through its pages during worship." Theodore N. Levterov, "Early Adventist Worship, 1845–1900s," in Ángel Manuel Rodríguez, ed., *Worship, Ministry, and the Authority of the Church* (Silver Spring: Biblical Research Institute, 2016), 61–62. Prior to the 1920s and 1930s, spontaneity was presented as the desired norm. In 1907, J. N. Loughborough published *The Church: Its Organization, Order, and Discipline*, which was republished several times until the 1920s. In this work, Loughborough addressed the question, "In the absence of a minister what is the proper manner of conducting the church service?" Loughborough's answer was simple and intentionally vague. "There should certainly be the avoidance of any stereotyped, formal manner that would run things into a special rut," he wrote. He then supported his conclusion from the writings of Ellen White, stating, "The 'Testimonies for the Church' give much excellent instruction on that point. As samples of this, see Vol. II, pages 419, 420, 577–579; Vol. IV, page 461; Vol. V, page 609, etc." J. N. Loughborough, *The Church: Its Organization, Order, and Discipline* (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1920), 170. In spite of this council, other Adventist leaders did desire a standard order of service. In 1906, H. M. J. Richards published *Church Order and Its Divine Origin and Importance*, and outlined a program that he believed Adventists should follow in their church services. H. M. J. Richards, *Church Order and Its Divine Origin and Importance* (Denver: Colorado Tract Society, 1906), 64–66. Richards' publication had limited circulation in comparison to Loughborough's book, however, and it was not until the 1920s and 1930s that Richards' view became dominant. Some local churches began printing weekly bulletins in the 1920s, which outlined the order of service for that particular church on that particular Sabbath. "The Suggestion Corner: Advertise the Meeting," *The Church Officers' Gazette* 10, no. 5 (May 1923): 16; "News Notes: [Church Bulletin Weekly]," *Columbia Union Visitor* (January 3, 1924): 4; Robert S. Fries, "Boston," *Atlantic Union Gleaner* (February 17, 1926): 2. In 1932, the first *Church Manual* standardized local church practice around the world with two suggested orders for service, one longer and the other shorter. Both of these program outlines are still followed by a large number of Adventists churches today. [J. L. McElhany], *Church Manual* (Washington, D.C.: General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1932, 151–152; cf. Levterov, "Early Adventist Worship," 72–73.

2. George R. Knight, "Old Prophet, New Approaches: 45 Years of Crisis and Advance in Ellen White Studies," *Journal of Asia Adventist Seminary* 17, no. 2 (2014): 99.

3. Secretariat, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, "A Study of Church Government and Unity," n.p., (September 2016), 7–8.

4. Karen Orren and Stephen Skowronek, *The Search for American Political Development* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 123–124.

5. Ottilie Stafford, "On Mislaying the Past," *Spectrum* 15, no. 4 (December 1984): 31.

6. Bertha Dasher, "Leadership Positions: A Declining Opportunity?," *Spectrum* 15, no. 4 (December 1984): 35–37; Patrick Allen, "The Depression and the Role of Women in the Seventh-day Adventist Church," *Adventist Heritage* 11,

no. 2 (Fall 1986): 48–54; Bertha Dasher, "Women's Leadership, 1915–1970: The Waning Years," in *A Woman's Place*, ed. Rosa Taylor Banks (Hagerstown: Review and Herald, 1992), 75–84; Kit Watts, "The Rise and Fall of Adventist Women in Leadership," *Ministry* 68, no. 4 (April 1995): 6–10; Kit Watts, "Moving Away from the Table: A Survey of Historical Factors Affecting Women Leaders," in *The Welcome Table*, eds. Patricia A. Habada and Rebecca Frost Brillhart (Langley Park, MD: TEAMPress, 1995), 45–59; Laura L. Vance, *Seventh-day Adventism in Crisis: Gender and Sectarian Change in an Emerging Religion* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1999).

7. Watts, "Moving Away from the Table," 54.

8. Some of the most significant works on this subject (in addition to those cited in footnote 6) include: John G. Beach, *Notable Women of Spirit: The Historical Role of Women in the Seventh-day Adventist Church* (Nashville: Southern Publishing Association, 1976); Bert Haloviak, "The Adventist Heritage Calls for Ordination of Women," *Spectrum* 16, no. 3 (August 1985): 52–60; Iris M. Yob, *The Church and Feminism: An Exploration of Common Ground* (Englewood, CO: Winsen Publications, 1988); Lourdes E. Morales-Gudmundsson, ed., *Women and the Church: The Feminine Perspective* (Berrien Springs: Andrews University Press, 1995); Nancy Vyhmeister, ed., *Women in Ministry: Biblical & Historical Perspectives* (Berrien Springs: Andrews University Press, 1998); Josephine Benton, *Called By God: Stories of Seventh-day Adventist Women Ministers*, rev. ed. (Lincoln: AdventSource, 2002); Beverly Beem and Ginger Hanks Harwood, "'Your Daughters Shall Prophesy': James White, Uriah Smith, and the 'Triumphant Vindication of the Right of the Sisters' to Preach," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 43, no. 1 (Spring 2005): 41–58; Beverly G. Beem and Ginger Hanks Harwood, "'What about Paul?' Early Adventists and the Preaching of 'the Marys'," *Spectrum* 38, no. 2 (Spring 2010): 25–30; Ján Barna, *Ordination of Women in Seventh-day Adventist Theology: A Study of Biblical Interpretations* (Belgrade, Serbia: Preporod, 2012); David Trim, "The Ordination of Women in Seventh-day Adventist Policy and Practice, up to 1972" (paper presented at the Theology of Ordination Study Committee, Linthicum Heights, MD, July 22–24, 2013), accessed May 2, 2017, https://www.adventistarchives.org/the-ordination-of-women-in-seventh-day-adventist-policy-and-practice.pdf; Denis Kaiser, "Setting Apart for the Ministry: Theory and Practice in Seventh-day Adventism (1850–1920)," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 51, no. 2 (Autumn 2013): 177–218; Laura Vance, "Gender," in Terrie Dopp Aamodt, Gary Land, and Ronald L. Numbers, eds., *Ellen Harmon White: American Prophet* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), 279–294; Ginger Hanks Harwood and Beverly Beem, "'Not a Hand Bound; Not a Voice Hushed': Ordination and Foundational Adventist Understandings of Women in Ministry," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 52, no. 2 (Autumn 2014): 235–273; Ginger Hanks Harwood and Beverly Beem, "'Quench Not the Spirit': Early Adventist Hermeneutics and Women's Spiritual Leadership," *Spectrum* 43, no. 2 (Spring 2015): 66–71; John W. Reeve, ed., *Women and Ordination: Biblical and Historical Studies* (Nampa: Pacific Press, 2015).

9. J. Caleb Clanton, *The Philosophy of Religion of Alexander Campbell* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2013), 2; cf. George R. Knight, *Organizing for Mission and Growth: The Development of Adventist Church Structure*, Adventist Heritage Series (Hagerstown: Review and Herald, 2006), 15–27.

10. As James White stated, "Those who drafted the form of organization adopted by S. D. Adventists labored to incorporate into it, as far as possible, the simplicity of expression and form found in the New Testament." When White reminded Adventists in the early 1880s of this fact, he stressed, "The more of the spirit of the gospel manifested, and the more simple, the more efficient the system." J[ames] W[hite], "Organization and Discipline," *RH* (January 4, 1881): 8.

11, James White clarified that the General Conference was to be organized as a means of "systematizing the[] labor" of Adventist preachers and controlling "all missionary labor in new fields." [James White], "General Conference," *RH* (April 28, 1863): 172.

12. John Byington and U. Smith, "Report of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists," *RH* (May 26, 1863): 204–206.

13. Ibid.

14. [White], "General Conference," *RH* (April 28, 1863): 172.

15. State conferences typically ratified General Conference resolutions. A number were amended or rejected, however. Researchers can verify if a resolution was ratified, amended, or rejected, by comparing official General Conference minutes with official state conference minutes. Here are some examples: First, on March 12–13, 1870, the Battle Creek church voted to hold a Laodicean church trial (i.e., every member was put on trial) and give the General Conference Executive Committee the authority to settle each individual's case. The General Conference session of 1870 voted to approve this request on March 15. The Michigan State Conference then ratified the General Conference vote on March 16. Authority was therefore delegated to the General Conference and the trial was soon carried out. J. N. Andrews, G. H. Bell, and Uriah Smith, *Defense of Eld. James White and Wife: The Battle Creek Church to the Churches and Brethren Scattered Abroad* (Battle Creek: Steam Press, 1870), 112–113; Jas. White and Uriah Smith, "Business Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Session of the General Conference of S. D. Adventists," *RH* (March 22, 1870): 109; H. S. Gurney and Wm. C. Gage, "Michigan State Conference: Tenth Annual Session," *RH* (March 22, 1870): 110, cf. Kevin M. Burton, "Cracking the Whip to Make a Perfect Church: The Unholy Cleansing of the 'Adventist Temple' in Battle Creek on April 6, 1870," *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society*, forthcoming.

Second, on November 17, 1873, the General Conference adopted a resolution that endorsed G. I. Butler's leadership philosophy-theology. W. H. Littlejohn opposed this stance on leadership and feared that it would be ratified by the state conferences. He explained his concern to Ellen White in a private letter and stated that the General Conference resolution was cautiously worded "lest their doctrine should prove too bold for general acceptance." James White soon opposed Butler's leadership doctrine and traveled to each state conference to make sure that these bodies did not ratify it. In the end, the Michigan State Conference and Battle Creek church were the only two bodies that did ratify the resolution— all others rejected it. Geo. I. Butler and U. Smith, "Business Proceedings of the Twelfth Annual Meeting of the S. D. A. General Conference," *RH* (November 25, 1873): 190; Wolcott H. Littlejohn to Ellen G. White, October 26, 1874, White Estate Incoming Correspondence, EGWE-GC; E. H. Root and I. D. Van Horn, "Michigan Conference of S. D. Adventists: Thirteenth Annual Session," *RH* (September 16, 1873): 110; [Seventh-day Adventist Church of Battle Creek, MI],

"Pledge of the Church at Battle Creek, and others, to the General Conference of S. D. Adventists, Nov. 14–18, 1873," WDF 453 #3, CAR; cf. Kevin M. Burton, "Centralized for Protection: George I. Butler and His Philosophy of One-Person Leadership," (master's thesis, Andrews University, 2015).

Third, on March 15, 1880, a special session of the General Conference adopted the following resolution:

Resolved, That the local elders and deacons in our churches should be elected annually, such election to occur in each church at a time set by each State Conference, except in churches where dissatisfaction with the incumbent has been expressed by at least a respectable minority of the church. In such cases it shall be the duty of the church clerk to notify the Conference committee of such fact; and elections in such churches shall be deferred till proper help is provided by the committee.

Though this was adopted by a General Conference session, it still needed to be ratified by the state conferences and local churches. The General Conference Committee reported the following in the *Review* in January 1881: "This recommendation of the General Conference was considered by nearly all our State Conferences during the past camp-meeting season, when sessions of these Conferences were held. Quite a number of them passed resolutions indorsing this action," General Conference Committee, "A Change of Church Officers," *RH* (January 4, 1881): 11. This report indicates that the General Conference resolution was only a "recommendation" even though it did not use that language. The 1881 report also reveals that the resolution was rejected by some state conferences. The following conferences ratified the resolution: Dakota, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Vermont. The following conferences rejected it: New England, New York, Quebec, and Upper Columbia. The Iowa State Conference amended the resolution by adding an appendix. Jas. White and U. Smith, "Business Proceedings of the Special Session of the General Conference of S. D. Adventists, March 11–15, 1880," *RH* (March 18, 1880): 187; S. B. Whitney and A. L. Dawson, "Dakota Conference," *RH* (October 21, 1880): 269; R. F. Andrews and N. F. Craig, "Illinois Conference," *RH* (September 30, 1880): 237; S. H. Lane and J. S. Shrock, "Indiana Conference," *RH* (October 14, 1880): 253–254; Smith Sharp and W. E. Dawson, "Kansas Conference: Sixth Annual Session, Held at Wakarusa, May 20–24, 1880," *RH* (June 10, 1880): 381; J. B. Goodrich and Timothy Bryant, "[Maine Conference]," *RH* (September 9, 1880): 188–189; J. Fargo and A. B. Oyen, "Michigan Conference," *RH* (October 14, 1880): 253; H. Grant and D. P. Curtis, "Minnesota Conference," *RH* (July 15, 1880): 61; D. M. Canright and J. B. Gregory, "Ohio Conference," *RH* (September 30, 1880): 238; B. L. Whitney and D. T. Fargo, "Pennsylvania Conference," *RH* (October 21, 1880): 269; A. S. Hutchins and C. E. Powell, "Vermont Conference," *RH* (September 30, 1880): 238; Geo. I. Butler and D. A. Robinson, "New England Conference," *RH* (September 16, 1880): 204–205; B. L. Whitney and E. W. Whitney, "New York Conference: Nineteenth Annual Session," *RH* (October 21, 1880): 269; James White and D. T. Bourdeau, "Organization of the S. D. A. Conference of the Province of Quebec," *RH* (September 2, 1880): 173; G. W. Colcord and Alonzo T. Jones, "Upper Co-

lumbia Conference Business Proceedings at the Milton, Oregon, Camp-meeting, May 20–31, 1880," *RH* (July 15, 1880): 61–62; Geo. I. Butler and Ira J. Hankins, "Iowa Conference," *RH* (June 24, 1880): 13–14.

16. [Emphasis is mine.] [White], "General Conference," *RH* (April 28, 1863): 172.

17. Researchers can analyze this system of checks and balances by comparing state conference minutes with local church record books. Unfortunately, most church record books are unavailable and church clerks were often sparse in their commentary. Nevertheless, one of the clearest examples that illustrates this point is local church adoption, rejection, or amendment of the recommended church covenant. In 1860, local churches were counseled to adopt the following covenant: "We, the undersigned, hereby associate ourselves together, as a church, taking the name, Seventh-day Adventists, covenanting to keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus Christ." Most local churches did adopt this covenant, while some amended it and others rejected it entirely. The Ashfield, New South Wales, Australia, church, for example, modified the covenant slightly. Others, however, made significant changes or wrote their own covenant. On April 5, 1879, the Soliloquy, Virginia, Seventh-day Adventist Church organized and added various restrictions and promises to the standard covenant. Most notably, the church outlawed the usage of tobacco and alcohol and condemned the wearing of jewelry, artificials, bonnets, or feathers in hats in their covenant. They further promised to evangelize the world and maintain an active Sabbath school and Bible class. Similarly, in 1919, the Norfolk Island, Australia, church, adopted the standard covenant but added fifteen questions to it that must be asked to each potential member prior to their acceptance into the church. The Yarmouth, Maine, Seventh-day Adventist Church is an especially interesting example. This church organized in 1863 and adopted a unique covenant entirely unlike the standard suggestion. Perhaps the most significant aspect to note is that it intentionally, unlike the standard covenant, included all three members of the Trinity. The first part of the (long) covenant stated,

We whose names are herein after recorded, situated in Yarmouth, Me. and vicinity, believing the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are inspired by God (2d Tim. 2.15) giving the doctrine and rules by which all men should be governed, and that we, by faith in Jesus Christ, have become the children of God (Gal. 3.24, 26) being regenerated and renewed by the power of the Holy Spirit (Rom. 8.15, 16. Titus 3.5) and made to hope for eternal life through Jesus Christ, as his second appearing (Matt. 25.46. Phil. 3.20, 21. Rom. 2.7. Col. 3.4) which we believe to be now near even at the door, (Matt. 24.14, 32, 33. Dan. 2.44) And believing it our duty, as Christians, to live according to the requirements of the New Covenant, to observe and practice its order, its institutions and ordinances, We therefore Covenant together . . .

Joseph Bates and Uriah Smith, "Doings of the Battle Creek Conference, Oct. 5 & 6, 1861," *RH* (October 8, 1861): 148; Seventh-day Adventist Church of Ashfield, New South Wales, Australia, "Record of Meetings," 1–2 (printed), WDF 285-e, CAR; Seventh-day Adventist Church of Soliloquy, Virginia, "Record Book, 1879–1905," Church Covenant Page, VT 000225,

CAR; Seventh-day Adventist Church of Norfolk Island, Australia, "Norfolk Island Church," [1–6], WDF 285-e, CAR; [Emphasis is mine.] Seventh-day Adventist Church of Yarmouth, Maine, "Record Book, 1863–[]," [5–8], VT 000325 ASC Vault, CAR.

18. United States Bureau of the Census, *Religious Bodies: 1926*, vol. 2 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1929), 25–26.

19. James White and A. B. Oyen, "Sixteenth Annual Session of the General Conference of S. D. Adventists," *RH* (October 4, 1877): 106.

20. Burton, "Centralized for Protection," 146–157, 169–172.

21. In December 1871, the tenth annual session of the General Conference adopted a resolution that listed ten different theological beliefs. They did not adopt these beliefs as a creed or statement of beliefs, however, but merely thanked God that He had revealed these truths to them. James White and U. Smith, "Business Proceedings of the Tenth Annual Session of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists," *RH* (January 2, 1872): 20.

22. James White and U. Smith, "Seventeenth Annual Session of the General Conference of S. D. Adventists," *RH* (October 17, 1878): 121.

23. Jas. White and U. Smith, "General Conference *of S. D.* Adventists: Eighteenth Annual Session, Nov. 7, 1879," RH (November 20, 1879): 161.

24. Geo. I. Butler and A. B. Oyen, "General Conference: Twenty-first Annual Session," *RH* (December 26, 1882): 787.

25. First issue, of the eighteen-part series: [W. H. Littlejohn], "The S. D. A. Church Manual," *RH* (June 5, 1883): 361–362.

26. Geo. I. Butler and A. B. Oyen, "General Conference Proceedings: Twenty-second Annual Session," *RH* (November 20, 1883): 733. It is worth noting that Ellen White was present during the discussion of the proposed Church Manual. W. C. White to Mary White, November 13, 1883, White Estate Incoming Correspondence, EGWE-GC.

27. In 1909, Ellen White stated, "The city of Portland was remarkably blessed by God in the early days of the message. At that time able ministers preached the truth of the soon coming of the Lord, giving the first warning of the near approach of the end of all things. In the city of Portland, *the Lord ordained me as His messenger, and here my first labors were given to the cause of present truth.*" [Emphasis is mine.] Ellen G. White, An Appeal, October 19, 1909, LT 138, 1909; cf. Ellen G. White, An Appeal to Our Churches Throughout the United States, MS 003, 1910; Ellen G. White, "An Appeal to Our Churches Throughout the United States," *RH* (May 18, 19110: 3.

28. Vance, "Gender," 286.

29. Laura L. Vance has noted that Ellen White's "later writings ([late] 1870s–1915) more frequently encouraged Adventist women to engage in 'public gospel work,' and Adventist employers to treat female employees well and pay them equitably." Vance, *Seventh-day Adventism in Crisis*, 180; cf. Denis Fortin, "Ellen White, Women in Ministry, and the Ordination of Women," in *Women and Ordination*, ed. Reeve, 102. Jerry Moon has analyzed many of these writings and concluded, "The list of roles open to women in gospel ministry embraces a wide range of job descriptions and vocational options, including preaching, teaching, pastoral care, evangelistic work, literature evangelism, Sabbath school leadership, chaplaincy, counseling, and church administration." Jerry Moon, "'A Power That Exceeds That of Men': Ellen G. White on Women in Ministry," in *Women in Ministry*, ed. Vyhmeister, 203.

30. In the 1880s, Adventist missionaries argued with some men on Pitcairn Island that "had withdrawn from the church" and "would not attend the meetings as long as the 'woman [Mary McCoy] continued.'" These men believed "that if they attended the meeting while a woman taught, the word of God would be broken; for a woman must not 'usurp authority over a man.'" Mary McCoy lamented, "So the greater part of the men absented themselves, and the women who attended, did not come with a right spirit." Two days later, in another meeting, the topic was debated, and those supportive of women teaching men argued, "Does Mrs. White teach?" They stated emphatically, "'Yes,' and no one dares to condemn her work and labor of love." This was undoubtedly not a singular occurrence. J. O. Corliss, "The Pacific Islands as a Mission Field," *RH* (February 21, 1888): 118–119.

31. Josephine Benton published a partial list of Seventh-day Adventist women ministers from 1884 to 1975. Benton, *Called by God*, 155–162. Another partial list appeared in Habada and Brillhart, eds., *The Welcome Table*, 359-381. More recently, Andrews University Seminary Studies and Pioneer Memorial Church sponsored Sarah Burton to compile another list made from official conference minutes with included source references. Her partial list runs from 1869 to 1973, but it is much less thorough after 1905. Though this list has not yet been published, the author has a copy in his possession. [Sarah E. Burton], "Women Ministers and Missionaries," n.p., [2014].

32. Terrie Aamodt, "Van Horn, Isaac Doren and Adelia P. (Patten)," in Denis Fortin and Jerry Moon, eds., *The Ellen G. White Encyclopedia* (Hagerstown: Review and Herald, 2013), 532; Jas. White and U. Smith, "Business Proceedings of the Ninth Annual Session of the General Conference of S. D. Adventists," *RH* (February 14, 1871): 68.

33. E. B. Saunders, "Report of the N.Y. and Pa. Conference," *RH* (October 12, 1869): 126.

34. Geo. I. Butler and U. Smith, "General Conference Proceedings: Twenty-fourth Annual Session (Concluded)," *RH* (December 8, 1885): 760.

35. United States Bureau of the Census, *Religious Bodies: 1906*, vol. 2 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1910), 23; S. N. Haskell, "Ministerial Licenses," *RH – Supplement* (October 23, 1879): 2; Kaiser, "Setting Apart for the Ministry," 202–203.

36. Beem and Harwood, "'Your Daughters Shall Prophesy'," 41–58; Beem and Harwood, "'What about Paul?'," 25–30; Harwood and Beem, "'Not a Hand Bound'," 235–273; Harwood and Beem, "'Quench Not the Spirit'," 66–71.

37. J. B. Frisbie is the only known Adventist to affirm the position of deaconess prior to 1879. J. B. F[risbie], "Deacons," *RH* (July 31, 1856): 102; cf. Nancy J. Vyhmeister, "Deaconesses in History and in the Seventh-day Adventist Church," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 43, no. 1 (Spring 2005): 147–149. Though most Adventist leaders did not acknowledge Phoebe to be a deaconess in their own writing, Uriah Smith did reprint an article that that stated this. J. A. Mowatt, "Women as Preachers and Lecturers: [Reprinted from the *Portadown News*]" *RH* (July 30, 1861): 65–66; cf. [Reprinted from the *Golden Rule*],

"On Keeping Silence," *RH* (December 16, 1858) 27.

38. Note that all of these writers affirm that women can speak publicly, but did not extend to them a position of authority within the church aside from the prophetic office. J[ames] W[hite], "Paul Says So," *RH* (September 10, 1857): 152; D. Hewitt, "'Let Your Women Keep Silence in the Churches'," *RH* (October 15, 1857): 190; J[ames] W[hite], "Unity and Gifts of the Church, No. 4," *RH* (January 7, 1858): 68–69; B. F. Robbins, "To the Female Disciples in the Third Angel's Message," *RH* (December 8, 1859): 21–22; B. F. Robbins, "The Promise of the Father. Luke XXIV, 49," *RH* (January 5, 1860): 53; S. C. Welcome, "Shall the Women Keep Silence in the Churches?," *RH* (February 23, 1860): 109–110; "Questions by Bro. McDonald," *RH* (April 22, 1862): 164; M. W. Howard, "Woman as a Co-Laborer," *RH* (August 18, 1868): 133; Mary Van Horn, "Letters: From Sr. Van Horn," *RH* (August 10, 1869): 55; M. M. Osgood, "Extracts from the Writings of the Learned, No. 2," *RH* (January 24, 1871): 47; "Shall Women Speak in the Church?," [Reprinted from the *Morning Star*] *RH* (March 14, 1871): 99; I. Fetterhoof, "Women Laboring in Public," [Reprinted from the *Earnest Christian*]," *RH* (August 8, 1871) 58–59.

39. [Emphasis is mine.] [Uriah Smith], "'Let Your Women Keep Silence in the Churches'," *RH* (June 26, 1866): 28.

40. D. T. Bourdeau, "Spiritual Gifts," *RH* (December 2, 1862): 5–6.

41. [J. H. Waggoner], "Woman's Place in the Gospel," *Signs of the Times* [hereafter *ST*] (December 19, 1878): 380; cf. "Wanted, Men and Women," *ST* (December 16, 1880): 566; "[Women Needed in the Home]," *ST* (December 30, 1880): 571.

42. Vyhmeister, "Deaconesses in History," 149.

43. S. N. Haskell to James White, December 13, 1878, White Estate Incoming Correspondence, EGWE-GC; cf. Vance, *Seventh-day Adventism in Crisis*, 197.

44. E. G. White, "Address and Appeal, Setting Forth the Importance of Missionary Work," *RH* (January 2, 1879): 1; cf. Kaiser, "Setting Apart for the Ministry," 189–190.

45. In 1880, Ellen White was about to preach to a large congregation when someone passed a note to S. N. Haskell, who was with her, that quoted a "certain text prohibiting women speaking in public." Haskell quickly took the preacher's stand and, as Ellen White remarked, "took up the matter in a brief manner and very clearly expressed the meaning of the apostle's words." It is evident, therefore, that White supported Haskell's view regarding women in ministry. Ellen G. White to James White, April 1, 1880, LT 017a, 1880.

46. See footnote 37. George R. Knight, "Early Seventh-day Adventists and Ordination, 1844–1863," in *Women in Ministry*, ed. Vyhmeister, 109; Kaiser, "Setting Apart for the Ministry," 208.

47. J. N. A[ndrews], "May Women Speak in Meeting?," *RH* (January 2, 1879): 4.

48. W[hite], "Paul Says So," 152; W[hite], "Unity and Gifts of the Church, No. 4," 68–69.

49. [Emphasis is mine.] J[ames] W[hite], "Women in the Church," RH (May 29, 1879): 172.

50. W. H. L[ittlejohn], "The Church Manual," *RH* (July 3, 1883): 426.

51. These women included: Sarah A. H. Lindsay, Ellen G. White, Julia Lee, Ellen S. Lane, Roby Tuttle, Elbra Durfee, Anna Fulton, Julia Owen, Hattie Enoch, Lizzie Post, Libbie Collins, Libbie Fulton, A. M. Johnson, Ida W. Ballenger, Helen L. Morse, and Day Conkling. [Burton], "Women Ministers and Missionaries."

52. Cf. S. N. Haskell, "What We Need," *RH* (June 19, 1879): 195; S. N. Haskell, "Onward," *RH* (January 1, 1880): 12; E. G. White, "Christ's Commission," *RH* (June 10, 1880): 369; J. W[hite], "All Branches of the Work," *RH* (August 5, 1880): 104; G. B. Starr, "Does Paul Contradict Himself?," *RH* (December 16, 1880): 388; N. J. Bowers, "May Women Publicly Labor in the Cause of Christ?," *RH* (June 14, 1881): 372; Brian E. Strayer, *J. N. Loughborough: The Last of the Adventist Pioneers* (Hagerstown, Maryland: Review and Herald, 2014), 361–362.

53. S. N. Haskell and U. Smith, "The General Conference: Twentieth Annual Session, Dec. 1, 1881," *RH* (December 6, 1881): 360.

54. Trim, "The Ordination of Women," 15–17.

55. S. N. Haskell and U. Smith, "General Conference: Business Proceedings (Continued)," *RH* (December 20, 1881): 392. The official General Conference minutes were printed in the *Review and Herald*, but also appeared unaltered as a printed tract. *Report of the General Conference and Other Anniversary Meetings of the Seventh-day Adventists, Held at the Tabernacle, in the City of Battle Creek, Michigan, Dec. 1–19, 1881* (Battle Creek: Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association, 1882), 8.

56. Trim, "The Ordination of Women," 14–16.

57. The case of Lulu Wightman is worthy of note. Wightman formally began her ministry in 1897 when she received a ministerial license from the New York Conference. A. E. Place and Wm. A. Westworth, "New York Conference Proceedings," *RH* (November 9, 1897): 717. After four years of ministerial labor, Wightman sought ordination to the gospel ministry. Significantly, she requested ministerial ordination through her local conference, not the General Conference. Wightman did not need permission from the General Conference since the 1881 resolution was indirectly adopted. Nevertheless, when her case was considered at the 1901 New York Conference meetings, it was rejected. R. A. Underwood, the union president, "and others" were in favor of ordaining Wightman, but G. B. Thompson, the local conference president, and A. G. Daniells, the General Conference president, were opposed. Thompson and Daniells's recorded response is telling—they apparently did not state that ordaining a woman was against policy, but reasoned that "they felt . . . that a woman could not properly be ordained—just now at least." Haloviak, "The Adventist Heritage," 53–56; Bert Haloviak, "A Place at the Table: Women and the Early Years," in *The Welcome Table*, eds. Habada and Brillhart, 27–32; cf. T. E. Bowen, "New York Conference," *RH* (September 24, 1901): 626. Therefore, these details provide some support for my suggestion that church policy was open to the ordination of women to the gospel ministry prior to 1930.

58. James White, "Report from Bro. White," *RH* (August 13, 1867): 136. Francis Nelson praised Louisa Strong in the *Review* a short time later, stating, "I would say to all who may avail themselves of the benefit of her labors, that sister Strong was a great help to the sisters just starting out in the health and dress reforms, in which they have made good progress." Francis Nelson, "Thanks for Labor," *RH* (December 17, 1867): 16.

59. Kaiser, "Setting Apart for the Ministry," 197–198.

60. L[ittlejohn], "The Church Manual," *RH* (July 3, 1883): 426.

61. E. G. White, "The Duty of the Minister and the People," *RH* (July 9, 1895): 434. Denis Kaiser has demonstrated that "by the 1890s, Ellen White recommended the ordination of people, both male and female, for various lines of ministry. Thus, she emphasized that ordination was not an act linked solely to the clergy, but she envisioned ordination as a practice that set apart and committed people to various specific lines of ministry such as deaconesses, missionaries, and medical physicians." Kaiser, "Setting Apart for the Ministry," 213–214, 218.

62. Vyhmeister, "Deaconesses in History," 150; Arthur N. Patrick, "The Ordination of Deaconesses," *RH* (January 16, 1986): 18–19; Douglas Morgan, *Lewis C. Sheafe: Apostle to Black America*, Adventist Pioneer Series, ed. George R. Knight (Hagerstown: Review and Herald, 2010), 276; H. F. Phelps, "Minnesota," *RH* (March 1, 1898): 145; C. H. Castle, "What We Are Doing," *Pacific Union Recorder* (April 23, 1903): 4; Anna M. Nicholas, "Toledo," *The Welcome Visitor* (March 30, 1904): 2; H. H. Burkholder, "Wilmington," *The Welcome Visitor* (July 20, 1904): 2; W. H. Green, "Second Church, Pittsburg, PA," *Atlantic Union Gleaner* (January 31, 1906): 54; "[Elder Burkholder]," *The Welcome Visitor* (April 25, 1906): 4; F. H. DeVinney, "Report of Labor," *The New York Indicator* (November 20, 1907): [2]; W. A. Westworth, "Southern New England," *Atlantic Union Gleaner* (March 4, 1908): 75; W. E. Bidwell, "Locust Point, Medina, O.," *Columbia Union Visitor* (April 29, 1908): 3; "Northern Illinois," *Lake Union Herald* (May 25, 1910): 7; B. W. Spire, "Among the Churches," *Field Tidings* (June 25, 1919): 3; F. A. Detamore, "First Fruits in Sarawak," *Asiatic Division Outlook* (September 1 and 15, 1921): 5; "News Notes," *Southwestern Union Record* (September 27, 1921): 4; F. A. Detamore, "First Fruits in Sarawak," *RH* (December 8, 1921): 11; Kasim Ali, "Nowshera Bath, Punjab," *Eastern Tidings* (June 1, 1923): 8; cf. "Are They Not Important Now?," *ST* (January 24, 1900): 16. It is important to note that Adventist periodicals noted the ordination of local church officers (elders, deacons, and deaconesses) far less frequently than the ordination of ministers. The dozens of specific examples documented in periodicals thus represents a meager percentage of the actual number of women ordained to this office. Furthermore, several other sources mention that deaconesses were elected in numerous Adventist churches around the world, but say nothing specifically about ordination. Since it was standard procedure to ordain newly elected officers in the local churches it is possible that these women were also ordained. Here are a few representative examples: G. B. Thompson, "Rochester," *The New York Indicator* (January 24, 1900): 1; Mae Dart, "Lexington," *Southern Union Worker* (January 5, 1911): 4; "East Pennsylvania," *Columbia Union Visitor* (March 22, 1911): 5; J. Gershom Dasent, "Decatur, Ala.," *The Gospel Herald* 9, no. 2 (February 1913): 1; "[Redondo]," *Pacific Union Recorder* (September 7, 1916): 8; Geo. H. Skinner, "Port Arthur Church," *Western Canadian Tidings* (February 14, 1923): 7.

63. United States Bureau of the Census, *Religious Bodies: 1906*, vol. 2, 7.

64. H. E. Rogers, "Church Elders, Attention!," *RH* (February 7, 1907): 30.

65. H. E. Rogers, "Report to Bureau of the Census," *RH* (April 21, 1927): 24.

66. The word "membership" should not be confused with "church membership," which is the topic of the paragraph that immediately follows this sentence. The entire paragraph in which this statement appears reads as follows:

Each conference has an executive committee for the conduct of its business along the lines of different departments of the church's work. The presidents of the state conferences and chairmen of state departments are ex officio members of the executive committee of their union conferences, and the presidents of the union conferences, together with the chairmen of union departments, constitute the executive committee of the general conference. Membership in the conferences or the ministry is open to both sexes, although there are very few female ministers.

United States Bureau of the Census, *Religious Bodies: 1906*, vol. 2, 23. It is worth noting that people did read these census statements and that other authors quoted this particular clause in their work. Rulon S. Howells, *His Many Mansions: A compilation of Christian Beliefs . . .* (New York: Greystone Press, 1940), 39.

67. [Emphasis is mine.] United States Bureau of the Census, *Religious Bodies: 1906*, vol. 2, 23.

68. James E. Anderson, *Public Policymaking: An Introduction*, 8th ed. (Stamford, CT: Cengage Learning, 2015), 7.

69. United States Bureau of the Census, *Religious Bodies: 1916*, vol. 2 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1919), 22; United States Bureau of the Census, *Religious Bodies: 1926*, vol. 2, 26.

70. *Manual for Ministers* (Takoma Park: General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1925), 2–9.

71. Gilbert M. Valentine, *The Prophet and the Presidents* (Nampa: Pacific Press, 2011), 73–75.

72. *Seventh-day Adventist Year Book of Statistics for 1889 . . .* (Battle Creek: Review and Herald, 1889), 132–133; *Seventh-day Adventist Year Book for 1890 . . .* (Battle Creek: Review and Herald, [1890]), 115–118; "General Conference Committee Minutes for 1890," n.p., (1890), 21, accessed June 2, 2017, http://documents.adventistarchives.org/ Minutes/GCC/GCC1890.pdf. General Conference sessions were held in the late summer, fall or early winter from the 12th annual session in 1873 to the 28th annual session in 1889. Beginning with the first biennial session of the General Conference in 1891, the regular meetings have convened in the spring or summer so as not to conflict with the Fall Council.

73. Department of Education, *Lessons in Denominational History* (Washington, D.C.: General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1942), 320; *Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia*, 1996 ed., s.v. "Annual Council."

74. Ian Tyrrell, *Reforming the World: The Creation of America's Moral Empire*, America in the World, eds. Sven Beckert and Jeremi Suri (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010), 1–7. Matthew McCullough, *The Cross of War: Christian Nationalism and U.S. Expansion in the Spanish-American War*, Studies in American Thought and Culture, ed. Paul S. Boyer (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2014).

75. Lewis L. Gould, *The First Modern Clash Over Federal Power: Wilson Versus Hughes in the Presidential Election of 1916* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2016), 130–132.

76. Alison Collis Greene, *No Depression in Heaven: The Great Depression, the New Deal, and the Transformation of Religion in the Delta* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016), 48.

77. Robert E. Wright and Thomas W. Zeiler, eds., *Guide to U.S. Economic Policy* (Thousand Oaks, CA: CQ Press, 2014), 137.

78. Glenn Porter, *The Rise of Big Business, 1860–1920*, 3rd ed., The American History Series, eds. John Hope Franklin and A. S. Eisenstadt (Wheeling, IL: Harlan Davidson, 2006), 93–94.

79. Amanda Porterfield, *Corporate Spirit: The Long History Behind American Corporate Society* (New York: Oxford University Press, forthcoming).

80. George R. Knight, "The Role of Union Conferences in Relation to Higher Authorities," *Spectrum Online*, October 7, 2016, accessed May 19, 2017, http://spectrummagazine.org/article/2016/10/07/role-union-conferences-relation-higher-authorities.

81. Benjamin McArthur, *A. G. Daniells: Shaper of Twentieth-Century Adventism*, Adventist Pioneer Series, ed. George R. Knight (Nampa: Pacific Press, 2015), 105.

82. Richard W. Schwarz and Floyd Greenleaf, *Light Bearers: A History of the Seventh-day Adventist Church* (Nampa: Pacific Press, 2000), 317, 330. It is worth noting that Ellen White, as well as other pioneers, such as J. N. Loughborough and C. C. Crisler, began to stress the importance of simplicity in organization as the General Conference grew in size and power in 1889 and 1901. A. Leroy Moore, "Kingly Power," in Fortin and Moon, eds. *The Ellen G. White Encyclopedia*, 920; Ellen G. White to the Brethren of the General Conference, December 19, 1892, LT 032, 1892; *J. N. Loughborough, Rise and Progress of the Seventh-day Adventists* . . . (Battle Creek: General Conference Association, 1892), 323–324; Barry David Oliver, *SDA Organizational Structure: Past, Present, and Future*, Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series, vol. 15 (Berrien Springs: Andrews University Press, 1989), 201–217; J. N. Loughborough, *The Church: Its Organization, Order, and Discipline* (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1907), 124–125, 141–143, 156; C. C. Crisler, *Organization: Its Character, Purpose, Place, and Development in the Seventh-day Adventist Church* (Takoma Park: Review and Herald, 1938), 14, 87, 106, 115, 187, 192–193, 212–213.

83. Department of Education, *Lessons in Denominational History*, 320.

84. Ellen G. White, *Life Sketches of Ellen G. White* . . . (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1915), 125.

85. Harwood and Beem, "'Not a Hand Bound'," 255–257; Gary Land, *Historical Dictionary of the Seventh-day Adventists*, 2nd ed., Historical Dictionaries of Religions, Philosophies, and Movements, ed. Jon Woronoff (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015), xxiv.

86. Timothy E. W. Gloege, *Guaranteed Pure: The Moody Bible Institute, Business, and the Making of Modern Evangelicalism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2015), 10.

87. Paul Earnest McGraw, "Born in Zion? The Margins of Fundamentalism and the Definition of Seventh-day Adventism," (PhD diss., George Washington University, 2004), 2.

88. Some recent works illustrate some aspects of Adventist-Fundamentalist relations. Michael W. Campbell, "The 1919 Bible Conference and Its Significance for the Seventh-day Adventist History and Theology," (PhD diss., Andrews University, 2007); Denis Kaiser, "Trust and Doubt: Perceptions of Divine Inspiration in Seventh-day Adventist History (1880 – 1930)," (PhD diss., Andrews University, 2016).

89. I. A. Crane, "Are You Really a Fundamentalist?," *Southwestern Union Record*, (March 23, 1926): 2; I. A. Crane, "Are You Really a Fundamentalist?," *Columbia Union Visitor,* (April 22, 1926): 8.

90. James Lamar McElhany, "Are Seventh-day Adventists Christians?," *ST* (May 10, 1927): 4; Varner J. Johns, "Gates of Brass," *ST,* (April 7, 1931): 14; Robert Leo Odom, "Why We See Protestantism in Eclipse," *The Watchman Magazine* (September 1931): 8; W. H. Branson, "Loyalty in an Age of Doubt," *The Ministry* 6, no. 10 (October 1933): 3; F. D. N[ichol], "Are We Justified in Proselyting?," *RH* (January 23, 1936): 3; Carlyle B. Haynes, "What Do You Know About Seventh-day Adventists?," *ST* (November 28, 1939): 4; Carlyle B. Haynes, "What Do You Know About Seventh-day Adventists?," *The Canadian Watchman* (February 1940): 8.

91. Margaret Lamberts Bendroth, *Fundamentalism & Gender, 1875 to the Present* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), 56.

92. Randall Balmer, "American Fundamentalism: The Ideal of Femininity," in *Fundamentalism and Gender*, ed. John Stratton Hawley (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 48–49, 53.

93. Vance, *Seventh-day Adventism in Crisis, 115.*

94. Cf. J. Gordon Melton, "Critiquing Cults: An Historical Perspective," in *Introduction to New and Alternative Religions in America*, vol. 1, eds. Eugene V. Gallagher and W. Michael Ashcraft (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2006), 127.

95. Wm. C. Irvine, *Heresies Exposed* . . . (New York: Loizeaux Brothers, 1921), 154; cf. H. F. D., "Seventh-Day [sic] Adventist 'Heresies'," *Present Truth* (September 30, 1926): 10.

96. This work was originally published in 1938. Jan Karel van Baalen, *The Chaos of Cults: A Study of Present-Day Isms*, Rev. Ed. (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1952), 196–197, 211.

97. H. M. S. Richards, *Feed My Sheep* (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1958), 352–353.

98. C. G. Bellah, "Getting a Minister's Order," *Central Union Outlook* (December 3, 1912): 2; [A. L.] K[ing], "False Statements Refuted," *Signs of the Times Australia* (September 3, 1934): 6.

99. "Adventist Founder Dies," *Northern Union Reaper* (July 20, 1915): 3.

100. S. H. Lane, "Indiana," *RH* (March 24, 1903): 19.

101. United States Bureau of the Census, *Religious Bodies: 1936*, vol. 2, part 1 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1941), 27.

102. Everett Dick, *Founders of the Message* (Takoma Park: Review and Herald, 1938), 9. It is interesting to note that Dick was unable to publish an academic historical monograph for the church in the first part of the

twentieth-century. As Gary Land states, "The leaders of the Seventh-day Adventist General Conference preferred the apologetic approaches" to their history and would not allow Dick "to address such matters as the ill health of James and Ellen White and the shut door doctrine." It was for this reason that Dick prefaced *Founders of the Message* with this statement: "I make no claim that the volume is a critical, scientific history, but have frankly attempted to produce a popular work." Ibid., 9–10; Gary Land, "Foreword," in Everett N. Dick, *William Miller and the Advent Crisis* (Berrien Springs: Andrews University Press, 1994), vii–viii; cf. Jonathan M. Butler and Ronald L. Numbers, "Introduction," in *The Disappointed: Millerism and Millenarianism in the Nineteenth Century*, eds. Ronald L. Numbers and Jonathan M. Butler (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1993), xvi.

103. Merlin D. Burt, "Bibliographic Essay on Publications About Ellen G. White," in *The Ellen G. White Encyclopedia*, eds. Fortin and Moon, 165–166.

104. J. N. Loughborough, *The Prophetic Gift in the Gospel Church*, The Bible Students' Library, vol. 164 (Oakland: Pacific Press, 1901), 44–48.

105. J. N. Loughborough, "The Study of the Testimonies—No. 4," *Daily Bulletin of the General Conference*, (January 31 and February 1, 1893), 58–59; J. N. Loughborough, "The Prophetic Gift," *RH* (July 18, 1899): 454.

106. J. N. Loughborough, *Rise and Progress*, 70–74, 91ff; J. N. Loughborough, *The Great Second Advent Movement: Its Rise and Progress* (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1905), 145–147, 182–183, 202–203.

107. Carlyle B. Haynes, "Are Prophets Essential to the Church To-Day?," *ST* (February 4, 1919): 13.

108. V. P. Hulse, "To Keep Thee in the Way," *North Pacific Union Gleaner* (June 15, 1926): 1.

109. "Divine Leadership All the Way," *Inter-American Division Messenger* (November 1927): 1.

110. [Emphasis is mine.] "God's Special Messenger," *The Church Officers' Gazette* 26, no. 4 (April 1939): 28–29.

111. [Emphasis is mine.] A. W. Peterson, "Where There Is No Vision the People Perish," *Youth's Instructor* (October 17, 1944): 15.

112. Though he has incorrectly attributed this version of the story to Loughborough, Ronald Graybill has astutely observed that this story "helps to explain why [Ellen White's] prophetic gift never translated into any belief that women in general might be fitted for leadership roles in the church and why to this day the central church leadership has refused to approve the ordination of women to the gospel ministry." Ronald Graybill, "Prophet," in *Ellen Harmon White*, eds. Aamodt, Land, and Numbers, 81. Though Loughborough did not connect the Foy-Foss-Harmon story with gender, Uriah Smith did make this association in 1866, but only in reference to Foss and Harmon—he never mentioned Foy. Smith's statement was not remembered or repeated, however. The only person prior to 1935 to reference Smith was W. C. White, Ellen White's son. When White cited Smith's 1866 statement, however, he intentionally excluded the comments about gender. White did not accept the gender myth or even perpetuate Loughborough's version of the story. He did not mention William Foy, utilize the phrase, "the weakest of the weak," or make any connections with gender. [Uriah Smith], "The Visions—Objections Answered," *RH* (June 12, 1866): 10; William C. White, "Sketches and Memories of James and Ellen G. White," *RH*

(March 14, 1935): 10.

113. First, Delbert Baker has demonstrated that William Foy did not refuse to share his visions, but rather continued to serve God his entire life. Delbert W. Baker, *The Unknown Prophet*, rev. ed. (Hagerstown: Review and Herald, 2013). This disrupts that causality of the narrative: God did not choose Foy first, then reluctantly turn to Hazen Foss, and finally settle on Ellen Harmon. Second, there is no evidence from the 1840s to suggest that Foy, Foss, and Harmon all had the same vision. In 1866, Uriah Smith did claim that Foss had the same vision as Ellen Harmon, but he made no mention of Foy. The next documented moment in which this topic arose came in 1890, when Ellen Harmon White wrote a private letter and said that Foss told her that he had seen the same vision that she had received. White did not endorse or deny Foss's purported claim, however—she simply repeated it. [Smith], "The Visions—Objections Answered," *RH* (June 12, 1866): 10; Ellen White to Mary Foss, December 22, 1890, LT 037, 1890. Third, Ellen White never claimed, or affirmed, that she was God's last choice and that God would have preferred a man to be His prophet. Though William Foy, Hazen Foss, and Ellen Harmon were all real people who had visions, the connections that have been made between the three of them lack historical merit. "Did God Choose Ellen G. White to Be [a] Prophet Only Because Two Men Refused His Calling?," Center for Adventist Research, September 1, 2015, accessed May 2, 2017, https://askthecenter.freshdesk.com/support/solutions/articles/6000054387-did-god-choose-ellen-g-white-to-be-prophet-only-because-two-men-refused-his-calling-.

114. John R. Rice, *Bobbed Hair, Bossy Wives, and Women Preachers: Significant Questions for Honest Christian Women Settled by the Word of God* (Murfreesboro, TN: Sword of the Lord Publishers, 1941), 58.

115. *Constitution, By-Laws, and Working Policy of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists* (Battle Creek: Autumn Council, 1926).

116. [Emphasis is mine.] *Constitution, By-Laws, and Working Policy of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists* (Battle Creek: Autumn Council, 1930), 71.

117. [Emphasis is in original.] Anderson, *Public Policymaking*, 7.

118. "Questions and Answers," *The Central Union Outlook* (September 12, 1922): 6.

119. W. H. Branson and M. E. Kern, "Report of Committee on Constitution and Working Policy," *RH* (June 19, 1930): 234.

120. [McElhany], *Church Manual*, 139.

121. Though I strongly disagree with his analysis and conclusions, Peter Hitchens has also recognized this point. Peter Hitchens, *A Hidden Shadow: An Investigation Into the Church Manual* (Anaconda, MT: Bob Vun Kannon, 1993). George R. Knight and Barry D. Oliver argue that this concept of unity originated in response to the 1901 General Conference session. George R. Knight, "The Role of Union Conferences"; Oliver, *SDA Organizational Structure*, 317n2, 341.

122. [Emphasis is in original.] "The New Church Manual," *RH* (June 2, 1932): 527.

123. During the Fundamentalist era women were sidelined in many conservative Christian assemblies and ministries. The women's missions movement began to decline in the 1920s and about this time women were barred from

management positions in the Moody Bible Institute and forbidden to take classes on preaching. Tyrrell, *Reforming the World*, 227; Gloege, *Guaranteed Pure*, 125–126, 160. "In 1930 the Independent Fundamental Churches in America explicitly eliminated women as voting members." This organization, formed in 1924 as the American Conference of Undenominational Churches, had allowed women to serve as pastors, but after 1930 they became "almost a nonentity as far as formal activity was concerned." Bendroth, *Fundamentalism & Gender*, 63.

124. United States Bureau of the Census, *Religious Bodies: 1936*, vol. 2, part 1, 29.

125. Allen, "The Depression and the Role of Women," 53. According to Allen one female pastor was added in 1935, but he did not specify how long she held that position.

126. [McElhany], *Church Manual*, 34.

127. *Seventh-day Adventist Church Manual*, 18th ed. ([Silver Spring]: Secretariat of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 2010), 78–79. Though the *Church Manual* did not allow for the ordination of deaconesses until 2010, several Adventist ministers ordained deaconesses anyway in the late twentieth-century. Nancy J. Vyhmeister, "Deaconesses in History and in the Seventh-day Adventist Church," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 43, no. 1 (Spring 2005): 151; Ruth de Graaff, "Blossburg Deaconesses are Properly Ordained," *Columbia Union Visitor* (October 15, 1986): 6.

128. E. G. White, "The Duty of the Minister and the People," *RH* (July 9, 1895): 434; This statement has been republished several times in various periodicals, presumably by those in favor of ordaining women to at least the office of deaconess. E. G. White, "A Working Church," *The Canadian Union Messenger* (May 30, 1911): 86; E. G. White, "A Working Church," *Northern Union Reaper* (February 21, 1911): 2; E. G. White, "A Working Church," *Southern Union Worker* (March 2, 1911): 65; E. G. White, "A Working Church," *Australasian Record* (March 9, 1914): 2; "Council to Workers," *Columbia Union Visitor* (May 18, 1933): 2; Ellen G. White, "The Duty of the Minister and the People," *Southwestern Union Record* (May 16, 1934): 2; "A Broader Dorcas Work," *The Church Officers' Gazette* 36, no. 10 (October 1949): 22; "A Broader Dorcas Work," *The Church Officers' Gazette* 37, no. 6 (June 1950): 22; Ordell R. Rees, "Northern Union Conference Gateway to Service: Dorcas and the Church," *Northern Union Outlook* (February 28, 1956): 3; R. A. Pohan, "Dorcas Activities in North Borneo," *Far Eastern Division Outlook* (March 1956): 9; R. A. Pohan, "Dorcas Activities in North Borneo," *The Messenger* 6, no. 2 (March-April 1956): 6.

129. Trim, "The Ordination of Women," 17–18.

130. Ellen G. White, *Pastoral Ministry* (Silver Spring: Ministerial Association, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1995), 75, 224. Several Adventists have intentionally extracted this statement from Ellen White's article in their publications. S. T. Shadel, "Laymen's Missionary Movement," *Lake Union Herald* (March 17, 1926): 7; P. T. Jackson, "The Master's Example," *Lake Union Herald* (October 29, 1946): 4; "A Work for Women," *Pacific Union Recorder* (March 27, 1950): 11.

131. Vance, *Seventh-day Adventism in Crisis*, 172–178.

132. Allen, "The Depression and the Role of Women," 52.

133. This statement appeared in the 1906, 1916, and 1926 Federal censuses of religious bodies, but was removed in the 1936 statement on polity. United States Bureau of the Census, *Religious Bodies: 1926*, vol. 2, 26; United States Bureau of the Census, *Religious Bodies: 1936*, vol. 2, part 1, 29.

134. Ava M. Covington, *They Also Served: Stories of Pioneer Women of the Advent Movement* (Takoma Park: Review and Herald, 1940), 83–104.

135. G. W. Colcord and F. M. T. Simonson, "Quarterly Report of the Ill. T. and M. Society," *RH* (February 8, 1877): 43; [Uriah Smith], "The Biblical Institute," *RH* (November 22, 1877): 164; Ex. Com. Gen. T. & M. S., "Tract and Missionary Institute," *RH* (November 28, 1878): 176; [Uriah Smith], "Tract and Missionary Institute," *RH* (January 2, 1879): 4; "Constitution and By-laws of the American Health and Temperance Association," *RH – Supplement* (January 9, 1879): 2; B. L. Whitney, "Wellsville, N. Y., Institute," *RH* (February 20, 1879): 63; D. M. Canright, "Ohio T. and M. Institute," *RH* (January 29, 1880): 74; [Uriah Smith], "The Institute at Battle Creek," *RH* (February 26, 1880): 136; D. P. Curtis, "The Minnesota T. and M. Institute," *RH* (April 15, 1880): 253; Geo. I. Butler, "Tract and Missionary Institute in Iowa," *RH* (September 23, 1880): 219; R. F. Andrews and N. F. Craig, "Illinois Conference," *RH* (September 30, 1880): 237; T. M. Steward and A. A. John, "Illinois T. and M. Institute," RH (January 18, 1881): 44; W. W. Conklin, "Institute in Dist. No. 4, Iowa," *RH* (January 25, 1881): 60; R. F. Andrews and F. A. Lawrence, "Illinois Conference," *RH* (September 27, 1881): 220; cf. "Literary Notices: Robert's Rules of Order," *Health Reformer* 12, no. 4 (April 1877): 126.

136. "Editorial Notes," *RH* (January 2, 1879): 5; S. Brownsberger, "Students and Teachers, Attention," *RH* (July 24, 1879): 36.

137. Uriah Smith, *Key to Smith's Diagram of Parliamentary Rules* . . . (Battle Creek: Review and Herald, 1881); W. H. L[ittlejohn], "The Church Manual," *RH* (September 18, 1883): 602.

138. It is important to note that the word "dispose" does not mean reject—it means to take action. As clear from the context of this statement, resolutions were disposed of by direct or indirect adoption or rejection. Smith, *Key to Smith's Diagram of Parliamentary Rules*, 5; cf. Henry M. Robert, *Pocket Manual of Rules of Order for Deliberative Assemblies* . . . (Chicago: S. C. Griggs and Company, 1879), 28§7.

139. Robert, *Pocket Manual*, 45§19; Smith, *Smith's Diagram*, 13–14.

140. Robert, *Pocket Manual*, 53§21; Smith, *Smith's Diagram*, 16–17.

141. Robert, *Pocket Manual*, 59§24; Smith, *Smith's Diagram*, 19.

142. Robert, *Pocket Manual*, 54–56§22, 77§29; Smith, *Smith's Diagram*, 17, 22–26.

143. [Emphasis is in original.] Robert, *Pocket Manual*, 147–148§53, 54–56§22; Smith, *Smith's Diagram*, 17.

144. In 1873, J. N. Andrews described the General Conference Executive Committee as a committee for action. He wrote,

The efficiency of our system of organization depends very much upon the existence and the action of this committee. During the interval from one Conference to another, the general management of our affairs as a people is in their hands. They constitute an executive board to carry into effect the meas-

ures which are determined upon by the Conference. Without their action, much of the Conference business would end in mere talk. By their means we are able to act as a body, and at all times are represented by those who are authorized to act for us.

J. N. Andrews, "The General Conference Committee," *RH* (October 28, 1873): 160.

145. Here are some examples of Adventists taking these actions: *Lay It on the Table*: Geo. I. Butler and U. Smith, "Proceedings of the Eleventh Annual Meeting of the General Conference of S. D. Adventists," *RH* (March 11, 1873): 108; "Transcription of Minutes of GC Sessions from 1863 to 1888," 158, accessed May 12, 2017, http://docs.adventistarchives.org/docs/ GCB/GCB1863– 88.pdf#view=fit; Jas. White and U. Smith, "Business Proceedings of the Special Session of the General Conference of S. D. Adventists, March 11–15, 1880," March 18, 1880, 187; S. N. Haskell and U. Smith, "The General Conference Business Proceedings (Continued)," *RH* (December 13, 1881): 376. *Postpone to a Certain Day*: Jas. White and U. Smith, "Business Proceedings of the Special Session of the General Conference of S. D. Adventists, March 11–15, 1880," March 18, 1880, 187; S. N. Haskell and U. Smith, "The General Conference Business Proceedings (Continued)," *RH* (December 13, 1881): 376; S. N. Haskell and U. Smith, "General Conference: Business Proceedings (Continued)," *RH* (December 20, 1881): 392.

146. Here are some examples of Adventists taking these actions: *Committee of the Whole*: J. O. Corliss and D. H. Lamson, "S. D. A. Ministerial Association of Michigan," *RH* (April 11, 1882): 238; S. N. Haskell and M. L. Huntley, "International Tract Society (Continued)," *RH* (November 25, 1884): 742. *Special Committee*: Jas. White and U. Smith, "General Conference of S. D. Adventists: Eighteenth Annual Session, Nov. 7, 1879," *RH* (November 20, 1879): 161; Geo. I. Butler and U. Smith, "General Conference Proceedings: Twenty-fifth Annual Session (Continued)," *RH* (November 30, 1886): 744. *Referred Back to the Committee on Resolutions:* S. N. Haskell and U. Smith, "General Conference: Business Proceedings (Continued)," *RH* (December 20, 1881): 392.

147. Here are some examples of Adventists taking this action: "Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association: Thirty-ninth Annual Meeting, Held in the Tabernacle, Battle Creek, Michigan, March 9, 1899, 10 A. M.," *The General Conference Bulletin* 8, no. 18 (March 16, 1899): 186–187; Jno. I. Gibson, "The Publishing Association," *RH* (March 21, 1899): 187; H. W. Decker and Edith Starbuck, "Minutes of North Pacific Conference," *Pacific Union Recorder* (June 19, 1902): 7; cf. Henry Lyon, David Hewitt, and Wm. M. Smith, "Report of the Committee Chosen to Investigate the Financial Condition of the Review Office," *RH* (December 18, 1855): 96; "Quarterly Meeting of the State Board of Health of Michigan," *Good Health* 18, no. 2 (February 1883): 59.

148. Trim, "The Ordination of Women," 16.

149. Kaiser, "Setting Apart for the Ministry," 190n64.

150. S. N. Haskell and Maria L. Huntley, "Fourth Annual Session of the General Tract and Missionary Society," *RH* (December 11, 1879): 185.

151. W. C. White, "The Time to Work," *RH – Supplement* (December 11, 1879): 4.

152. Geo. I. Butler and U. Smith, "General Conference Proceedings: Twenty-fifth Annual Session," *RH* (December 14, 1886): 778–779.

153. M. H. Brown, "The General Meeting at Rome, N. Y.," *RH* (January 25, 1887): 61; M. H. Brown, "The Work in New York," *RH* (February 1, 1887): 77; P. Z. Kinne and J. V. Willson, "New York Tract Society," *RH* (February 8, 1887): 86; *An Important Testimony to Our Brethren and Sisters in New York; and an Appeal from the New York Conference Committee* (n.p.: T. & M. Society Press Print, [1887]), 14.

154. E. E. Andross, "Obituaries: Sawyer," *RH* (December 1, 1890): 23.

155. *Seventh-day Adventist Year Book . . . [for] 1888* (Battle Creek: Review and Herald, [1888]), 143; "[Daniel Thomson's Change in Address]," *RH* (May 3, 1887): 287; "[International Tract and Missionary Society Advertisement]," *RH* (August 16, 1887): 527; Geo. A. King, "Notice," *RH* (January 31, 1888): 80; J. E. Robinson, "The Brooklyn, N. Y., Mission," *RH* (July 24, 1888): 471.

156. Geo. I. Butler and A. B. Oyen, "General Conference Proceedings: Twenty-second Annual Session," *RH* (November 20, 1883): 733.

157. Geo. I. Butler, "Changes in Fields of Labor," *RH* (November 27, 1883): 752; cf. G. I. B[utler], "Business Councils," *RH* (December 18, 1883): 798.

158. M. C. Wilcox, "General Report," *RH* (February 19, 1884): 125.

159. G. I. B[utler], "The New Paper in England," *RH* (April 1, 1884): 217. Though the referred resolution referenced Europe, rather than England specifically, it is clear that England was the place to which W. C. White was asked to go because Adventists had been attempting to establish a printing press in that location for several years. Jas. White and U. Smith, "General Conference (Concluded)," *RH* (December 11, 1879): 190.

160. "General Conference," *ST* (January 5, 1882): 8.

161. "[Masthead for the Editorial Page of the Signs]," *ST* (January 5, 1882): 6.

162. S. N. Haskell and U. Smith, "The General Conference: Twentieth Annual Session, Dec. 1, 1881," *RH* (December 6, 1881): 360.

163. J. N. Andrews and Uriah Smith, "Business Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Session of the General Conference of S. D. Adventists," *RH* (May 25, 1869): 173; Jas. White and Uriah Smith, "Business Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Session of the General Conference of S. D. Adventists," *RH* (March 22, 1870): 109.

164. "General Conference," *ST* (January 5, 1882): 8; S. N. Haskell and U. Smith, "General Conference: Business Proceedings (Continued)," *RH* (December 20, 1881): 392.

165. E. J. Waggoner, "How Readest Thou?," *ST* (December 29, 1890): 601–602.

166. Kaiser, "Setting Apart for the Ministry," 190n64.

167. Cf. "[Editorial Correction: Dropped, Not Drafted]," *RH* (November 8, 1864): 192; J. H. W[aggoner] to Locals, [187–], Lucinda Hall Collection, Folder 5, EGWE-GC.

168. [A. Kunz], "Death of Eld. J. H. Waggoner," *RH* (September 3, 1889): 558; "Baraboo Standard," *Milwaukee Weekly Wisconsin*, September 10, 1851; "Editorial Change," *Milwaukee Weekly Wisconsin*, March 24, 1852.