

IN THE SHADOW OF THE 'DAILY':
BACKGROUND AND AFTERMATH OF THE 1919 BIBLE AND
HISTORY TEACHERS' CONFERENCE

By Bert Haloviak

Assistant Director
Office of Archives and Statistics

A Paper Presented at the Meeting of Seventh-day Adventist
Biblical Scholars in New York City

November 14, 1979

Materials used in this paper have been drawn from
published and unpublished sources housed in the
Archives of the General Conference and at the White
Estate.

Office of Archives and Statistics
General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists
Washington, D.C.

IN THE SHADOW OF THE 'DAILY':
BACKGROUND AND AFTERMATH OF THE 1919 BIBLE AND
HISTORY TEACHERS' CONFERENCE

Bert Haloviak

INTRODUCTION

Arthur G. Daniells, after the initial three-week phase of the 1919 Bible and History Teachers' Conference wrote W. C. White:

I think I can truly say that at the close of this important meeting, we stand together more unitedly and firmly for all the fundamentals than when we began the meeting.

A contrary opinion was expressed three years later by J. S. Washburn, a minister of thirty-eight years, when he stated:

Under the authority, and sanction or permission at least of this so called Bible Institute, teachers were undermining the confidence of our sons and daughters in the very fundamentals of our truth, while the parents were not allowed to inquire into the sacred secrets of this private council.... One of our most faithful workers said the holding of this [1919] Bible Institute was the most terrible thing that had ever happened in the history of this denomination.¹

The Washburn statement reflected a viewpoint that had deep roots in the denominational past, but a viewpoint that was not represented at the 1919 Conference. That viewpoint was not excluded by design, but rather because the initiative for the Conference came from the education field, and delegates were selected largely from the Bible and history faculties of the major educational institutions.

The discord with this unrepresented segment had begun far earlier than 1919 and would continue after the Conference. The nature of the disharmony concerned conflicting viewpoints regarding the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy and was fought with the theological question of the "daily" of Daniel 8 as a backdrop.

This paper will attempt to outline the two major conflicting positions on the nature of the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy and to illustrate the consequences of the friction between those positions. It will also examine some of the crises that militated against a successful dialogue that might have synthesized the conflicting viewpoints. The writer believes that the tragedy of

the decade that preceded, and the decades that followed the Conference was that each side had elements of truth that were needed by the other. Distrust, however, resulted in one position dismissing the other as "verbal inspirationists," while the second camp considered its opponents to be moving, consciously or unconsciously, toward the destruction of the spirit of prophecy. With that distrust came solidification of positions that rendered more unlikely the needed dialogue.

After looking at the Conference itself and some of its unresolved questions, the paper briefly examines certain apostasies that colored the atmosphere as the debate on the "daily" was beginning. It then examines the major proponents of each of the positions that became solidified over the question of the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy.

It should be noted that the nature of the questions involved in this paper necessitated a broad attempt for documentation. It should be understood that, while the writer believes that the evidence justifies the general conclusions reached, the paper in no way purports to be a thorough exposition of the many involved episodes that it touches.

The sponsors of the 1919 Bible and History Teachers' Conference did not produce minutes of the meeting nor did they issue a formal report of positions taken on the various topics presented. The transcript of this conference, therefore, does not constitute any kind of an official statement. The transcript consists of both study papers and discussions. Some of the discussions covered topics not on the agenda.

Careful scholarship would place more weight on the thoughts expressed in the papers than in the ideas presented during the discussions, insofar as denominational consensus is concerned. While the extemporaneous remarks of a

delegate might reveal his own deepest theological problems, the same topic handled by the same person but appearing in a denominational journal or book would more nearly represent the church at large or a major school of denominational thought.

1919 BIBLE AND HISTORY TEACHERS' CONFERENCE

T. E. Bowen, in a poetic outburst to his friend A. O. Tait, sought to prepare him for the seasonable Washington climate he could expect during the forthcoming Bible and History Teachers' Conference to be held for six weeks beginning July 1, 1919:

The days are getting slimmer,
The heat begins to simmer

To make his point painfully clear, Bowen noted that by the time July comes on "it will be delightfully warm, so come on and help us enjoy it." He recalled that when the location for the Conference was under consideration, A. G. Daniells noted that Bowen had stayed around Washington for the past 10 to 12 summers and survived.²

A fair amount of the initiative for holding such a conference had come from the Pacific Press, where Tait was serving as an editor. As early as 1913, M. C. Wilcox, editor of the Signs of the Times, had called for such a meeting to undertake in-depth Bible studies similar to those he recalled from a bygone era. Another thing that Wilcox recalled from that earlier period was that there was not "that awful fear that somebody was going to teach heresy if they held a little different view from what somebody else did."³

Two years later Wilcox renewed his call. This time he listed the points of difference among editors, Bible teachers, and ministers and hoped such questions as (a) prophetic dates relating to the beginning and ending of the 1260 years, (b) meaning of the term "Spirit of Prophecy" in Rev. 12:17 and 19:10, (c) the

"daily" of Daniel 8, (d) the king of the North of Daniel 11, (e) "This generation" of Matthew 24, and (f) the plagues of Rev. 16, would be considered. The matter was discussed during Fall Council and the delegates looked toward such a meeting "at the first opportunity." A year later A. O. Tait made a similar recommendation.⁴

In 1917 W. C. White became wearied by the over-concentration on war themes depicted in denominational periodicals. He wondered if the denomination then had scholarship sufficient to develop prophetic themes broader than the immediate war situation. As he looked toward the Bible teachers he believed, "with a few exceptions," that they could be classed within two categories: (a) orthodox, but unprogressive and boring, (b) progressive and interesting, but not orthodox. He called for a systematic method of improvement and urged that a summer Bible school be conducted annually. Daniells responded favorably to the proposal by recalling his own attempts in 1913 to conduct a Bible Teachers' Institute. He believed that such meetings with Bible teachers and editors should result in a "blending in unity."⁵

The General Conference Committee on April 5, 1918, adopted a resolution calling for a Bible and History Teachers' Council of six weeks' duration to begin July 1, 1918. Bible and history teachers from SDA colleges and junior colleges, leading editors and "such other leading men" as the GCC might designate, were invited to attend. A committee of seven selected some 40 delegates and assigned approximately 67 Bible and history topics to be considered. Some of the suggested topics and proposed speakers were: "The Use of the Spirit of Prophecy in Bible and History Teaching," A. G. Daniells or W. A. Spicer; "The 'Daily' of the Book of Daniel," F. M. Wilcox; "Inspiration: What Is It in the Bible and in the Testimonies?", A. G. Daniells; "What Shall Our Attitude Be on the Flesh Question?", F. M. Wilcox. When the war situation caused cancellation of the proposed Conference, the General Conference Committee recommended one similar in scope to be held in 1919. Rather interestingly, however, the

topics approved by the GCC did not include either the spirit of prophecy or the "daily." The covering letter sent to the delegates did note, however, that it was not intended that the 11 listed topics would be the only subjects considered, but that others could be considered "as may seem best."⁶

As a member of the General Conference Committee, W. C. White automatically qualified as a delegate to the Conference. Daniels extended to him, however, a special invitation to attend. Although White could think of nothing he would enjoy as much as attending the Conference, his urgent work in manuscript preparation prevented his attendance.⁷

The area of perhaps greatest interest during the discussions at the 1919 Bible and History Teachers' Conference concerned the nature of the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy. Although the subject was formally discussed on three separate occasions, other areas of the stenographic report of the meetings afford additional insight into the various understandings of the nature of the inspiration of Ellen G. White.

W. W. Prescott, General Conference field secretary, first broached the subject by suggesting that statements in the spirit of prophecy needed to be "interpreted" to bring them into "harmony with history and fact." This, he noted, might at times conflict with the normal first reading of a specific statement. Prescott then moved from that point to concluding that the spirit of prophecy should be "corrected" when errors of fact were uncovered. He listed six such "corrections" that had been made in the 1911 edition of Great Controversy.⁸

F. M. Wilcox, editor of the Review, while agreeing that Mrs. White in the past had recognized fallibility in her recall of certain events about which she was writing from memory, emphasized a holistic approach to the writings that enabled him to avoid the need of deciding whether specific historical statements were inspired or not. This basic divergence seemed to be present throughout the

discussions on the spirit of prophecy, and seemed to be unresolved when the Conference ended.⁹

A. O. Tait picked up the Prescott theme and stated, "In other words, she never claimed she had inspired evidence in regard to those dates and historical facts." Prescott responded by inaccurately attributing the following position to W. C. White:

I talked to Eld. W. C. White about this matter, as I had something to do with this book, and he has told me that there was no claim that this book was to be an inspired authority on facts of history.¹⁰

As will be examined later, W. C. White never attempted to divide portions of the spirit of prophecy writings into inspired and uninspired sections. While he did not consider Mrs. White as final authority on questions of historical accuracy, and not to be used as authority in settling disputed historical questions, he studiously avoided distinguishing between so-called inspired and uninspired aspects of the spirit of prophecy.

While D. E. Robinson offered an explanation that could account for at least three of the six "corrections" mentioned by Prescott, W. G. Wirth, Bible teacher from Pacific Union College, affirmed that he had never believed "that the history of the spirit of prophecy was to be taken as inspired." He considered that the "history was merely thrown in to substantiate the principles."¹¹

Six days after that general discussion on the spirit of prophecy, A. G. Daniells expressed pleasure for the opportunity of meeting and having a "plain talk about this question." He also expressed happiness for the chance to place himself "on record regarding this gift to the church" because of the criticisms that seemed to plague him and other members of the General Conference that they were "shaky with reference to the spirit of prophecy," and that they stood on slippery ground.¹²

Daniells concluded his introduction to the subject by expressing his deep

concern over the possibility of his influencing someone to have less than full confidence in the prophetic gift in the church. He then related experiences both in the United States and Australia that solidified his firm confidence in the spirit of prophecy. As he was discussing the details of the crisis "that would shake this denomination to its foundation," the Kellogg crisis, Daniells informed the stenographers not to transcribe the remainder of that meeting "which would take over 60 pages of typewriting."¹³

At the beginning of his talks on the spirit of prophecy during the second series of meetings, Daniells again started with the hope that he would not say "one word that will destroy confidence in this gift. . . . I do not want to create doubts." On several occasions he called for an affirmation from the teachers that his position was not one that would cause them to think he was shaky on the spirit of prophecy. It seemed clear that Daniells considered he was dealing with sympathetic listeners. One of the teachers sympathetically pointed to the widespread belief that neither he nor Prescott believed the Testimonies and this seemed to solidify Daniells' intention of "explaining" the position of those who caused him to have that reputation. Daniells, as well as others, consistently attributed to that segment a belief in the verbal inspiration of the spirit of prophecy.¹⁴

During his July 30 talk, Daniells seemed to reveal rather fully his concept of the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy. While he clearly considered the Testimonies to be from the Lord, he likewise stressed that there was a need for interpretation to occur. He emphasized that the real basis for his confidence in the gift was the fruitage of the gift within the church.

Daniells considered the spirit of prophecy as an inspired commentary upon the Bible, but he rejected the concept that it was the only safe interpreter of the Bible or that it was "an infallible interpreter" of the Bible. On questions

of interpretation, Daniells stressed his belief in a holistic approach on a teaching in the spirit of prophecy. He emphasized that the "whole trend of teaching and thought that is put through the Testimonies on that subject" should determine the conclusions.¹⁵

Daniells did not consider that Mrs. White claimed "to be an authority on history, and never claimed to be a dogmatic teacher on theology." He emphasized that he believed that "as far as she was concerned, she was ready to correct in revision such statements as she thought should be corrected." He seemed to be stressing that, just as Mrs. White should not be considered an "infallible interpreter" of the Bible, so she should not be considered an "infallible guide to history." It should be noticed that Daniells seemed to avoid the position Prescott seemed to take of considering Mrs. White not "inspired" upon certain points. Daniells distinguished between the question of infallibility and inspiration and stated, "I never understood that she put infallibility into the historical quotations," while also agreeing that the final proof of the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy was its spiritual value rather than its historical veracity.¹⁶

Another facet of Daniells' understanding of the proper use of the spirit of prophecy related to his belief that some claimed too much for the writings. While he warned that all efforts should be made to avoid casting doubts upon the gift to students, another way to injure the student would be "to take an extreme and unwarranted position."¹⁷

Daniells' philosophy toward interpreting the spirit of prophecy in terms of the context was enunciated in response to a question concerning the use of butter. He knew, Daniells asserted, that from conversations he had with Mrs. White that she well understood that common sense dictated that people should be

governed by the locality and circumstances in their relation to the health question.¹⁸

The most prominent feature in the discussions of the spirit of prophecy on August 1 was the question of verbal inspiration. F. M. Wilcox stated that because of his knowledge of the methods used in the Ellen White works he "never believed in the verbal inspiration of the Testimonies." J. N. Anderson wondered if the leadership should continue to "let our people in general go on holding to the verbal inspiration of the Testimonies?" He called for cautious moves in the direction of educating the membership to avoid the serious crisis that might someday occur. C. L. Taylor doubted that the membership generally believed in the verbal inspiration of the Testimonies. He noted that the question was discussed far more at the Conference "in one day" than he ever heard of it in his entire life. Daniells again seemed to be reacting to those who questioned his standing on the spirit of prophecy when he stated:

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

Daniells expressed his opinion that holding to a verbal inspiration concept of the Testimonies was illogical "because everybody who has ever seen the work done knows better, and we might as well dismiss it."¹⁹

G. B. Thompson believed that the church had been incorrectly educated and thus the denomination faced the possibility of a shock on the question of verbal inspiration. His confidence in the spirit of prophecy was not in its verbal inspiration, he stated, but rather "in their influence and power in the denomination." He concluded, "They are not verbally inspired--we know that--and what is the use of teaching that they are?" M. E. Kern suggested that the question of verbal inspiration did not settle the problem of defining the

inspiration of Ellen White and Daniells responded by suggesting that difficulties sprang from the two questions of infallibility and verbal inspiration. He then referred to James White statements in the Review and Herald that attempted to correct erroneous ideas about verbal inspiration. Daniells believed that because that explanation was not accepted "and passed on down," the present generation faced that perplexity. He continued:

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

The next three pages of transcript depict Daniells applying the question of verbal inspiration to such questions as salt, eggs, butter and book revision. How, he asks, could the writings be revised, if they were verbally inspired.²⁰

Several attempts were made to arrive at a practical way to deal with the concept of inspiration. B. L. House considered the problem not to be the question of verbal inspiration, but rather the methodology used in preparing the books. Because he believed the Testimonies were prepared differently than other works containing historical extracts, he implied that the Testimonies were more inspired. F. M. Wilcox again stressed his over-all concept of inspiration that would allow for the possibility of fallibility in a specific detail. "It seems to me I would have to accept what she says on some of those general policies or I would have to sweep away the whole thing," he stated.²¹

The discussion closed, however, with most questions unresolved. Perhaps the most basic was that posed by C. L. Benson, dean and history teacher at Pacific Union College:

If there are such uncertainties with reference to our historical position, and if the Testimonies are not to be relied on to throw a great deal of light upon our historical positions, and if the same is true with reference to our theological interpretation of texts, then how can we consistently place implicit confidence in the direction that is given with reference to our educational problems, and our medical school, and even our denominational organization? If there is a definite spiritual leadership in these things, then how can we consistently lay aside the Testimonies or partially lay them aside when it comes to the prophetic and historic side of the message and place these things on the basis of research work.²²

C. L. Taylor, Bible instructor at Canadian Junior College, restated the Benson question by noting that if Ellen White's statements concerning history and possibly certain expositions of scripture were considered unreliable:

The only natural conclusion for me, and probably for a great many others, would be that the same authorship is unreliable regarding organization, regarding pantheism, and every other subject that she ever treated on--that she may have told the truth, but we had better get all the historical data we can to see whether she told the truth or not. That is something I would like to hear discussed. I do not believe we shall get to the foundation of the question unless we answer Professor Benson's question.²³

M. E. Kern, Secretary of the GC Youth Department, likewise touched on that question when he wondered how the same individual (probably referring to Prescott) could consider the historical data in the spirit of prophecy as unreliable "and then assert his absolute confidence in the spirit of prophecy." He likewise wondered how an individual (obviously meaning Daniells) could ignore the definite testimony concerning butter and still claim absolute confidence in the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy. The question is, stated Kern, "What is the nature of inspiration?" Kern emphasized the twin problems of explaining such a philosophy of inspiration to young people and also the problem of avoiding rationalizing away the entire spirit of prophecy. Kern continued:

Can we, either in the Bible or the Testimonies, play upon a word instead of the general view of the whole scope of interpretation? I do not believe a man can believe in the general inspiration of the spirit of prophecy and still not believe that vegetarianism is the thing for mankind. I can understand how that testimony was written for individuals, and there are exceptions to it, and how Sister White in her human weakness could make a mistake in stating a truth, and still not destroy the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy; but the

question is how to present these matters to the people.²⁴

Prescott likewise considered the question of "inaccuracies" within the spirit of prophecy as a dilemma regarding the question of inspiration. He recalled his experience relating to the revision of Great Controversy. His problem was, he stated, to "retain faith" in those areas of the spirit of prophecy that he had no possibility of verifying as he did the historical revisions that were accepted. He noted that he had not given up the spirit of prophecy despite this difficulty, but "had to adjust" his "view of things." He alluded to his poor reputation concerning his stance upon the spirit of prophecy and sympathized with the question posed by Benson noting:

I have gone through the personal experience myself over that very thing that you speak of. If we correct it here and correct it there, how are we going to stand with it in the other places?

His solution seemed to be to distinguish between the books that he judged were prepared largely by Mrs. White and those "prepared by others for sale to the public," while at the same time asserting, inconsistently, that he would not draw a line "between what was authoritative and what was not."²⁵

The Conference concluded without answering ^[BENSON'S] this basic question. Perhaps it was not equipped to do so. Perhaps the range of alternatives was not given a wide enough hearing. Perhaps a varying view of the nature of the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy needed to be combined with the views represented at the Conference.

During his last discussion on the spirit of prophecy at the Conference, Daniells alluded to his in-depth exposure to the workings of that gift within the church. Indeed, very few were alive by 1919 who had a more thorough exposure to the spirit of prophecy than A. G. Daniells. Note this statement made to the Conference delegates:

All these years since the Battle Creek controversy began I have been face to face with this question of the testimonies. I have met all the doubters, the chief ones, and have dealt with it in ministerial institutes, and have talked it over and over until I am thoroughly familiar with it, whether I am straight or not. I do not know that there is a crook or a kink in it that I have not heard brought up by these men that have fallen away from us.²⁶

A glimpse at some of the questions raised during the controversy with J. H. Kellogg and A. T. Jones in Battle Creek might be helpful in gaining a perspective of Daniells' and others' attitudes toward the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy.

KELLOGG-JONES CRISIS

As the Kellogg-Jones crisis was approaching a peak of intensity, George Butler, former president of the General Conference wrote the current president, A. G. Daniels, his reaction:

It is a terrible, terrible thing! and are we going into the conflict before us . . . the great and closing conflict, with two camps wrangling with each other, Arthur? I do not believe it is possible, unless we get this thing fixed up in some way, and union restored, to go on without being terribly crippled for years, and the loss of many souls.

A fundamental element of the wrangling mentioned by Butler concerned conflicting interpretations of the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy.²⁷

The attitude that both John Harvey Kellogg and Alonzo T. Jones had toward the spirit of prophecy seemed to preclude or at least to sharply minimize the possibility of considering the context of the message given or of "interpreting" it. When urged, in 1905, to explain or have A. T. Jones explain a pre-1900 testimony relating to medical work Kellogg stated, "I don't know that it needs explanation. There is just the statement there." Jones commented, "I never explain the Testimonies. I believe them." Kellogg agreed with that position and affirmed:

What is the use of trying to explain what the Lord is doing, what the Lord says. The Lord says it as he wants to say it.

A little later during this same meeting, Kellogg reiterated this attitude:

I am not going to explain what the Lord says. I am not going to try to. When I read my Bible I believe the Bible--the word the Lord has sent to me, and I will just get out of it all I can. I will ask the Lord to interpret that to me so I can understand it. I read the Testimonies in just the same way.²⁸

Jones affirmed that his understanding of the inspiration of the testimonies was undercut when he could not explain a seeming inconsistency. Like Kellogg he refused to explain or consider the changing circumstances when he related to the spirit of prophecy. Jones told the congregation at the Battle Creek Tabernacle:

I have not a cent's worth of respect for any such plea as is made too often and especially of late years on 'Testimonies up-to-date'; as if a Testimony up-to-date is to take the place of all that ever went before it. Mahomet taught that doctrine as to his revelations--that the last revelation took the place of all that went before it. But God's revelation is not that way. God's revelation is truth, and is just as good today as it was a thousand years ago. It never gets out of date; and the last one that comes is not going to contradict, or vitiate, or set aside, or annihilate any that went before it.... No sir, the Bible is the Word of God. It is the same today as it was when Isaiah wrote it, when Amos wrote it, when Hosea wrote it, when Paul wrote it, and will be the same after the world is ended and gone. It is so with the Testimonies, too, as certainly as they are the truth of God.²⁹

Jones thus reacted strongly against those who he believed "explained away," or took a "broad view" of the testimonies, and he considered that they were violating the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy. He likewise continued to believe that the testimony applying to the presidency of the General Conference in 1897 continued to have relevance in 1906 and thus Daniells was not loyal to the testimonies since the testimony stated that it was not wise to have one man as president. He rejected all explanations of that testimony, noting that "whenever it has been quoted it has been explained, instead of obeyed,

and doubtless will be so to the end." He noted that everyone agreed that the testimony stated that there should not be one president, but it was always explained to mean something "different from what it says." He concluded:

Why must we be required to accept all these explanations of what the Testimonies mean, instead of being left free to believe them for just what they say? Can not we be allowed to believe what is said in plain words? Shall we not be allowed to know what we know? Must we accept the General Conference explanation of everything? If that be so, then what need have we of the Testimonies, the Bible, our own faculties and senses, or anything else than just the "General Conference" explanation?³⁰

Jones was so firmly tied to his concept of inspiration that when word came to him that Mrs. White asked him among others to write to her their perplexities concerning her writings so that she might explain them, Jones wrote her that upon that consideration he would not write because:

Such a proposition in itself surrenders at once the whole ground of the claim in behalf of your writings as the word of God, or as given by inspiration of God. For if the writings were really the word of God--a. They need no explanation. b. If the writings to be explained were not the word of God, then I would not want any explanation of them; for I would not care any more for them than for any other writings that were not the word of God.³¹

Another tendency present in both Jones and Kellogg was their tendency to state their conclusions in a rather absolute manner. Because Jones believed that the 1907 Sabbath School lessons on the covenants directly contradicted the conclusions resulting from the message of justification by faith that he was so completely involved with during the decade of the 1890s, he asserted:

In these Sabbath School lessons regularly produced by "the denomination," and used by the denomination for the religious and doctrinal instruction of the denomination, it stands undisputable that the Seventh-day Adventist "denomination" stands so committed to sheer legalism that they have involved in it the very universe of God.... So far as in their power lies, [the denomination] have actually committed the created universe and even the Creator Himself to that same covenant of bondage of self-righteousness.

Jones' absolutism did not permit him to accept explanation that the judgment of the Sabbath School Department in publishing the lessons or the author

in writing them, did not commit the denomination to that position. He asserted that, if the Kellogg book, Living Temple, had been published by the Sabbath School Department and studied as quarterly lessons,

then it would be as certain as any thing can be, that the denomination would have been committed to the "LIVING TEMPLE" as a denominational book, and its teachings as denominational doctrine.³²

The same type of position seemed to be taken by Jones when the ninth volume of the Testimonies was published in 1909. Because of the intensity of his belief that the article "Sunday Labor" in that volume contradicted earlier Ellen White statements on the Sunday question, Jones issued a pamphlet entitled "The Ten Commandments for Sunday Observance," asserting that the "SDA Denomination and 'organized work' stands publicly committed to Sunday observance."

He wrote Daniells:

I cannot imagine what "the denomination" or "organized work" could now possibly do that would cause me to write or address anything more to Seventh-day Adventists or concerning them as distinct from any other Sunday keepers or worshippers of the beast and his image. Therefore from now on you can safely count that the Seventh-day Adventist "denomination" and "organized work," as distinct from any other church factions or Sunday keepers will be perfectly free from any "attacks" or "opposition" from me.³³

The Jones and Kellogg position on the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy that minimized context and interpretation seemed to place them in a situation where a choice between only two alternatives was possible. They could totally reject the messages that they had been following for years or they could find some explanation that could deal with seemingly inconsistent messages. They followed the latter route and concluded that some of Mrs. White's testimonies were influenced by others. Thus not all that she wrote was to be considered inspired. Once they placed themselves into the position of having to decide which of the writings were inspired and which were not, it seemed merely a question of time before they no longer would feel comfortable

in the church. When Daniells reminded Jones of his stance on the testimonies in the 1890s when Jones "used them with great force to wheel men and policies into line," Jones agreed that that was the case, but continued:

Every soul knows that I never was partial in them, that I never used some with pile-driver force, while utterly ignoring or explaining away others just as plain and definite. The brethren, and the people, know well that whenever I was advocating a matter and some one produced a Testimony to the contrary, instead of explaining it away I stopped instantly and changed my course accordingly. And that was because of my loyalty to the Testimonies. And that loyalty to the Testimonies was because I believed--honestly and truly believed--that everything that was written and sent out as Testimony was Testimony from the Lord. To that belief and that confidence I was as true as it is possible for a man to be. But that trust and that confidence have been betrayed. And by that betrayal I have been compelled--most reluctantly compelled, I assure you--yet literally compelled to yield that position.³⁴

Ellen White considered that the Kellogg-Jones crisis was "undermining the foundation pillars of the faith." She noticed the "misrepresentations and falsehoods" regarding the testimonies and warned that:

Very adroitly some have been working to make of no effect the Testimonies of warning and reproof that have stood the test for half a century. At the same time, they deny doing any such thing.

In considering the "undermining," Mrs. White frequently alluded to the question of the alleged human influence on the testimonies. She noted that many had gone into infidelity through the position "somebody has told Sister White." She pointed out:

Unless there is a breaking away from the influence that Satan has prepared, and a reviving of the testimonies that God has given, souls will perish in their delusion. They will accept fallacy after fallacy, and will thus keep up a disunion that will always exist until those who have been deceived take their stand on the right platform.³⁵

The Kellogg-Jones crisis was only the beginning of the disunion over the spirit of prophecy that was to plague the denomination in the early years of the century. Other apostasies sprang from and operated in conjunction with or independently of the Battle Creek faction. The element that most had in common

was their conclusion that portions of the spirit of prophecy writings could be taken as uninspired.

THE "DAILY"

As the "daily" controversy erupted within the denomination, the intensity of the Battle Creek crisis and the consequences of the attacks of other apostasies, served to solidify the contending views into two camps relative to the question of the nature of the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy.

Positions solidified according to interpretations of Dan. 8:11-13 and a statement made in Early Writings:

Yea, he magnified himself even to the prince of the host, and by him the daily sacrifice was taken away, and the place of his sanctuary was cast down. And an host was given him against the daily sacrifice by reason of transgression, and it cast down the truth to the ground; and it practised, and prospered. Then I heard one saint speaking, and another saint said unto that certain saint which spake, How long shall be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot? (Dan. 8:11-13)

Then I saw in relation to the "daily" (Dan. 8:12), that the word "sacrifice" was supplied by man's wisdom, and does not belong to the text; and that the Lord gave the correct view of it to those who gave the judgment hour cry. When union existed, before 1844, nearly all were united on the correct view of the "daily," but in the confusion since 1844, other views have been embraced, and darkness and confusion have followed. Time has not been a test since 1844, and it will never again be a test.³⁶

The "old view" or "pioneer position" of the "daily" interpreted it, as did almost all the Millerites, to refer to ancient Roman paganism, while the "new view" interpreted the term to refer to the taking away of the knowledge of Christ's priestly mediation in the heavenly sanctuary by instituting a false sanctuary system. One view depended primarily upon the literal reading of the Early Writings statement, while the other emphasized the contextual background to the statement.

STEPHEN HASKELL

In May of 1920, Stephen Haskell, at age 87, reflected upon the denominational events of the previous 15 years. By 1920 he saw within the church "two classes of critics of the sharpest kind." He observed that one side criticized everything that did not seem in complete harmony with the spirit of prophecy, while the other exhibited a disposition "to show in some way [it] cannot be relied upon." He was amazed that certain people within these groups were so familiar with and had access to the unpublished letters of Ellen White. Haskell saw the camps preparing "for a battle of the fiercest kind." One group was preparing to "defend the old position" at all costs and the other seemed to be preparing, at all costs, to "improve" the positions to conform to the "present status of society." Haskell concluded:

One might think that the Controversy will in the end, be among Seventh-day Adventists whether [the spirit of prophecy] writings as given in the past will stand the test or not.

He informed W. C. White, "Of course you know where I stand."³⁷

Fourteen years earlier Haskell noted a crisis within the church and reacted to it by publishing an article in the Review designed to deal with the Kellogg-Jones issues. In relating himself to the question of human influence over the testimonies, he used the example of Paul's writings and questions raised during Bible times that intimated that Paul sometimes was influenced by others, and thus, whether there should be distinctions drawn within his writings. Haskell pointed out that it was the letters Paul received from the household of Chloe that informed him "that the state of things existed which he had seen in vision would exist." This brought Haskell to his conclusion:

God shows his prophets what will be, and then when circumstances arise, or the prophet has his attention called to it by private letters, he writes what he has seen. It is the same among the people of God today who have drifted away from the old landmarks, and who follow their own understanding.... It is thus demonstrated by

the Bible alone that Testimonies, letters, symbolic actions, and verbal statements of a prophet are all of the same force.

Haskell pointed out that he was not implying that everything a prophet stated was necessarily inspired of God, but he did fear that "the severest conflict ... that the people of God will pass through ... will be over the Testimonies of the spirit of prophecy."³⁸

Stephen Haskell, as did many who supported the "pioneer position" of the "daily," claimed a rich heritage and intense feeling because of the guidance of the spirit of prophecy in his experience. As a young minister in the 1860s, Stephen Haskell was given instruction by James White that called for him to place his faith directly in God for guidance in his ministry and not to depend upon others to instruct him. James White told Haskell that God could instruct him by His spirit. From that time onward, Haskell understood and lived believing that God gave him his ministerial instructions by the spirit of prophecy. From that time onward, he wrote Mrs. White in 1909, "your testimonies as far as I have understood them have been my counsellors."³⁹

In his discussions of the issues involved in the "daily" debate, Haskell frequently relegated the theological questions to an extremely minor position. Nevertheless, he pursued the subject with all the vigor at his disposal, believing that it was necessary "to save the cause of God and those who believe the old views on the teachings of the spirit of prophecy." Haskell stated that the question of the "daily" itself did not "amount to a hill of beans" and caused him shame that it consumed any of his time. He noted that he never had preached on the subject since embracing the truth in 1852-53. He alleged that if it was merely the question of the "daily" he would not have published anything on the subject. He wrote to C. C. Crisler:

If God will forgive me for having this correspondence over this daily I think I will never be caught in such a trap again. I will simply give the

testimonies and let the issue go on that. And, if Sister White says that she does not mean what she said, when she said what she did on the daily, then I will say no more.⁴⁰

Haskell believed that the vital question was the proper position for the spirit of prophecy to occupy within the church. He believed the question was not between him and the "daily," but rather between him "and the Early Writings."

He continued:

It is the Early Writings that I would defend and as long as I believe they teach the view I take, and there are many others that believe the same, and if Sister White does not give any explanation in harmony with Prescott's idea to defend the Testimony for the sake of others I shall defend them. (sic) Must I be made to believe the testimonies teach a certain thing, contrary to my own judgment and the reading of the Writings, when Sister White herself does not so explain it?⁴¹

Haskell believed that the "new view" lent support to those who claimed that the spirit of prophecy was manipulated to mean differently than what it read and also that it could be changed because of differing circumstances or varying influences upon Mrs. White. He believed that concept would destroy the credibility of the spirit of prophecy. "And right here is the worst affect of these new views on our people," wrote Haskell to Mrs. White. He believed that once the leadership of the church accepted the position that the testimonies "do not mean what they say," the church would compromise away the spirit of prophecy.⁴²

Haskell had the firm conviction that the years of labor he and other pioneers wrought in the work gave them a special mission as the "latter days" approached. He thus placed emphasis upon the position of the living pioneers on the subject of the "daily." He seemed to sense a certain estrangement between himself and the General Conference leadership because he did not endorse their position on the "daily," and he believed it relevant, he pointed out to Mrs. White, that "not a single old Sabbath-keeper that has had experience in getting out the foundation principles of our faith ... believes in this 'new

light.' " He again wrote her:

I see quite clearly there are breakers ahead. I also see there must be some who will give the Testimonies that you have given no uncertain sound. If not so, then the cause will be undermined by errors creeping in. They are coming in from all sides. Someone must be more familiar with your writings so, from the Bible, and from your testimonies, be prepared to defend the truth.

The next year he wrote Mrs. White concerning the "daily" debate:

Every person who had an experience in the early days of the message do (sic) not wish to discuss this question. They feel that it is an insult to the Spirit of the Lord, to go to the Lord and pray for light on a matter that He has settled.... There is no hope of these old people who lived back in the early days of the Message being converted to this new light; even if [others] bring volumes of histories to prove it. Because they give more for one expression in your testimony than for all the histories you could stack between here and Calcutta.

Haskell saw hope, he wrote Mrs. White, because such younger leaders as G. A. Irwin, I. H. Evans, Dr. Kress, F. C. Gilbert, O. A. Johnson, and Leon Smith, did not accept the "new view." He believed that the main thrust of Satan's attack during the contemporary period was his attack upon the spirit of prophecy. He wrote W. C. White, "Your mother alone cannot give the straight testimony. There must be some raised up that will stand by what your mother has written."⁴³

In addition to his position of refusing to divide the spirit of prophecy into inspired and uninspired parts, Haskell expressed himself upon other questions relating to the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy. While he did not believe Mrs. White was infallible, Haskell considered the writings inspired on the same basis as the Biblical writings. He considered Mrs. White as much a prophet as Biblical prophets and that the writings should be interpreted as would Biblical writings. Indeed, Haskell seemed to consider the spirit of prophecy as an extension of the Biblical writings. He wrote to Daniells in 1910 that he considered the "testimonies as the spirit of prophecy, precisely the same as is the book of Daniel, Revelation, or other books of the Bible." He also considered

the Bible "as being so plain that, if a person will read it, and adhere to the reading, they will find the truth." He believed that, just as the New Testament magnified the Old, so did the spirit of prophecy magnify the Bible.⁴⁴

Given this position, Haskell believed that a study of the spirit of prophecy writings would "settle nearly every point that people question at the present time concerning the message." While he believed that the foundations were established by Bible study, he also believed that those pillars were confirmed by the spirit of prophecy. He alleged that there was no question of interpreting the "daily" amongst the early SDAs "for they took it for granted that the Early Writings settled it." Since Haskell believed that the "old view" of the "daily" had been established by a vision given to Mrs. White, he could not endorse a position that would, according to him, revise "a sentence, or paragraph" from those writings.⁴⁵

Just as Haskell believed that only another prophet would be qualified to distinguish between inspired and uninspired writings, so he emphasized that "none but inspiration can single out a clause and say it means different (sic) from the words used." He would thus accept no other evidence on the question of the "daily" than the words of Mrs. White stating that she did not mean to use the term "daily" in her statement in Early Writings. Haskell affirmed:

If the whole United States, and Europe, Australia, and Africa should rise up and proclaim that view correct, it would make no difference to me, unless the testimony of Sister White should say so. There is no use in being like a leaf in the wind, swayed to and fro.⁴⁶

Although Haskell opposed revising and even editing of the spirit of prophecy writings, he did so from the standpoint of the credibility of the writings, not on the basis of their supposed verbal inspiration. He wrote Mrs. White in 1909 and expressed his hope that her words might be available "as they were written," since he believed that much of the "power and vitality," was removed

by her assistants in making them "readable and adapted to the present condition of things and the people." He reacted similarly, he said, to the revised version of the Bible. Haskell considered that James White, in his editing of the writings had a special ability in "editing them without taking you out of them." He reacted very negatively to substantive changes that seemed to be called for by those who believed the writings needed to be harmonized with history or made to accommodate new believers or varying conditions. He opposed L. R. Conradi's "modifications." He wrote W. C. White:

If you have had the experience that I have had in meeting this matter of dropping out and of changing your mother's writings, you never would allow one sentence to be dropped out, or changed, in her writings that have gone before the public. We have enemies of our faith that are watching just such points, and when they find one they make big capital of it.

Obviously referring to the Kellogg-Jones situation, Haskell continued:

It is the dropping out of some of these things from what has been published in your mother's writings, and the changing of some things, that has (sic) been taken advantage of by the enemies of truth and today is the cause of some of our best brethren losing confidence in you; because they think you change your mother's writings and call it "editing."⁴⁷

Haskell affirmed that he could respond to every criticism he ever heard raised against the spirit of prophecy except the one woman who publicly asked, "Can you prove from the Bible that a prophet ever had sons that changed the prophet's testimony, and called it 'editing?'" His only response, Haskell stated, was that he could prove from the Bible "that prophets had sons that did not always do right, and their not doing right tested the people." He hoped that White would excuse his bluntness but, he said, it was a point upon which he was sensitive.⁴⁸

In 1918 Stephen Haskell recalled a conversation with Mrs. White some 40 years previous. According to Haskell, Mrs. White predicted there would be a time when the testimonies would be in demand "just as they were originally

given in order to meet objections before we got through." Two years later Haskell wrote that such a demand was called for "almost everywhere I go." The demand was based upon the attacks charging that the writings had been altered to suit circumstances.⁴⁹

Haskell seemed to be working toward a methodology that would satisfy this need and also to deal with the concept of progressive revelation, for he realized that the health question "like every other point of truth has developed," and Mrs. White "wrote more fully as the people were prepared to receive the light." He recalled that Mrs. White said that there was a time when it was right to eat flesh, but there would also be a time in the future when it would be unsafe. Haskell believed that science indicated that that time had "about come," in 1920. He thus believed that, while the earlier writings should not be altered, later spirit of prophecy statements that indicated how that truth had been magnified and developed should be included with the original statements.⁵⁰

Some three months before his death, S. N. Haskell sent to F. M. Wilcox his parting statement "in favor of the fundamental principles of present truth." The five-page statement reiterated his belief in the nature of the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy. He believed that "every inspired writer points to God as its author, but it is written by human hands in the words of men." He recognized the fallibility of a prophet, but considered his testimony to be infallible. If God speaks through a prophet, "then his testimony is on par with that of every other prophet." He recognized that change in the individual or group to whom a testimony was directed could cause a change in the application of the testimony. The messages of a prophet might not be explained by human reasoning, but still were to be followed. No one was authorized to "sit in judgment" to determine what was inspired and un-inspired "or in any way dissect any prophet's testimony."⁵¹

While space limitations prevent such analysis here, a remarkable harmony of viewpoint could also be shown in two other major "pioneer" disputants on the question of the "daily," J. N. Loughborough and G. I. Butler. Both rejected the concept of verbal inspiration as well as the concept that certain of the spirit of prophecy writings were more authoritative than others, and both considered that the "new view" of the "daily" would be destructive to the spirit of prophecy.

That harmony of viewpoint likewise extended to a newer generation of Seventh-day Adventists that also claimed a rich heritage relative to the spirit of prophecy. Such participants in the debate as F. C. Gilbert, L. A. Smith, G. A. Irwin, and G. B. Starr all considered the spirit of prophecy to be under attack. A sense of strident urgency seemed to become prevalent with the presentations of some of these defenders of the "old view." The tendency to share the contents of personal testimonies, to publicly question the orthodoxy of church leaders, and to castigate opponents for past errors began to become a prominent feature of the debate on the "daily."

CLAUDE HOLMES

Claude E. Holmes, 1881-1953, linotype operator and Washington correspondent of Southern Watchman, was among the informal attendants at the 1919 Bible and History Teachers' Conference. Raised as an Adventist, Holmes grew up in the West Union, Iowa, church, most of whose congregation consisted of "pioneer" Adventists. Holmes declared that the spirit of prophecy "was the word of God to them." He noted:

As I associated with these staunch old patriarchs Sabbath after Sabbath I imbibed some of their love and zeal for the truth.... Such an environment was not conducive to theoretical jangling over the authority and necessity for the spirit of prophecy; for to those brethren and sisters the testimony of Jesus was to be implicitly followed without question.... I spent whole winters studying the testimonies and studying Daniel and Revelation by Smith until I could almost repeat them by heart.... When I see men coming in who seek to discredit the sacred

teachings of the spirit of prophecy my righteous indignation arises and I feel stirred to contend for the faith once given to the saints.⁵²

Holmes' extensive knowledge of the spirit of prophecy writings gave him a reputation, in the days prior to available indexing, of being an authority on the writings. Review editors frequently called upon him to provide references and quotations from the writings. In addition to his memory and intense study of the writings, Holmes acquired probably the largest private collection of Ellen White writings, published and unpublished, within the denomination. Holmes' skill as a linotype operator enabled him to prepare a multitude of private spirit of prophecy compilations in type form and then pull proofs of the galleyed type at practically no expense. After W. A. Colcord left the church in 1914, Holmes borrowed and copied over 300 typewritten pages of unpublished testimonies from him. As A. G. Daniells was travelling in the Far East in 1917, Holmes convinced someone that he had Daniells' permission to copy the bound volumes of unpublished Ellen White testimonies housed in the General Conference vault. Although it resulted in his dismissal from the Review, he thereby attained possession of hundreds of personal testimonies. This access to some of the personal testimonies sent to Prescott and Daniells greatly inflamed relationships.⁵³

One of the reactions of Claude Holmes to the 1919 Bible Conference consisted of his publishing an open letter in pamphlet form. Holmes decried the statements he heard at the Conference "again and again by a number of our Bible and history teachers that Sister White is not an authority on history." He considered that position as the ultimate evil since those views would be "poured into the receptive minds of our young people to undermine their faith in the spirit of prophecy." Holmes interpreted the positions taken in 1919 to mean that the Conference concluded that Mrs. White selected relevant historical materials just as any researcher would. If the facts selected happened to be

erroneous, they should be rejected. Holmes' view of the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy totally rejected that concept. He believed that Mrs. White selected from divergent historical sources those items that she recognized as truth and thereby those items became authoritatively and infallibly true. According to Holmes, everything dealt with by a prophet became authoritative. He believed that as much inspiration was required to distinguish truth from error as was required to present original truth. He continued:

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

Holmes concluded this 11-page open letter to J. S. Washburn by emphasizing his uncompromising stance on the absolute inspiration of the spirit of prophecy. He affirmed that he drew no line "between the so-called human and divine; they are all Scripture to me."⁵⁴

Years later, Holmes again referred to the Conference in a protest he registered to the president of Emmanuel Missionary College, A. W. Johnson, and to E. R. Thiele, chairman of the Bible department. In his capacity as local elder of the West Central Church of Chicago, Holmes, in a round-table discussion in Berrien Springs in 1948, opposed the "strange and conflicting views of the prophecies," that he believed were being taught to some of the members of that church. He asserted that "when Bible teachers present views contrary to established positions, students and preachers are encouraged to do the same." He stated that the door that permitted such new views to be presented was opened during the 1919 Bible Conference.⁵⁵

An additional response of Holmes to the Conference consisted of his issuing a protest against the teachings of E. F. Albertsworth and H. C. Lacey, two of the three teachers from Washington Missionary College who attended the Conference. Besides issuing his own protest, Holmes advised certain students to do the same. Although the student protests initially involved only Professor Albertsworth, because of the alleged "light esteem" that he exhibited toward the spirit of prophecy, the upshot of the episode resulted in the severance, by mid-1920, of all three of the WMC representatives at the 1919 Conference and further problems between the General Conference and the Columbia Union.⁵⁶

J. S. WASHBURN

J. S. Washburn, 1863-1955, wrote A. G. Daniells in 1912:

Truly I have reason to regard you as one of the best friends I have on earth.... May God grant that nothing may ever sever the bonds of brotherly trust and confidence between us. An old friendship wrecked is worse than a funeral.

Daniells responded:

All you say strikes a responsive chord in my heart. I have known you from a boy on the farm, and have always felt a sort of a brotherly feeling for you.

In 1922, in an open letter to the General Conference session in San Francisco,

Washburn wrote the following to A. G. Daniells:

For years my confidence in you has been slowly dying until now it is dead beyond recall, beyond the hope of a resurrection. I am sadly forced to acknowledge that the astounding change in your attitude toward the spirit of prophecy and the message, and toward your most loyal friends and workers has so completely destroyed the trust I once had in you that it can never be restored, except by a direct miracle of God.⁵⁷

Washburn claimed a rich SDA heritage. He was converted by J. N. Andrews at 11, baptized by James White at 12 and began preaching Adventism at 21. In a state of confusion and dismay after the 1888 General Conference session that he attended, Washburn, who was a nephew of George Butler, had an interview

with Mrs. White at Ottawa, Kansas. Washburn considered that interview a turning point in his life. From that time onward he maintained complete confidence in the inspiration of Mrs. White. He wrote Mrs. White in early 1915:

I truly believe it is the complete faith in the spirit of prophecy and the study and obedience to the Testimonies that will bring the latter rain. I believe the complete acceptance of the gifts of the spirit of prophecy is the key to the situation in the last great crisis, and I do pray God that the brethren in Washington and all over the world may be faithful to the great light that God has sent to His people through the Testimony of Jesus Christ.

In addition to his intense study of the spirit of prophecy and desire to obtain "everything that Sister White wrote," Washburn's amazing memory enabled him to memorize much of the Bible and spirit of prophecy writings. By 1918 he claimed to have memorized Revelation, Romans, James and Second Peter. He noted that his memory improved "with the study of the Bible and spirit of prophecy." By 1948 he claimed to have memorized the entire New Testament and was working toward committing Isaiah to memory.⁵⁸

Although Washburn entered the debate on the "daily" somewhat humorously by writing S. N. Haskell that he was thinking of the "daily" "continually," in actuality he did not consider the "new view" at all amusing. He believed that it was ushering in the "greatest shaking our people have ever had," by causing doubt and disbelief in the spirit of prophecy and by moving the firm "prophetic framework" upon which the message was constructed.⁵⁹

Washburn heard Daniells present the "new view" at the 1910 Southern Union Conference meetings. In an all-night conversation shortly thereafter, Daniells raised some questions that, to Washburn, indicated that the president of the General Conference was seeking to destroy the spirit of prophecy. Washburn asserted that he was "simply horrified," to hear Daniells assert that Ellen White's statement on the "daily," was an "imperfect statement," and also that she had made other statements that were accepted as testimonies that

likewise were "imperfect." Daniells also stated, according to Washburn, that Mrs. White had erred in sending letters encouraging J. E. White to accept tithe funds for his work in the South. Washburn also bristled that Daniells allegedly considered A. T. Jones' attack on the "Sunday Labor" section of Volume 9 of the Testimonies as an attack that was the "hardest thing to answer" that the GC had to respond to. To Washburn, that assertion seemed to indicate that perhaps Mrs. White was in error. Washburn claimed that Daniells took the preceding positions specifically to avoid the need to accept the plain statement in Early Writings concerning the "daily." He stated:

I say brother White, in all sincerity, that the view which leads any one of our brethren to take such a position on the Testimonies is condemned by this attitude, if for no other reasons whatever, and is entirely unsafe to be held by the leaders of our work. To defend the "new view" of the "daily," he must destroy the spirit of prophecy."⁶⁰

J. S. Washburn saw the 1919 Bible Conference as the continuation of a "terrible controversy." In 1921 Washburn wrote F. M. Wilcox that he had lately feared that the latter was losing faith. He noted, "You were in that secret Bible Council which I believe was the most unfortunate thing our people ever did, and it seemed to me you were losing the simplicity of your faith." He also noted that Wilcox defended the three WMC representatives at the Conference when their teachings were brought into question before the College Board. He brought the issues of the "daily," Washington Missionary College teachers, and 1919 Bible Conference together in a 16-page open letter to Claude Holmes dated April 18, 1920. He implied that the consensus from the Conference considered that the spirit of prophecy was not inspired on history, while some considered the writings uninspired regarding theology and health reform. He alleged that the position led "inevitably to infidelity, as was demonstrated by Dr. Albertsworth, recently dismissed summarily from the faculty

by the College Board of Washington College." Washburn published the information that the Columbia Union president, a year previous, attempted to rid the college of the three "infidel" teachers, but that the General Conference came to their assistance and instead "forced out of office," that president. He noted that, although the three teachers differed in other beliefs, all three united in advocating "the new doctrine of the daily as taught by Professor Prescott" and others. Washburn identified the denominational origins of the "new view" with E. J. Waggoner, A. T. Jones, and J. H. Kellogg, and thence to W. W. Prescott. He additionally attributed the decline in enrollment at WMC to the teaching of the "new view" there. He pictured that view as

besieging and threatening to desolate and destroy the work of God's last message at its headquarters, at its very heart.... Here is a remnant of the new phase of the world-old apostasy at our headquarters and in our principal Bible School.

Washburn assured the readers of his pamphlet that the three teachers would not be teaching at the college the next year. The "Omega apostasy" had received a setback at Washington Missionary College, he affirmed.⁶¹

While the controversy intensified from that point onward, it was to reach a still more volatile point at the 1922 General Conference session. Washburn offered hints of his future intentions a year earlier in correspondence with F. M. Wilcox:

You say again, "If you feel that the cause of truth is jeopardized by men occupying positions of responsibility, then it would be proper for you to state your convictions that the wrong may be righted." I do truly feel, I am certain that it is so, and I must say so at the proper time.... The time is surely coming soon when these questions will go before a wider tribunal than the General Conference Committee.⁶²

Two open letters to A. G. Daniells, dated May 1, 1922, were among the items circulated to the delegates at the San Francisco General Conference session in 1922. Claude Holmes began his letter by recalling a previous sermon

by Daniells where the latter denied the accusation that the leadership of the GC "did not believe and follow the spirit of prophecy." Holmes then listed 12 specific areas wherein he believed that Daniells ignored or subverted spirit of prophecy counsel. Holmes concluded:

I firmly believe that the deplorable conditions found in the church today are due largely to the course you have followed. In all seriousness I ask: Should men be leaders in our work year after year who neglect to follow God's counsel and persist in following their own way?⁶³

Washburn's 36-page open letter was even more comprehensive in its accusations. He again accused Daniells of seeking to destroy the spirit of prophecy in order to uphold his teaching on the "daily." He recalled the all-night 1910 talk that shattered his faith in Daniells. Washburn stated that those "criticisms" were "burned into my very soul, and have been from that very moment and will be there till the day of judgment." The roots of the "daily" theology and the Washington Missionary College episode were discussed. He noted that, in his defense before the WMC Board one of the teachers considered that "he was teaching in harmony with the Bible Institute that had been held in Washington during the summer of 1919." That teacher, according to Washburn, stated that the Institute "taught that the spirit of prophecy was not inspired on history," while some at the Institute believed it also was not inspired on questions of health reform or theology. Washburn considered the Conference as representing a meeting of "doubters":

Two of our best writers told me that articles on the Turkish question were kept out of our papers since that secret council had thrown doubt on that question and many others. So while Islam is gathering her millions for the last great fulfillment of the prophecy of Daniel 11th and 12th chapter, our papers, our ministers, our sentinels are chloroformed to sleep, are muzzled into silence by this Council of Darkness, this Diet of Doubts. Was not this secret council a crowning act in the program of doubt and darkness and criticism that has been enveloping Washington recently? Will this bring the latter rain, the full assurance of faith and the victorious life? And you and Professor Prescott were the leading figures in that Institute. No doubt you found it impossible to agree with all the new chaotic theology of that council, but Elder Daniells, how could you permit such a dangerous parade of doubts, and preside over such a cloud of misty higher criticism? Did that institute cure the

the criticism you tell me is destroying our work? No, it multiplied it a hundred times. And you more than any other man are responsible.

Washburn concluded by appealing to the delegates for an investigation of all his charges. He stated that he was not fearful "that the representatives of our people will turn me down or out for standing for the original message and the spirit of prophecy." He was appealing, Washburn said, "not to any small committee or to a secret Council like that of the summer of 1919, but to the representatives of God's chosen people in open session assembled."⁶⁴

Washburn claimed that his "Open Letter" was largely instrumental in defeating Daniells' opportunities for reelection to the GC presidency in 1922. Indeed, San Francisco newspaper accounts depicted Daniells emotionally defending his leadership, but decrying the bitter attacks against him and holding a "handful of written documents, which he said were the proofs of his charges of propaganda and villification."⁶⁵

The defeat of Daniells in 1922 did not end the basic alignments that had begun to solidify much earlier. The Bible versions controversy, the Columbia Union-General Conference friction, the reorganization battles over the 1931 Omaha Fall Council decisions, and even the manual used by the Young People's Missionary Volunteer Society, all resulted in conflict during the 1930s, and all directly related to a basic difference of interpretation over the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy. After the Omaha Council, Washburn identified another believer in the "new view" of the "daily" who apostasized: L. R. Conradi. He noted:

Many who are counted leading men, writers and editors among us teach this same doctrine.... For many years the Columbia Union has been engaged in a great fight of faith, a fight to preserve the original teachings of our great Message and confidence in the guidance of the Holy Spirit through the spirit of prophecy.... Thank God for the spirit of prophecy.⁶⁶

By 1932, F. M. Wilcox noticed disastrous consequences from the alienation. He noted that entire churches were stirred up and that college students were

lining up their teachers as to whether they were "fundamentalist" or "modernist." Wilcox wrote C. H. Watson, president of the General Conference, that he believed it was necessary for the General Conference to "re-establish itself in the confidence of our people against the onslaughts which have been made upon [it] ... by misguided individuals for a series of years."⁶⁷

W. W. PRESCOTT

Somewhat facetiously, William Warren Prescott, 1855-1944, informed the delegates to the 1919 Bible and History Teachers' Conference: "I would like to be understood as being a conservative. I thought I would have to proclaim it to you myself." The stenographic notes of the Conference indicated that "laughter" followed the statement.⁶⁸

Although the subject of the "daily" was not on the agenda to be discussed in 1919, and although it was not formally discussed as a topic, the general philosophy and central conclusions of the "new view" were, in a sense, given during the 20 presentations of W. W. Prescott on "The Person of Christ," and "The Mediation of Christ," the title of his daily worship series. Although he had not used the term "daily," because of his use of the Revised Version of the Bible that enabled an emphasis upon the term "continual," Prescott clearly presented the "new view." He emphasized:

"Our message against the beast and his image centers right here, and that is to give Christ the place that belongs to him. When we are preaching the person of Christ, as we have been doing here, we are preaching against the papacy, even though we do not mention the papacy.... The vital thing is to give Christ his place as the living head of the church.... His priesthood is a continual priesthood. His sacrifice is a continual sacrifice. His ministry is a continual ministry. All growing out of the fact that he in his own person continued. Now if you take away this, you despoil Christianity.... Our continual experience is based upon his continual ministration. Our ability to continue as Christians, our ability to continue personally is based upon the Person of Him who continues, and that is based upon his word in his continual service for us.... The continual sacrifice goes on. It is one sacrifice for sin continually, and we shall live because he gives himself to us continually.... So the whole question of our Christian experience, our ability to work for him is all bound up in this one thing. Then when the Papacy strikes at this

one thing it strikes at that which will demolish Christianity. And that is its purpose: to abolish Christianity and put a man in Christ's place. ... We must restore the law of God as interpreted by Christ. We must restore the dealing with that law as revealed in the scriptures. We must restore to the people the means of obeying that law, or else we are not giving this message to the world.⁶⁹

As did other debaters on the "daily" question, Prescott believed he saw in the subject elements of truth that far transcended the immediate theological issue. As early as 1907 he stated that he believed his view of Daniel 8 established a "much more vital connection with the real heart of this message" than had been possible under the previous interpretation. He believed that the "new view" enabled a knowledge of the mediatorial work of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary that the denomination was especially called upon to present to the world just as the counterfeit mediatorial system was designed to encompass the world within its false system. He and others attached a special significance to the particular time in Adventist history when light was shining upon this view since it seemed to come at the time when Adventism was moving strongly into Roman Catholic countries. While the message exposed the false sanctuary, Prescott believed it also called the world to a restoration of the pure Word of God and supplied the power necessary for obedience to the law of God by faith in Christ's mediatorial work.⁷⁰

Through his pamphlet, " 'The Daily': A Brief Reply to Two Leaflets on This Subject," through Protestant Magazine, of which he was editor from 1909 to 1916, through union conference sessions and ministerial institutes, through Sabbath School lessons that he prepared, and through correspondence with teachers and students, Prescott continued to espouse his views of the "daily."⁷¹

Prescott envisioned a somewhat different role for the spirit of prophecy within the church than those who supported the "old view" of the "daily." He considered that the Bible should be its own interpreter and that appeal should

not be made to some other "visible authority" to interpret the Scriptures. Such methodology, he affirmed, would eventually result in being led step by step to substituting other authority for that of the Bible. Such a condition, he believed, would enfeeble and render uncertain the Christian experience of the church membership. Prescott thus opposed submitting the question of the "daily" to Mrs. White for her decision, as others had suggested. While he favored any explanation she might offer as to what her vision concerning the "daily" encompassed, he asserted that he did not consider that it was Mrs. White's "province to act as judge in mere matters of historical or Biblical" interpretation. Prescott believed that there was danger in asserting too great a claim upon the spirit of prophecy for in so doing, he believed that when historical evidence clearly refuted interpretations of the gift, that the gift would then be discredited and lose its authority amongst the membership. Prescott placed great stress upon the study of the context of statements made by Mrs. White in arriving at a correct understanding of her message.⁷²

L. R. CONRADI

Louis R. Conradi, 1856-1939, leader of SDA work in Europe, likewise emphasized the Scriptures as its own expositor. He rejoiced at Mrs. White's counsel of August, 1910, that those engaged in the debate on the "daily" should refrain from using her writings to support their position since she had no clear light on the subject. Conradi hoped that the counsel could be accepted as a general principle for the future. He decried the weakness of the position of the "pioneers" and their evidence in support of their views of the "daily," and stated: "No wonder that some of its defenders should clamor for 'an infallible interpreter of the Word of God' to give the lacking support." Conradi had espoused his "new view" of the "daily" as early as 1898, and considered that the denomination exposed a "terrible weakness" by allowing Uriah Smith's work to continue to be circulated with what he considered an "untenable position" on the "daily"

in it. Conradi considered that "it shows the lack of backbone" within the denomination. He had successfully prevented Smith's books from being published in England unless they were revised and intended to continue to adhere to that policy, he wrote Daniells. "I believe that it is our duty as watchmen to see that the truth is proclaimed and written on every point," he wrote in 1910.⁷³

Even as two varying positions on the question of the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy seemed to be solidified in the United States, so did such positions begin to develop in Europe. In 1910 a missionary to the Turkish mission, Z. G. Baharian informed W. C. White and W. A. Spicer of increasing doubts concerning the spirit of prophecy. These doubts, according to Baharian, came largely from L. R. Conradi and were also held by the superintendent of the Turkish Mission, E. E. Frauchiger.

Baharian traced the roots of the differing positions to about 1898 when the question of health reform began to be introduced to Europe. He directly broached the question of the spirit of prophecy in a council meeting in Constantinople in October, 1910, at which Conradi was present. According to Baharian, Conradi spent some time seeking to prove that the Ellen White writings could be divided according to varying degrees of inspiration, consisting largely of two parts: testimonies which were largely revelations from God and other works that, while the subject matter was guided by the Holy Spirit, the content could contain errors and Conradi affirmed that he himself had corrected some of these "errors." According to Baharian both Conradi and Frauchiger denied that the writings on health reform were inspired. Baharian thus concluded that that position indicated "that her writings are not a safe guide to us." He noted, "What an awful thing it is that one minister should teach one way and another minister another way. We have many battles yet to fight. May God pity His people."⁷⁴

T. E. Bowen, GC office secretary, writing on behalf of the traveling W. A. Spicer, did not respond to the substantive questions raised by Baharian, but did note:

This is a live question ... and affects not only your field, but affects others, and is really no new issue raised; for it is constantly up here as well as in Turkey.

Because of the difficulties to deal with such a basic question by correspondence, W. C. White urged that Baharian meet with A. G. Daniells during a forthcoming meeting at Friedensau. He hoped that Daniells could bring Conradi, Frauchiger, and Baharian together for a discussion of the broad subject of the "authenticity and the use" of the spirit of prophecy as well as the proper manner of teaching the question of health reform "in a new field."⁷⁵

Although the opportunity for a meeting with Conradi at Friedensau did not occur because of the time factor and because Daniells feared Conradi would be "tired and nervous," Daniells did discuss issues in Constantinople with the members of the Turkish Mission. Daniells gained the impression that Baharian represented one extreme on the question while Frauchiger the opposite extreme. He refused to discuss Conradi's position on the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy since he feared such views might be misrepresented. Daniells believed his presentation of the subject served to caution Baharian "with reference to taking a radical position." He dealt with the "fundamental principles underlying the spirit of prophecy and its varied forms, as well as "quite fully with the question" of book revision. Daniells noted that "the interview was a very pleasant one, and they all expressed themselves as being very grateful and well satisfied." Daniells made the following observation to W. C. White:

I had a similar meeting with the brethren and sisters in Odessa. I find that there is an influence going out from this country [United States] to all those lands, to undermine confidence in the spirit of prophecy. The thing is in the air, and it must be dealt with promptly and wisely. Our

leaders must take a consistent, Biblical position--one in harmony with both the Scriptures and the actual facts as they exist. Then I believe they can stand their ground and establish our people immovably upon this phase of our message and work.⁷⁶

A. G. DANIELLS

A. G. Daniells, 1858-1935, considered the contextual relationship to spirit of prophecy statements to be vital. In a two-day question-and-answer session on the spirit of prophecy at a Boulder, Colorado, camp meeting in 1906, Daniells had several occasions to deal with questions involving contextual relationships to the writings. A former church member wanted to know how it was possible for the administrator of the Boulder Sanitarium, who was an ordained minister, to continue in his position in view of the fact that Mrs. White, in a Review and Herald article spoke against ministers performing largely administrative duties. Daniells urged against "taking such a radical position as that." He believed that the health condition of the individual involved offered a logical exception to the general counsel. He applied that same principle to the statement that "no one man should be president of the General Conference." Daniells believed that A. T. Jones had stretched that statement to make it teach something entirely out of harmony with the obvious purpose for which the testimony was given. He urged that "it will not do to take a single statement and stretch it beyond its purpose and meaning."⁷⁷

Daniells addressed himself to the question of contextual considerations again when he responded to questions raised by a minister in Missouri concerning the apparent contradiction on the question of Sunday labor that appeared in Volume 9 of the Testimonies with what had appeared in earlier Testimonies. Daniells considered that the questions were fundamental in relation to the spirit of prophecy. He wrote W. C. White:

Beyond all question there is at work now an underground current of influence that is undermining confidence in your mother's writings. And I believe that unless we take a consistent, defensible position we shall be driven into very hard places where the cause will suffer great loss. But I feel sure that if we claim only what your father and mother claimed in the beginning, and what you yourself believe regarding the spirit of prophecy, we shall be able to stand against all these influences, and make Sister White's writings of continued value and service to this cause.

In responding to the minister, Daniells cautioned several times against "taking extreme positions" on the subject. He urged that the Testimonies, as well as the Bible should be studied as a whole to understand its component parts.⁷⁸

He then presented the contextual background for the position taken in Vol. 9 regarding Sunday labor: the testimony was written concerning Sunday legislation in Australia at a time when the leadership there vitally needed such counsel. It was also written with the stern, unyielding position taken by the European leadership in an earlier crisis that resulted in authorities closing the Basle publishing house, selling its facilities to pay fines, and jailing the leader of the work in Europe. Believing that other areas of the world might need similar counsel, Mrs. White, according to Daniells, published that testimony in Volume 9. He continued:

I do not believe that the testimonies in Volume 9 contradict any former testimonies with regard to Sunday labor or any other points. We should bear in mind that Christian experience is progressive, and that the Testimonies have taught advanced principles year by year as the work has progressed and as the people have been prepared to receive new light. If you examine the first volumes of the Testimonies, you will find that only the A B C of many principles and truths were at first presented. These have been developed from time to time since. One who is hunting for technicalities and trying to find a basis for doubts will have opportunity to find apparent discrepancies in the Testimonies. This might also be said of the Scriptures. The Lord has seen fit to present the truth in such a way that those who are inclined to doubt can always find a peg on which to hang their doubts. It is my conviction, however, that there is a beautiful harmony running through all the Testimonies.

When Daniells sent a copy of his response to W. C. White, the latter read it to A. T. Robinson, C. C. Crisler and Mrs. White and W. C. White noted

that they said "Amen, to what you have written." White asked Daniells' permission to make copies of the letter to distribute to others. He wrote Haskell that he considered it a "clear and forceful defense of Testimony Vol. 9, and of Mother's work in general." He was sure Haskell would enjoy reading it.⁷⁹

Daniells was first exposed to the Prescott-Conradi position on the "daily" in traveling through Europe from Australia to the 1901 GC session. Although he did not immediately immerse himself in the subject, he eventually concluded that their position by "undeniable, indisputable facts" was correct. As did almost everyone who engaged in the debate, Daniells believed that the real issues involved far transcended the question over whether or not the "daily" represented paganism and when it was taken away. If that was the only issue, said Daniells, "I would not waste much of my time arguing with men who persist in making claims utterly at variance with all the reliable history of the world." Daniells believed he received great blessing and deep insight into the glorious Biblical truths concerning the ministry of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary after having immersed himself in the study. Indeed, Daniells believed that the truth concerning the "efficacious work of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary" should well have accompanied the presentation of righteousness by faith in 1888. No wonder, Daniells asserted, that Satan instituted the false system that he had through the Papacy. Daniells saw a controversy "whether the enemy shall bring in the most stupendous counterfeit that he has ever foisted upon the human family, and put it in place [of] the vital, fundamental truth regarding man's salvation."⁸⁰

Although the statement in Early Writings concerning the Millerite "correctness" on the question of the "daily" initially troubled Daniells, his study of the contextual and historical background to the statement resolved the question for him. He concluded that the central point of the vision given Mrs. White concerned the "time" of the ending of the 2300 days, not the specifics

of the theology concerning the "daily." Given this interpretation, the spirit of prophecy harmonized with the Bible and with the historical evidences Daniells believed were connected with it. He believed that this position "puts the spirit of prophecy on the side of the Scriptures, and on the side of authentic history, and it does not do any violence to the meaning of the testimony itself." Daniells believed that those who so interpreted the statement in Early Writings were the "truest friends of the gift of prophecy" and that "short-sighted expositors" were forcing a situation that would place the writings in an "indefensible position."⁸¹

Daniells believed himself justified in presenting his views of the "daily" at the seven union conference sessions of 1910 because of the L. A. Smith tract that alleged that those who held the "new view" did so in complete opposition to the spirit of prophecy teaching. Daniells believed that the influence of the General Conference officials holding that view was thereby being destroyed and required a response. He likewise bristled at the "fierce, fighting, arbitrary attitude" some held that defended the "old view." He decried the access some seemed to have to "private testimonies" concerning others. Daniells believed that "shockingly indiscreet" use was made of some of those testimonies. He wondered how it was that certain men "seemed to have their pockets full of personal testimonies."⁸²

By the time that Mrs. White urged that "silence is eloquence" on the subject of the "daily," in August of 1910, Daniells considered that the issue had been virtually settled. While he intended not to continue the controversy, Daniells stated:

Scores and hundreds of our brethren who have been giving the subject study, and have become thoroughly convinced that the new view is right, will go on with their investigation, and will become more firmly established as the days go by. I think every Bible teacher in our Colleges

in this country believes in the new view, and will teach it this way, if they teach anything at all regarding the daily.⁸³

W. C. WHITE

Mrs. White, in reflecting upon the early period of denominational history noted that when a message from the Lord was given, she and her husband consulted with the "leading brethren" if they were present, "as to the best manner of bringing the instruction before the people." W. C. White, in his understanding of the nature of the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy, likewise considered that a significant role pertaining to that gift was relegated to the church leadership. He quoted his mother as saying, "I have done my part. I have written out what the Lord has revealed to me. Now it is for you to say how it shall be used." W. C. White considered this as entirely reasonable since the church leadership "were in contact with all the problems pertaining to the cause of present truth." He continued:

It was a wise provision of heaven that they should share in the responsibility of saying how and in what manner the messages should be placed before whom they were intended to benefit.⁸⁴

Sometimes, according to W. C. White, Mrs. White herself could not, or would not, explain or interpret a certain testimony. W. C. White quoted her as saying, "I can not explain it; you should understand it better than I. If you do not understand it, pray to the Lord, and He will help you." W. C. White cited an example where that methodology was not used and the leadership misapplied a testimony for "six or eight years" until the Lord gave another vision to Mrs. White. W. C. White believed that the gift of prophecy was not designed to inhibit the leadership or membership from exercising its responsibilities in "prayerfully carrying forward the work." He believed that because that responsibility was left with them "those who carried the responsibilities of leadership were ever made stronger in their work rather than dependent upon the Lord's messenger."⁸⁵

In responding to a statement written by R. A. Underwood on the spirit of prophecy in 1921, W. C. White outlined his concept of the relationship between the spirit of prophecy and the Bible. He emphasized that there was a marked difference between the Biblical writers and Mrs. White. White considered that the Bible was a "collection of inspired writings winnowed." He elaborated by stressing that the testimonies contained "many writings which correspond to the writings of prophets and scribes that were essential to the people of God when given but which did not find place in the cannon of scripture." White seems, in this draft of a response to Underwood to emphasize that the nature of the inspiration of Ellen White, while similar to that given certain Biblical prophets, is different in that it would have a more limited application. Still, he affirmed, the Holy Spirit, after the close of the Scriptures, would continue to shed light not only upon Biblical teachings, but also in matters of "organization, policy, and activities, in the closing work." The spirit of prophecy, according to White, could bring unity to the church because of the degree of authority it also maintained on questions of doctrine.⁸⁶

In his consideration of the contextual relationships of the spirit of prophecy writings, such ingredients as the historical background, the status of denominational work at the time, the nature of the recipient of the testimony, and the possibilities of testimonies to be given or withheld depending upon varying circumstances entered into the thinking of W. C. White. He noted that Mrs. White "often stated" that God had never commissioned her to write proverbs and thus her writings, "to be properly understood" had to be read in their contextual setting. According to W. C. White, his mother expressed concern over the dual problems of the unwise use made of testimonies that no longer applied because of changed circumstances and the opposite difficulty of the church suffering if relevant counsel was not available in time of need. W. C. White

believed that the counsel contained in the tract "The Writing and Sending Out of the Testimonies to the Church" provided guidelines between both those extremes.⁸⁷

A major episode involving W. C. White occurred during the 1913 Fall Council and concerned the question of context as well as the problem of "inspired" and "uninspired" portions of the spirit of prophecy. The contextual aspect concerned the use of a testimony by James Edson White that was given under different circumstances than when he applied it. The question was also raised if that testimony should be considered inspired and if so should it be given the same authority as the testimonies published in Volume 9 with which it seemed to conflict. While W. C. White considered the testimony as authentic and thus inspired, his refusal to classify it or to give it the same status as the published testimonies caused widespread discussion.⁸⁸

Concerning the disputed testimony, White wrote Daniells:

It might be much easier to repudiate a few documents that perplex us, and say they were forgeries, but it is the truth that makes us free, and I do not know of any way in harmony with the law of God than to deal with these matters just as they are.

He asserted that he could not attempt to classify the spirit of prophecy writings and he believed that Daniells knew the reason why. W. C. White reminded Daniells of those times in the past when counsel came to the church leadership without any clear indication that it was based upon revelation. Often, however, it transpired that the leadership later learned that the counsel had, indeed, been based upon direct revelation or was later reinforced by direct revelation. White continued:

You know that if we had undertaken at any time in the past to draw a line between counsel based upon revelation and definite testimony regarding duty, that we should have been obliged to revise our opinion many times. It was with these facts in mind that I refused, at the Council, to express any opinion regarding the classification of the Watson letter. And yet it is reported that I said it was not testimony.⁸⁹

White believed that confusion resulted at the Council because some considered that only direct revelation constituted testimony. This was not W. C. White's understanding of the nature of the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy. He wrote Daniells in 1913:

It has always seemed to me that in Mother's writings, as in the writings of Paul and other Bible writers, that there was a simple statement of history, a statement regarding Christian experience, arguments regarding Bible doctrine, and counsel to individuals and to churches; also the relation of revelations from God, and all these united constituted Paul's testimony to the church.

White restated this again in 1915:

I have sometimes said that I did not understand that all testimony was [REVELATION] inspiration, and I referred to the writings of the apostle Paul. Some was history, some revelation, some exhortation, and some argument. He did not claim that all he wrote was the record of revelations from heaven; but all his writings together constituted his testimony to the church, and I have regarded Mother's writings in a similar way.

While White clearly differentiated between Ellen White speaking on personal matters and her writings that were sent out as testimonies, some at the 1913 Council believed that certain items had been sent as testimonies that were not to be so regarded. W. C. White did not agree to that, he asserted, "because I did not believe it." He also disputed the statement frequently attributed to him: "It is evident that there must be a line drawn somewhere in mother's writings," and asserted that he could not draw such lines "because I know not where to draw them."⁹⁰

W. C. White still looked back to the 1913 episode in 1921 and recalled that a union conference president inquired if the disputed testimony should be regarded the same as published testimonies. White noted that he said, "no," and would still say the same. He noted:

Many things that mother has written which are true she did not deem it advisable to publish. There is a difference in the breadth of application. As a result of this conversation, the brother to whom I was speaking carried the word that I said that the letter was not testimony. In this he erred.⁹¹

Amongst those dismayed by such reports was J. W. Watt, a minister for 34 years. According to Watt, a union conference president who conducted a canvassers' institute in Watt's area of Johnstown, Pennsylvania, drew a logical conclusion from the concept that "all that Mother had written was not testimony." That president informed the believers in Pennsylvania, reported Watt, that Mrs. White's statement on the meat question "was not testimony, but only her own opinion." Watt wondered how "we small guns" could deal with the health reform question when higher officials recommended the membership to "eat all the flesh you desire," as long as it was not pork. Watt also wondered about the testimony that indicated that cheese should not be used. The union president seemed able to handle that question by refusing to recommend the early volumes of the testimonies to the believers. The president also informed Watt that "if you take the position that the testimonies are inspired like the Bible you will bring the curse down upon you spoken of in the book of Revelation of adding to the word."⁹²

In relating to questions concerning the spirit of prophecy and health reform, W. C. White consistently outlined the progressive experience of Mrs. White and the denomination and referred to the historical circumstances that related to the counsel given. Indeed, he applied this likewise to other areas. He wrote the following to F. M. Wilcox in 1921:

You will remember that [Mrs. White] has been very emphatic in her condemnation of drugs, and when pressed for a definition as to what constituted drugs, she has said, "Poisonous drugs." Mother has been emphatic in her condemnation of fiction, and when pressed to define what she referred to as fiction, she has always spoken of those works of fiction which lead the mind away from God. With these things in mind, I suppose we may understand her condemnation of fiction to refer to those works of fiction which lead the mind away from heavenly things. When we read what she has written about drugs, we may consider it as applying to poisonous drugs. When we read her condemnation of cheese, we may consider it as applying to unhealthful cheese. If there is any purely, strictly, and unmistakably healthful cheese, it may not come under this condemnation.... It seems to me that the food analysts and the doctors ought to lend a hand, if we are to attach some qualifying phrases to mother's condemnation of cheese.⁹³

Perhaps W. C. White's most detailed response to a question relating to health reform principles was given to a Loma Linda student who was preparing a paper on the consistency of the teachings in the testimonies on health reform. White noted that some considered the statements in Volume 3, p. 21, to be out of harmony with Volume 9 relative to the questions of butter, milk and eggs. White pointed out:

That which mother wrote in Testimonies, Volume 9 was intended by her to present to the people the best light she had on the subject, after many years of experience and many years of study of the warnings which the Lord had given to her in the earlier years of her experience in the health reform.

He emphasized such considerations in the early period as having to "choose the lesser of two evils," lack of sterilization techniques, non-examination of cattle for tuberculosis: "Therefore there existed in the milk and in the butter of those days much tuberculosis which was greatly endangering the health of the people who ate it." Under the circumstances of those days, Mrs. White, on occasion, recommended the use of meat to those having particular problems.

White noted:

In the later years, since our leading physicians have so fully studied this matter and so fully developed a system of diet that is a perfect substitute for meats, mother has never advised the use of meat, even though she was urged to do so by persons of large influence and of large information regarding medical affairs.⁹⁴

White explained the historical context to the statement in Volume 3, p. 21: "We bear positive testimony against ... butter." Compounding the problem of tuberculosis germs in butter, Adventists, in their efforts to avoid lard and other fats, turned to the use of butter and sugar and, in avoiding meats, adopted the practice of having from three to seven fried foods at a meal. Mrs. White received a vision concerning these practices and she "bore a positive testimony against ... butter." White considered the statement as "a historical statement regarding the testimony which she was bearing in the churches east and west." He continued:

Still later on, when conscientious physicians testified that after very faithful investigation and study, they had become satisfied that sterilized butter was a better fat for many people than any of the vegetable oils, mother accepted their work and their testimony, and did her best to present in her later writings the clearest and best light she had upon the subject.⁹⁵ Personally, I feel free to walk in the light of these later counsels.

F. M. Wilcox, in 1915, prepared a manuscript dealing with the spirit of prophecy. The manuscript, which was submitted to W. C. White for criticism, contained the observation, "Sister White has not been set in this church as a historian or as a theologian." White observed that the statement was "undoubtedly true" in the technical usage of the terms, but feared that the statement might create an erroneous impression. He suggested the following substitute:

Sister White, as a teacher of sacred truth, has not been led to a technical treatment of theological questions, but has given such views of the love of God and the plan of salvation, and of man's duty to God and to his fellow men, that when presented to the people, they arouse the conscience, and impress upon the hearer the saving truths of the Word of God. She says, 'The written testimonies are not to give new light, but to impress vividly upon the heart the truths of inspiration already revealed.'

In the technical sense of the word, Sister White is not a historian. She has not been a systematic student of history and chronology, and she has never intended that her works should be used to settle controversies over historical dates. But as one who relates history, one 'in whose work the character and spirit of an age is exhibited in miniature,' she is a historian whose works teach valuable lessons from the past for the present and the future.

White had reacted similarly several years earlier when a writer for Southern Watchman used Great Controversy as evidence to prove certain historical questions.

W. C. White noted that Mrs. White objected to the use of her writings as authority "regarding the details of history or historical dates."⁹⁶

On the question of Mrs. White's use of historians, W. C. White asserted:

I have overwhelming evidence and conviction that [the writings] are the description and delineation of what God has revealed to her in vision, and where she has followed the description of historians or the exposition of Adventist writers, I believe that God has given her discernment to use that which is correct and in harmony with truth regarding all

matters essential to salvation. If it should be found by faithful study that she has followed some expositions of prophecy which in some detail regarding dates we cannot harmonize with our understanding of secular history, it does not influence my confidence in her writings as a whole any more than my confidence in the Bible is influenced by the fact that I cannot harmonize many of the statements regarding chronology.

White noted that the visions given Mrs. White concerning historical events usually contained no geographical or chronological setting. Not only did she obtain that perspective by reading historical works, but in so doing, said White, "there was brought vividly to her mind scenes presented clearly in vision, but which were through the lapse of years and her strenuous ministry, dimmed in her memory." He also noted that Mrs. White, aware of her lack of education, admired the presentations of others of "the scenes which God had presented to her in vision." He continued:

She found it both a pleasure and a convenience and an economy of time to use their language fully or in part in presenting those things which she knew through revelation and which she wished to pass on to her readers."⁹⁷

White emphasized that his mother was not dependent upon historical research in writing the historical elements of her books. He stated:

Of this you may be sure because I know whereof I speak. Her use of the language of the historians was not for the sake of bringing into the book something that had not been revealed to her but was an effort to utilize in the best language she could find, the description of scenes presented to her.

Thus White believed that (1) the basic framework of the historical works was established by vision, (2) her study of the Bible and histories enabled Mrs. White to fill in certain details, (3) the revelations given Mrs. White enabled her "to select and appropriate that which was true and to discard that which was erroneous or doubtful."⁹⁸

Although W. C. White recognized the fallibility of Mrs. White, even to the extent of her fallibility "in stating things revealed to her," he seemed to studiously avoid stating that a specific published spirit of prophecy statement

was in error. He no doubt feared that some might conclude that the statement in question was thus not to be taken as inspired. Concerning the conflicting statements published between 1864 and 1874 dealing with the question of whether God or Eve mentioned death as the consequence of merely touching the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, White stated:

It is reasonable to suppose that the statement found in the later writings gives the most correct expression to the views opened up to Sister White in vision. In her earliest writings there are found a few statements which indicate that the vision was imperfectly understood, or imperfectly described.

Regarding the revision in Patriarchs and Prophets as to whether there were nine or seven generations living contemporaneously for hundreds of years, he noted:

At one time mother's attention was called to the fact that there were nine generations contemporaneous, and many of the nine generations contemporaneous for hundreds of years, but not every one of the nine generations contemporaneous for so long a time. Then she instructed us to change the statement to seven. What circumstance led to the less accurate statement in the early editions of the book, was never made known to me.

By using such terms as "most correct expression," or "less accurate statement," W. C. White seemed to purposely avoid the implications of the word "error."⁹⁹

In the statements relating to the 1911 revision of Great Controversy, neither Ellen White nor her son considered the revisions in the same light as did Prescott. Mrs. White stated:

When I learned that Great Controversy must be reset, I determined that we would have everything closely examined, to see if the truths it contained were stated in the very best manner, to convince those not of our faith that the Lord had guided and sustained me in the writing of its pages.

As a result of the thorough examination by our most experienced workers, some changing in the wording has been proposed. These changes I have carefully examined, and approved.

In discussing the revision, W. C. White referred to word changes because of availability of more accurate translations of historical sources, usage of more recent sources necessitated by an inability to locate and thus verify sources previously used, changes of different expressions to avoid

giving unnecessary offense. White noted, "In each of these places the more accurate form of expression has been duly considered and approved by the author." In dealing with certain substantive changes, where certain statements in the original edition were strongly disputed by Roman Catholic scholars, W. C. White quoted his mother as follows:

What I have written regarding the arrogance and the assumptions of the papacy is true. Much historical evidence regarding these matters has been designedly destroyed; nevertheless, that the book may be of the greatest benefit to Catholics and others, and that needless controversies may be avoided, it is better to have all statements regarding the assumptions of the pope and the claims of the papacy stated so moderately as to be easily and clearly proved from accepted histories that are within the reach of our ministers and students.¹⁰⁰

One can gain some understanding of the deep involvement of W. C. White with the denominational debate on the "daily" by merely totaling the pages of his letters to some of the participants. He wrote his brother a 20-page letter in June of 1909. The next year Daniells, P. T. Magan, and Washburn received letters of 11, 23, and 36 pages respectively. White believed the statement in Early Writings pertained to the prophetic periods relating to the "daily" rather than to the character of the "daily" itself. He arrived at this support of the "new view" because of his belief that an understanding of the contextual background of the statement was overwhelmingly vital to understanding it. He believed that that principle should generally be applied to his mother's writings. White considered it relevant that his mother had written much concerning the importance to the Advent movement of the 2300-year prophecy, while the nature of the "daily" itself was "wholly ignored" in all her writings "except in this one sentence of 35 words, found in the midst of the argument that 'time has not been a test since 1844 and it will never again be a test.' " The context to the statement found in Early Writings to White seemed to involve the entire article in which the statement was originally written, the entire scope of the

Ellen White writings on the subject, and the historical background to the original writing.¹⁰¹

White initially conceived of the study of the "daily" as a special opportunity to make a thorough study of Biblical and historical sources and eventually gain a clear understanding of the truth of the prophecy of Daniel 8. He concluded that such seemed to be God's will since the Lord had not chosen to settle the question through a revelation to Mrs. White. He seemed confirmed in that position as a wealth of historical evidence began to be uncovered that related to the broad prophetic periods of Daniel. He was likewise convinced because of the strengthening of the positions relative to the papacy.¹⁰²

Although White saw positive gains that could be achieved by a search for new light on the "daily," much as had occurred during the searching for truth encouraged by Mrs. White during the 1888 to 1890 period, he also made comparisons to that earlier period that had negative implications. White noted that during that period most believers were not so concerned with the new positions taken on the kingdoms and the law in Galatians as they were concerned with the supposed detrimental effect a change of position would have on the denominational influence. White also recalled:

They did not regard the new doctrine itself as of such serious importance, but they believed that the old positions had been sanctioned by the Testimonies, and to make a change would unsettle the confidence of our people everywhere in the Testimonies; and this they regarded as the most serious feature of the whole question.¹⁰³

While W. C. White tried to maintain objectivity relative to the "pioneer view," he clearly considered those representing that position as the primary aggressors in the debate. He objected to attempts to prevent publication of Conradi's book on Daniel in the Danish-Norwegian and in the United States, he opposed circulating of the O. A. Johnson and L. A. Smith pamphlets at the 1909 GC session, and he opposed the methods used in discrediting the views

held by those supporting the "new view." He noted:

Some are so anxious that they keep passing their questions and misgivings on to Mother, and many of these questions are like a snake that has swallowed a rabbit, it bulges out with a great complaint or accusation. The complaints and accusations that have been poured in upon Mother have many of them been presented in such an (sic) one-sided way that "if it were possible" they ~~were~~^{would} "deceive the very elect."¹⁰⁴

After the issuance of the L. A. Smith pamphlet that seemed so strongly to discredit the holders of the "new view," W. C. White believed that the Daniells-Prescott response was appropriate. The General Conference officials had been discredited in terms of their influence and their attitudes toward the spirit of prophecy had been seriously questioned. It seemed as though there was no alternative but to respond. White maintained that attitude until a testimony urging silence on the subject of the "daily" reversed his opinion.¹⁰⁵

As White analyzed the debate on the "daily" he, as others, looked beyond the theological dispute itself, and hoped that the debate might afford opportunity to resolve certain larger questions. One such question involved the continued circulation of Daniel and Revelation. Even though White was convinced that the historical sources that were uncovered as a consequence of the investigations over the "daily" refuted certain of the teachings in that book, he still favored what he termed a "liberal, open door policy" relative to its circulation. He believed that a book "so valuable in most of its features" should continue to be circulated "until something better should take its place." Conversely, he likewise favored the circulation of Conradi's book, although it took a completely different position on the "daily."¹⁰⁶

W. C. White considered two other questions of even greater importance, however. He wrote Daniells in March of 1910:

I have told some of our brethren that I thought there were two questions connected with this ["daily"] matter that were of more importance than the decision which shall be made as to which is most nearly correct, the old or the new view regarding the "daily." The first is, How shall we deal

with one another when there is difference of opinion? Second, How shall we deal with Mother's writings in our effort to settle doctrinal questions?

White hoped that a meeting between the main disputants on the "daily" might resolve not only the "daily" question, but also work toward resolving the larger questions.¹⁰⁷

Although the meeting proposed by White never occurred, two significant testimonies were sent four months after his proposal to the central figures in the debate: Butler, Loughborough, Haskell, Smith, Gilbert, Prescott, and Daniells. Mrs. White requested that her writings "not be used as the leading argument to settle questions over which there is now so much controversy." In noting that she had no specific instruction from the Lord on the "point under discussion," she again urged that her writings not be used in the debate. The testimony, dated July 31, 1910, was significantly entitled "Our Attitude Toward Doctrinal Controversy." Since Mrs. White ordinarily placed no titles upon testimonies, it seems quite possible that W. C. White placed that significant title on the testimony. The same testimony urged that "important books that have been in print for years" and that had been influential in bringing others into the church, should not be discredited over relatively minor matters. Questions of correction and revision should be referred to those ordinarily in charge of such matters.¹⁰⁸

The second testimony, dated August 3, 1910, contained the following relevant statement:

We must blend together in the bonds of Christlike unity; then our labors will not be in vain. Draw in even cords, and let no contentions be brought in. Reveal the unifying power of truth, and this will make a powerful impression on human minds. In unity there is strength.

This counsel, unfortunately, was not applied in the controversy over the "daily."¹⁰⁹

It seems apparent that W. C. White during the controversy over the "daily" hoped to find some way of harmonizing the divergent positions. Indeed, he

believed that the consequences of a failure could be disastrous to the influence of the spirit of prophecy writings. He urged his brethren:

Let us avoid taking such a position as to encourage men in urging upon their brethren personal views of the meaning of certain passages in the Testimonies in a way to cast censure and reproach upon their brethren who do not fully agree with them, and in a way that seems to obstruct the search for truth.

If we fail to stand firmly for correct principles, we may soon be plunged into a condition of things wherein many earnest and radical minds will feel free to select a passage here and a passage there from the Testimonies, and without proper regard to the context and to the teaching of the Bible and other passages in the Testimonies, proceed to teach a mixture of truth and error that is unprofitable to the church.

Let us avoid giving sanction to any man, or group of men, who take a disputed passage in the Testimonies, and putting their view of what it means in the strongest possible light, say that "persons of influence in the denomination" who do not agree with them, "contend that it does not mean what it says," and that their view squarely contradicts the spirit of prophecy. Surely we can not give our approval to such methods of dealing with the Testimonies, and with the brethren.

White deeply regretted that O. A. Johnson, L. A. Smith, Haskell and Gilbert were engaged so actively in "promulgating the doctrine that confidence in the Testimonies must rise or fall, according to the belief of our brethren in the old or the new view of the 'daily.'" ¹¹⁰

White made several unsuccessful attempts to have a "brotherly meeting" to deal with the questions. He observed to J. S. Washburn that he believed God permitted such differences to occur to enable a more thorough investigation of truth, and that if such occurred "and if we treat our brethren in Christ's own way, we shall get great good where the enemy hoped to bring in bitterness and division." White, unfortunately, had to inform Stephen Haskell in late 1910:

To this, as to former appeals for our brethren to get together for study and prayer over this matter, there was no favorable response, and the controversy although less open than formerly, has gone steadily forward. ¹¹¹

One might inquire whether we still live in the shadow of the "daily."

CONCLUSION

F. M. Wilcox enunciated a relevant truth in 1915. That truth had perhaps an even greater pertinence in 1928 when he again expressed it:

Some in the church of God, today as in every age, are inclined to be *too fast*. Others are inclined to be *too slow*. God in his providence links the impulsive Peter with those who are more staid and conservative. In the providence of God there are found in the Seventh-day Adventist Church today these varying natures and elements.... God permits these various temperaments to be associated in order that each may learn from the other, that the lack of one may be supplied by the abundance of the other.¹¹²

W. W. Prescott, whom many placed in the "too fast" category, observed at the Bible Conference:

Truth and error lie right close, side by side, and the reason why error comes up so near is to make us afraid of the truth. Now when error makes us afraid of the truth we back off from the truth and lose it. Now if we can have wisdom enough to have the full benefit of the truth and not swing off over into the error, we are in advance of our position.¹¹³

The consequences of individuals searching for truth relative to the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy without the benefit of the perspectives of the denominational community might be seen in the cases of A. T. Jones, J. H. Kellogg, E. J. Waggoner, A. F. Ballenger, L. R. Conradi, W. A. Colcord, and others. It is tragically relevant that all those mentioned answered the basic question posed by C. L. Benson at the Bible Conference by deciding that the spirit of prophecy could be divided into "inspired" and "uninspired" portions. It seems relevant that, in most cases, those who began to make such determinations eventually lost confidence in the spirit of prophecy. It also seems relevant that the apostasies sprang from both viewpoints relative to the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy.

Is it not possible that a fruitful dialogue between the two major positions could have answered the Benson question differently than did Jones and Conradi? The "pioneer position" urged that the writings could not be divided

into "inspired" and "uninspired" sections, but seemed to have no real means of dealing with apparent discrepancies. The "new view" position, with its emphasis upon context, offered a means of explaining those apparent discrepancies. Each side seemed to have additional concepts that could have been useful to the other. Sufficient opportunity for a dialogue seemed to be present. Such a dialogue might have refuted the dire prophecy made by J. S. Washburn in 1931:

I do not think the old guard will die now and I am sure it will never surrender, never cease to stand where it has stood for years in this message.... They may seem to be in the minority. They may seem to lack the official standing of those modernists who do not dare to go as far as L. R. Conradi--that is openly and apparently--and may even sign his condemnation papers, but in heart are far down the same road, and agree with his fundamentals, and are heading fast to his ultimate theological destination. Nevertheless the truth must win an eternal victory. Let the issue come, and the sooner the better. There is no compromise or modification or any possibility of fusion of these elements. Between them is an ever widening distance.¹¹⁴

¹A. G. Daniells to W. C. White, July 20, 1919, WCW Correspondence Bk. 116, 1917-19--D, White Estate; J. S. Washburn, "An Open Letter to Elder A. G. Daniells and an Appeal to the General Conference," 1922, pp. 28-9, F. M. Wilcox Personal Collection, Reference Files, J. S. Washburn Folder, General Conference Archives. Note: all citations hereafter are to materials housed at the GC Archives except those cited WE, which are housed at the White Estate. The designation PC will refer to Personal Collections and RG to the Record Group number of the cited document housed at the GC Archives.

²T. E. Bowen to A. O. Tait, June 25, 1919, RG 21, General Files, 1919--Tait, A. O.

³M. C. Wilcox to A. G. Daniells, Mar. 23, 1913, RG 11, Incoming Letters, 1913--W.

⁴M. C. Wilcox to Daniells and I. H. Evans, Oct. 31, 1915, RG 11, Incoming Letters, 1915--W; Daniells to M. C. Wilcox, Dec. 15, 1915, Ibid.; Tait to W. W. Prescott, Dec. 1, 1916, RG 17: W. W. Prescott, General Files, 1916-17--T.

⁵W. C. White to Daniells, Jan. 29, 1917, WCW Correspondence Bk. 116, 1917-19--D-E, WE; Daniells to W. C. White, Mar. 20, 1917, Ibid.

⁶W. E. Howell to "Dear Brother," June 3, 1919, WCW Correspondence Bk. 119, 1917-19--H-I, WE.

⁷W. C. White to F. M. Wilcox, May 21, 1919, WCW Correspondence Bk. 134, 1917-19--Wi-Y, WE; Howell to W. C. White, May 28, 1919, WCW Correspondence Bk. 119, 1917-19--H-I, WE; W. C. White to Daniells, June 6, 1919, WCW Correspondence Bk. 116, 1917-19--D, WE.

⁸H. S. Prener, "The 1260 Days," July 10, Discussion, pp. 32-3, 58-62c, RG 25: Stenographic Report of the 1919 Bible and History Teachers' Conference. The remainder of the citations in this section are from this stenographic report.

⁹Ibid., pp. 62d-64.

¹⁰Ibid.

¹¹Ibid., pp. 65-6, 71.

¹²Daniells, "The Spirit of Prophecy," July 16, p. 72.

¹³Ibid., p. 71.

¹⁴Daniells, "The Use of the Spirit of Prophecy in Our Teaching of Bible and History," July 30, 1919, pp. 1, 3, 4, 30.

¹⁵Ibid., pp. 2, 6, 9, 11, 14.

¹⁶Ibid., pp. 16-7, 21, 26, 27.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 22.

- ¹⁸Ibid., pp. 30-5.
- ¹⁹Discussion, "Inspiration of the Spirit of Prophecy as Related to the Inspiration of the Bible," pp. 3, 5-8.
- ²⁰Ibid., pp. 12-8.
- ²¹Ibid., pp. 19-22.
- ²²Ibid., pp. 4-5.
- ²³Ibid., p. 7.
- ²⁴Ibid., pp. 8-10.
- ²⁵Ibid., pp. 24-7.
- ²⁶Ibid., p. 2.
- ²⁷G. I. Butler to Daniells, Apr. 20, 1905, RG 11, Incoming Letters, 1905--B.
- ²⁸John Harvey Kellogg, "Report of the Work of the Sanitarium," Transcript, Dec. 28, 1905, RG 17: M. L. Andreasen, Reference Files, Sanitarium Report by Dr. Kellogg Folder, pp. 27, 45.
- ²⁹A. T. Jones, Remarks at Berrien Springs, Michigan, May 16, 1906, RG 11: Documents, 1901-50, Case Files, A. T. Jones Folder; Jones, Sermon at Battle Creek Tabernacle, Jan. 2, 1906, pp. 24-5, Pamphlet Files.
- ³⁰Jones to Daniells, Jan. 26-Feb. 13, 1906, pp. 16-8, RG 11, Incoming Letters, 1910--J; Jones, "Some History, Some Experience and Some Facts," Mar. 4, 1906, p. 45, Pamphlet Files; Jones, "The Final Word and a Confession," c. June, 1906, pp. 38-9, Pamphlet Files.
- ³¹Jones to Ellen White, Apr. 26, 1909, p. 2, RG 11, Incoming Letters, 1910--J.
- ³²Jones, "The Everlasting Gospel of God's Everlasting Covenant," July 20, 1907, pp. 27, 31-2, Pamphlet Files; Jones to Daniells, Aug. 20, 1907, RG 11, Incoming Letters, 1910--J.
- ³³Jones to Daniells, Feb. 13, 1910, Ibid.; W. W. Prescott, "Seeking to Find an Accusation," Review and Herald, Feb. 10, 1910, pp. 5-6.
- ³⁴Jones to Daniells, Jan. 26-Feb. 13, 1906, RG 11, Incoming Letters, 1910--J.
- ³⁵Ellen G. White, "Testimonies to the Church, Series B, No. 2, pp. 21-2, 57, Pamphlet Files; Ellen White, "Testimonies to the Church, Series B, No. 7, pp. 31, 53-4, 63, Ibid.
- ³⁶Ellen White, Early Writings, pp. 74-5.
- ³⁷S. N. Haskell to W. C. White, May 16, 1920, WCW Correspondence Bk. 146, 1920-22--H, WE.

- ³⁸Haskell, "The Crisis," Review and Herald, May 10, 1906, pp. 8-9.
- ³⁹Haskell to Ellen White, Dec. 29, 1909, WCW Correspondence, 1909--Haskell, S. N., WE.
- ⁴⁰Haskell to Daniells, Jan. 27, 1908, RG 11, Incoming Letters, 1908--H; Haskell to Daniells, Mar. 22, 1908, RG 21, "Special Files," A. G. Daniells, The Daily, Section 1; Haskell to C. C. Crisler, Mar. 30, 1908, RG 58: L. E. Froom, Reference Files, 1920s-30s, The Daily, Folder 1; Haskell to W. C. White, Dec. 6, 1909, WCW Correspondence, 1909--Haskell, S. N., WE; Haskell to Crisler, Feb. 25, 1910, RG 58: L. E. Froom, Reference Files, 1920s-30s, The Daily, Folder 1.
- ⁴¹Haskell to Daniells, Mar. 22, 1908, RG 21, "Special Files," A. G. Daniells, The Daily, Section 1; Haskell to Crisler, Mar. 30, 1908, RG 58: L. E. Froom, Reference Files, 1920s-30s, The Daily, Folder 1.
- ⁴²Haskell to W. W. Prescott, Nov. 15, 1907, RG 58: L. E. Froom, Reference Files, 1920s-30s, The Daily, Folder 1; Haskell to Ellen White, Dec. 6, 1909, DF 201: Daily Correspondence, WE; Haskell to Crisler, Mar. 30, 1908, RG 58: L. E. Froom, Reference Files, 1920s-30s, The Daily, Folder 1; Haskell to W. C. White, April 13, 1920, WCW Correspondence Bk. 146, 1920-22--H, WE.
- ⁴³Haskell to Ellen White, Feb. 25, 1909, WCW Correspondence, 1909--Haskell, S. N.; Haskell to Ellen White, Dec. 29, 1909, Ibid.; Haskell to Ellen White, May 30, 1910, DF 202: Daily; Haskell to W. C. White, Sept. 13, 1910, WCW Correspondence, 1910--Haskell, S. N., WE.
- ⁴⁴Haskell to Daniells, Sept. 29, 1903, RG 9: Historical Files, A. G. Daniells Folder; Haskell to Prescott, Nov. 15, 1907, RG 58: L. E. Froom, Reference Files, 1920s-30s, The Daily, Folder 1; Haskell to W. C. White, Nov. 27, 1909, WCW Correspondence, 1909--Haskell, S. N., WE; Haskell to W. C. White, Dec. 6, 1909, Ibid.; Haskell to Daniells, Mar. 13, 1910, RG 11, Incoming Letters, 1910--H; Haskell to W. C. White, Aug. 6, 1920, WCW Correspondence Bk. 146, 1920-22--H, WE.
- ⁴⁵Haskell to Daniells, Sept. 29, 1903, RG 9: Historical Files, A. G. Daniells Folder; Haskell to Prescott, Dec. 30, 1907, RG 58: L. E. Froom, Reference Files, 1920s-30s, The Daily, Folder 1; Haskell to Daniells, Mar. 13, 1910, RG 11, Incoming Letters, 1910--H; Haskell to W. C. White, Sept. 13, 1910, WCW Correspondence, 1910--Haskell, S. N., WE.
- ⁴⁶Haskell to W. C. White, Mar. 28, 1919, WCW Correspondence Bk. 146, 1920-22--H, WE; Haskell to Prescott, Dec. 30, 1907, RG 58: L. E. Froom, Reference Files, 1920s-30s, The Daily, Folder 1; Haskell to Ellen White, Jan. 30, 1908, DF 210: Daily Correspondence, WE; Haskell to W. C. White, Mar. 1, 1908, RG 58: L. E. Froom, Reference Files, 1920s-30s, The Daily, Folder 1; Haskell to Daniells, Mar. 22, 1908, RG 21: "Special Files," A. G. Daniells, The Daily, Section 1; Haskell to C. C. Crisler, Mar. 30, 1908, RG 58, L. E. Froom, Reference Files, 1920s-30s, The Daily, Folder 1; Haskell to Leon Smith, Jan. 21, 1909, WCW Correspondence, 1909--Haskell, S. N., WE.
- ⁴⁷Haskell to Ellen White, Sept. 24, 1909, WCW Correspondence, 1909--Haskell, S. N., WE; Haskell to Ellen White, May 30, 1910, DF 202: Daily, WE.

- 48Haskell to W. C. White, WCW Correspondence, 1909--Haskell, S. N., WE.
- 49Haskell to W. C. White, Nov. 4, 1918, WCW Correspondence Bk. 118, 1917-19--H, WE; Haskell to W. C. White, July 21, 1920, WCW Correspondence Bk. 146, 1920-22--H, WE.
- 50Haskell to W. C. White, July 8, 1920, WCW Correspondence Bk. 146, 1920-22--H, WE.
- 51Haskell to F. M. Wilcox, June 23, 1922, F. M. Wilcox PC, Reference Files, Miscellaneous Folder.
- 52C. E. Holmes to L. E. Froom, n.d. [c. Oct., 1927], RG 58: L. E. Froom, Reference Files, 1920s-30s, Holmes, C. E. Folder.
- 53Holmes to W. C. White, Oct. 27, 1919, WCW Correspondence Bk. 119, 1917-19--H-I, WE; Holmes to Froom, May 13, 1926, RG 58: L. E. Froom, Reference Files, 1920s-30s, Holmes, C. E. Folder; Prescott to Daniells, Feb. 25, 1917, RG 17: W. W. Prescott General Files, 1916-17--D; Daniells to Prescott and Shaw, April 5, 1917, RG 17: W. W. Prescott General Files, 1916-17--Unfiled Folder; Prescott to Daniells, May 17, 1917, Ibid.; Holmes to W. C. White, Jan. 18, 1919, WCW Correspondence Bk. 119, 1917-19--H-I, WE; Holmes to Froom, Nov. 5, 1927, RG 58: L. E. Froom, Reference Files, 1920s-30s, Holmes, C. E. Folder.
- 54Holmes to J. S. Washburn, April 1, 1920, "Have We an Infallible 'Spirit of Prophecy'?" DF 242: J. S. Washburn, WE.
- 55Holmes, Manuscript Proof Read at Round-Table Discussion, Berrien Springs, Michigan, Dec. 18, 1948, RG 11, General Files, 1949--W.
- 56Holmes to L. E. Froom, n.d. [c. Oct., 1927], RG 58: L. E. Froom, Reference Files, 1920s-30s, Holmes, C. E., Folder; Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Trustees of Washington Missionary College, Feb. 19, 1919 to May 17, 1920, Columbia Union College, Takoma Park, Md.
- 57Washburn to Daniells, Sept. 27, 1912, RG 11, Incoming Letters, 1912--W; Daniells to Washburn, Oct. 1, 1912, RG 11, Outgoing Letterbook 51, p. 366; Washburn, "An Open Letter to Elder A. G. Daniells and an Appeal to the General Conference," p. 16, F. M. Wilcox PC, Reference Files, J. S. Washburn Folder.
- 58Washburn to Ellen White, Feb. 18, 1915, WCW Correspondence Bk. 105, 1914-16--U-V--White, W. B., WE; Washburn to W. C. White, Sept. 10, 1918, WCW Correspondence Bk. 132, 1917-19--Wa-Wh, WE; Washburn to W. C. White, WCW Correspondence Bk. 105, 1914-16--U-V--White, W. B., WE; Washburn to A. L. White, DF 242: Washburn, J. S., WE; Washburn to J. L. McElhany, June 3, 1947, RG 11, General Files, 1947--W.
- 59Washburn to Haskell, Feb. 9, 1910, DF 201: Daily Correspondence, WE.
- 60Washburn to W. C. White, Sept. 5, 1910, pp. 6-7, F. M. Wilcox PC, Reference Files, Writings of J. S. Washburn Folder.
- 61Washburn to F. M. Wilcox, July 3, 1921, Ibid.; Washburn to Holmes, April 18, 1920, "The Startling Omega and Its True Genealogy," RG 58: L. E. Froom, Reference Files, 1920s-30s, J. S. Washburn Folder.

⁶²Washburn to F. M. Wilcox, July 3, 1921, F. M. Wilcox PC, Reference Files, Writings of J. S. Washburn Folder.

⁶³Holmes to Daniells, May 1, 1922, "Open Letter," p. 8, RG 33: Inactive Sustentation Files, J. S. Washburn Folder.

⁶⁴Washburn, "An Open Letter to Elder A. G. Daniells and an Appeal to the General Conference," 36 pp., F. M. Wilcox PC, Reference Files, J. S. Washburn Folder.

⁶⁵Washburn to A. L. White, Oct. 7, 1948, DF 242: Washburn, J. S., WE; RG 21: Documents, 1920s-50s, Clippings Regarding 1922 GC Session Folder.

⁶⁶Washburn, "The Omaha Organization Fulfills Prophecy," n.d., pp. 4-5, F. M. Wilcox PC, Reference Files, Writings of J. S. Washburn Folder.

⁶⁷F. M. Wilcox to C. H. Watson, April 17, 1932, RG 21: "Special Files," Columbia Union Folder.

⁶⁸W. W. Prescott Statement, July 3, 1919, p. 101, RG 25: Stenographic Report of 1919 Bible and History Teachers' Conference.

⁶⁹Prescott, "The Mediation of Christ," July 16, 1919, pp. 7, 12, 13, 14, 16, 19, Ibid.

⁷⁰Prescott to Haskell, Dec. 1, 1907, RG 58: L. E. Froom, Reference Files, The Daily, Folder 2; Prescott, "Our Time and Work From the Prophetic Standpoint," Week of Prayer Reading for Sunday, Dec. 12, 1909, Review and Herald, Nov. 18, 1909, pp. 7-9.

⁷¹Daniells to L. R. Conradi, Dec. 23, 1909, RG 11, Outgoing Letterbook 46, p. 317; W. B. White to Daniells, Jan. 23, 1912, RG 11, Incoming Letters, 1912--W; Prescott, "The Mediation of Christ," Protestant Magazine, Jan. 1913, pp. 6-14; Prescott to W. E. Straw, Aug. 2, 1916, RG 17: W. W. Prescott General Files, 1916-17--S; Prescott to T. M. Krainean, Jan. 21, 1917, RG 17: W. W. Prescott General Files, 1916-17--K Folder; Prescott to H. S. Miller, Aug. 20, 1917, RG 17: W. W. Prescott General Files, 1916-17--M Folder.

⁷²Prescott, "The Protestant Platform," Review and Herald, Dec. 16, 1909; Prescott, "The Bible Only," Review and Herald, Dec. 23, 1909, p. 4; Prescott to C. C. Crisler, Mar. 20, 1908, RG 58: L. E. Froom, Reference Files, 1920s-30s, The Daily, Folder 1; Prescott, "'The Daily': A Brief Reply to Two Leaflets on This Subject," pp. 2, 15-6, RG 58: L. E. Froom, Reference Files, 1920s-30s, The Daily, Folder 1.

⁷³L. R. Conradi, "'Whoso Readeth, Let Him Understand': A Short Key to Dan. 7-12," n.d. [c. 1910], pp. 25-8, RG 58: L. E. Froom, Reference Files, 1920s-30s, The Daily, Folder 1; Conradi to Daniells, Mar. 8, 1910, RG 11, Incoming Letters, 1910--C.

⁷⁴Z. G. Baharian to W. C. White, Feb. 24, 1910, WCW Correspondence, 1910-11--B Miscellaneous, WE; Baharian to "Dear Brother," Nov. 9, 1910, RG 21, Incoming Letters: Foreign, 1910--B.

⁷⁵T. E. Bowen to Baharian, Dec. 16, 1910, RG 21: Assistant Secretary, Outgoing Letterbook 9, pp. 294-95; Bowen to Baharian, Feb. 13, 1911, Ibid., pp. 525-26; Bowen to Baharian, May 29, 1911, Ibid., Outgoing Letterbook 10, pp. 91-2; Bowen to Daniells, June 1, 1911, RG 11, Incoming Letters, 1911--B; W. C. White to Daniells, June 16, 1911, WCW Correspondence, 1911--Daniells, A. G. Folder, WE; W. C. White to Daniells, July 5, 1911, Ibid.

⁷⁶Daniells to W. C. White, Aug. 3, 1911, RG 11, Outgoing Letterbook 49, pp. 561-66.

⁷⁷Daniells, Transcript of Remarks Made at Boulder Camp Meeting, Aug. 29 and Aug. 30, 1906, F. M. Wilcox PC, Reference Files, EGW Letters From FMW Folder; DF 312g: Daniells, A. G.--Spirit of Prophecy Questions Answered By, Folder.

⁷⁸Daniells to W. C. White, June 21, 1910, RG 11, Outgoing Letterbook 47, p. 983; William Duce to Daniells, June 15, 1910, RG 11, Incoming Letters, 1910--D.

⁷⁹Daniells to Duce, June 23, 1910, RG 11, Outgoing Letterbook 47, pp. 52-5; W. C. White to Daniells, July 10 and 28, 1910, WCW Correspondence, 1910--Daniells, A. G. Folder; W. C. White to Haskell, July 13, 1910, WCW Correspondence, 1910--Haskell, S. N., WE.

⁸⁰Daniells to W. C. White, Jan. 3, 1910, RG 11, Outgoing Letterbook 46, p. 393; Daniells, Transcript of Remarks Before Faculty of Fernando Academy, California, May 11, 1910, DF 200: A. G. Daniells Miscellaneous Articles, WE; Daniells to Haskell, Mar. 10, 1908, RG 11, Outgoing Letterbook 42, pp. 969-79; Daniells, Transcript of Bible Study at Nashville, Tennessee, Jan. 26, 1910, RG 21: "Special Files," A. G. Daniells, The Daily, Section 1.

⁸¹Daniells, "Remarks Before the Faculty of Fernando Academy, California, May 11, 1910," DF 200: A. G. Daniells Miscellaneous Articles, WE; Daniells to W. C. White, Feb. 22, 1910, WCW Correspondence, 1910--Daniells, A. G., WE; Daniells to W. C. White, Feb. 1, 1910, RG 11, Incoming Letters, 1910--W.

⁸²Daniells to W. C. White, Dec. 31, 1909, RG 11, Outgoing Letterbook 46, p. 374; Daniells to W. C. White, Feb. 8, 1910, WCW Correspondence, 1910--Daniells, A. G., WE; Daniells to W. C. White, Mar. 31, 1910, Ibid.; Daniells to W. C. White, Aug. 4, Aug. 5, Aug. 7, 1910, RG 11, Outgoing Letterbook 47, pp. 442, 448, 466.

⁸³Daniells to Conradi, Sept. 27, 1910, RG 11, Outgoing Letterbook 47, pp. 925-26.

⁸⁴Ellen White, "The Writing and Sending Out of the Testimonies to the Church," n.d., p. 5, Pamphlet Files; W. C. White to L. E. Froom, Jan. 8, 1928, RG 58: L. E. Froom, Reference Files, 1920s-30s, White, W. C. Folder; W. C. White, "The Anti-Meat Pledge," June 16, 1929, F. M. Wilcox PC, Reference Files, Testimonies of EGW of Special Interest Folder.

⁸⁵W. C. White, "The Integrity of the Testimonies to the Church," Remarks at College View, Nebraska, Nov. 25, 1925, PC 2: F. C. Gilbert PC, Box 4, Untitled Folder; W. C. White, "The Spirit of Prophecy: Six Lectures Delivered at the General Conference Advanced Bible School, 1936 Term," Lecture 5, p. 17, RG 58: L. E. Froom Reference Files, 1930s, Miscellaneous Materials Folder.

86R. A. Underwood, "The Relation of the Testimonies to the Bible and Their Place in the Church," Enclosure with Underwood to W. C. White, Mar. 18, 1921, DF 435: Underwood, R. A., Miscellaneous and Mss., WE; W. C. White, Draft Response to Underwood Statement, July 6, 1921, Ibid.

87W. C. White to Clarence Santee and G. M. Alway, WCW Correspondence Bk. 178, 1923-24--Sa-St. Helena, WE; W. C. White to Executive Committee of GC, Oct. 3, 1921, F. M. Wilcox PC, Reference Files, Testimonies of EGW of Special Interest Folder.

88W. C. White to Daniells, Dec. 26, 1913, WCW Correspondence Bk. 46, 1912-13--Daniells, A. G., WE; W. A. Colcord to J. E. White, Feb. 3, 1914, RG 17: M. L. Andreasen, Reference Files, Colcord, Belden, W. C. White, E. G. White, Kellogg Folder; W. C. White, "Regarding the Use of the Tithe," DF 384, WE.

89W. C. White to Daniells, Dec. 31, 1913, WCW Correspondence Bk. 46, 1912-13--Daniells, A. G., WE.

90Ibid.; W. C. White to J. W. Watt, Mar. 7, 1915, WCW Correspondence Bk. 105, 1914-16--U-V--White, W. B., WE.

91W. C. White to Katie I. Westphal, June 10, 1921, WCW Correspondence Bk. 164, 1920-22--U-Wa, WE.

92J. S. Watt to Ellen White, Jan. 7, 1914, WCW Correspondence Bk. 105, 1914-16, U-V--White, W. B., WE; Watt to W. C. White, Mar. 24, 1914, Ibid.; Watt to W. C. White, Mar. 14, 1915, Ibid.

93W. C. White to F. M. Wilcox, ^{JUNE 2} ~~May 16~~, 1921, WCW Correspondence Bk. 168, 1920-22--Wilcox, F. M., WE; see also, W. C. White to Watt, Feb. 19, 1914, WCW Correspondence Bk. 105, 1914-16, U-V--White, W. B., WE; W. C. White to Watt, Mar. 7, 1915, Ibid.; W. C. White to F. Vance, Feb. 18, 1921, WCW Correspondence Bk. 164, 1920-22, U-Wa, WE.

94W. C. White to Robert A. Hare, Feb. 10, 1922, WCW Correspondence Bk. 146, 1920-22--H, WE.

95Ibid.

96W. C. White to F. M. Wilcox, Apr. 27, 1915, DF 107d: Testimonies, WCW Statements, WE; W. C. White to W. W. Eastman, Nov. 4, 1912, DF 52b, WE.

97Ibid.; W. C. White to L. E. Froom, Jan. 8, 1928, RG 58: L. E. Froom, Reference Files, 1920s-30s, White, W. C. Folder.

98W. C. White to J. C. Stevens, July 25, 1919, WCW Correspondence Bk. 129, 1917-19, Sp-S Miscellaneous, WE; W. C. White to L. E. Froom, Dec. 13, 1934, DF 107d: Testimonies--WCW Statements, WE.

99W. C. White, "An Appeal for the Use of the Telescope," May 24, 1932, DF 107d: Testimonies--WCW Statements, WE; W. C. White, "The Spirit of Prophecy: Six Lectures Delivered at the General Conference Advanced Bible School, 1936 Term," Lecture 2, p. 12, RG 58: L. E. Froom, Reference Files, Miscellaneous Materials, 1930s Folder; W. C. White, May, 1932, "The House Questions Answered," Question No. 8, RG 58: L. E. Froom, Reference Files, Elmshaven Materials

Folder; W. C. White to S. Donaldson, July 9, 1919, WCW Correspondence Bk. 116, 1917-19--D-E, WE.

¹⁰⁰E.G. White Estate, "The 1911 Edition of Great Controversy," 1935, RG 58: L. E. Froom, Reference Files, Elmshaven Materials Folder.

¹⁰¹W. C. White to J. E. White, June 1, 1909, RG 58: L. E. Froom, Reference Files, Elmshaven Materials Folder; W. C. White to Washburn, Oct. 27, 1910, RG 17: M. L. Andreasen, Reference Files, The Daily Folder.

¹⁰²W. C. White to J. E. White, June 1, 1909, p. 2, RG 58: L. E. Froom, Reference Files, Elmshaven Materials Folder.

¹⁰³W. C. White to P. T. Magan, July 31, 1910, p. 13, RG 58: L. E. Froom, Reference Files, The Daily Folder.

¹⁰⁴Ibid., p. 21; W. C. White to Washburn, Oct. 27, 1910, pp. 25-8, RG 17: M. L. Andreasen, Reference Files, The Daily Folder; W. C. White to Washburn, April 28, 1910, DF 201a: Daily--WCW Letters, WE.

¹⁰⁵W. C. White to Daniells, June 20, 1910, WCW Correspondence Files, 1910--Daniells, A. G., WE; W. C. White to Washburn, Oct. 27, 1910, p. 27, RG 17: M. L. Andreasen, Reference Files, The Daily Folder.

¹⁰⁶W. C. White to Magan, July 31, 1910, p. 13, RG 58: L. E. Froom, Reference Files, The Daily Folder; W. C. White to J. E. White, June 1, 1909, p. 2, RG 58: L. E. Froom, Reference Files, Elmshaven Materials Folder.

¹⁰⁷W. C. White to Daniells, Mar. 13, 1910, WCW Correspondence, 1910--Daniells, A. G., WE.

¹⁰⁸Ellen White, "Our Attitude Toward Doctrinal Controversy," Selected Messages, Volume 1, pp. 164-65.

¹⁰⁹Ibid., p. 168.

¹¹⁰W. C. White to Haskell, Dec. 9, 1909, Quoted in White to Magan, July 31, 1910, p. 18, RG 58: L. E. Froom, Reference Files, The Daily Folder.

¹¹¹W. C. White to Daniells, Mar. 13, 1910, WCW Correspondence, 1910--Daniells, A. G., WE; W. C. White to Daniells, July 28, 1910, Ibid.; W. C. White to Washburn, Apr. 28, 1910, DF 201a: Daily--WCW Letters, WE; W. C. White to Haskell, May 25, 1910, Quoted in White to Washburn, Oct. 27, 1910, p. 23, RG 17: M. L. Andreasen, Reference Files, The Daily Folder.

¹¹²F. M. Wilcox, "Contending for the Faith," Review and Herald, Aug. 12, 1915, pp. 4-5; Wilcox, "The Spirit of Prophecy in the Remnant Church," Review and Herald, Nov. 15, 1928, p. 5.

¹¹³Prescott, "The Person of Christ," Discussion, July 13, 1919, p. 42, RG 25: Stenographic Report of the 1919 Bible and History Teachers' Conference.

¹¹⁴Washburn to F. M. Wilcox, Nov. 27, 1931, F. M. Wilcox PC, Reference Files, Writings of J. S. Washburn Folder.