Chapter One

A Context for Crisis

"We turn our eyes to the future," Uriah Smith wrote in his opening *Review* editorial for 1888. "The prospect, year by year, grows clearer, the evidence surer, that we have not followed cunningly devised fables in making known the soon coming of the Lord. Prophecies are converging to their fulfillment. Events are moving with accelerated velocity. The word of God is demonstrating its claims to truthfulness, and comforting every humble believer with the thought that the hope that is built thereon can never fail."[1]

General Conference president George I. Butler shared similar perspectives with Smith. "We have much reason to thank God and take courage as we enter upon the year 1888," he penned in a circular letter to the Adventist ministry in January. Noting that Seventh-day Adventists had "never taken a stand upon Bible exegesis which they have been compelled to surrender," he pointed out that "every year we have more and more evidence that we are right in our interpretation of the great prophetic themes which distinguish us as a people."[2]

January 1888 also saw Alonzo T. Jones, coeditor of the *Signs of the Times,* take the position that events then occurring in the uniting of religion and state in America were in "direct course of the fulfillment of Rev. 13:11-17" with its teaching on the formation of the image of the beast.[3]

Seventh-day Adventists everywhere were excited about the Second Advent in early 1888 as events on every side indicated that they would soon see the long-predicted national Sunday legislation become a reality. Nineteenth-century Adventists

saw their movement as a manifestation of biblical prophecy—especially the prophecies of Revelation 12-14. They were acutely aware of the fact that Revelation 12:17 pictured the last-day remnant as a commandment-keeping group and that Revelation 14:9-12 contrasted those who had the mark of the beast with those who "keep the commandments of God." Neither did it escape their biblical exegetes that the preaching of the message that contained that contrast (the third angel's message) would be humanity's last warning before the great Second Advent harvest of Revelation 14:14-20.

Viewing Revelation 14:6, 7 as the Adventist mandate to begin preaching a judgment-hour message in the 1840s, they did not fail to notice that verse 7 alluded to the fourth commandment of the Decalogue—the only one of the Ten Commandments that divided the Christian world. Thus Seventh-day Adventists had come to view themselves as the remnant church, a prophetic people, a body of believers who fully practiced *all* the commandments of God.

Coupling that view with such texts as John 14:15 ("If ye love me, keep my commandments"), Adventists had seen the observance of the biblical Sabbath as an outward sign of allegiance to the creator God. Likewise, they had taught since the late 1840s that those who honored Sunday, when the issue became clear to them, would be placing themselves in a position in which they would be giving their allegiance to the beast power of Revelation 13.

The Adventist interpretation of Revelation 13 predicted a last-day showdown between those who honored the true Sabbath and those who symbolically followed the beast—a climactic crisis that would eventually lead to a death penalty for those who did not come into line with the beast power (Rev. 13:16, 17). As a result, Seventh-day Adventists had been publicly predicting since the late 1840s that they would eventually be persecuted for their faithfulness to the biblical Sabbath.

In this historical and theological context it is not difficult

to see why Revelation 14:12 ("Here is the patience of the saints: here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus") was their flagship text. Revelation 14:12 was so central to Adventism that the *Review and Herald* quoted it under its masthead on the front page of every issue published in the nineteenth century.

Given their emphasis, it is easy to see why Adventists were sensitive to Sunday legislation and to persecution related to the breaking of Sunday laws. It is quite understandable, then, that they became excited and expectant about the end of time in the 1880s when state governments enacted and enforced one Sunday law after another. After all, such laws verified the fulfillment of the prophecies they had been preaching for 40 years.

The All-important Threat of Sunday Legislation

Throughout the 1880s Sunday legislation and persecution grew in strength and scope. The problem surfaced in an explosive way in California in 1882, when the Sunday question became a major issue in the state's elections—even to the point where some called for a third party with Sunday sacredness as its major platform plank. J. H. Waggoner claimed that the Sunday law had become a " 'bone of contention' " throughout the state, demolishing normal party lines. Its consequences hit Adventists when the local authorities arrested W. C. White for operating the Pacific Press on Sunday.[4]

Although California soon repealed its Sunday law, the threat of growing pressure for similar legislation across the nation spurred Seventh-day Adventists to action. Perhaps their most important move was to establish the *Sabbath Sentinel* in 1884 to publicize their reasons for opposing Sunday legislation and for observing the seventh-day Sabbath. More than 500,000 copies of the *Sabbath Sentinel* circulated during the single year of its existence. Adventists founded the *American Sentinel of Religious Liberty* in 1886 to continue the struggle against the wave of pending Sunday legislation.[5]

The scene of action shifted from California to Arkansas in 1885. Arkansas had had a Sunday law since 1883. It had originally contained an exemption for Sabbath observers, but the state legislature had repealed the exemption in 1885—allegedly to close saloons operated on Sunday in Little Rock by Jews. Between 1885 and 1887 the state had 21 cases related to Sunday desecration. All but two had involved Sabbathkeepers, and the authorities had released the defendants in those two instances without bail and dismissed their cases. For the Seventh-day Adventists, however, bail ranged from $110 to $500 each—a stiff fine in an era when a laboring man earned about $1 a day. Meanwhile, the authorities had not arrested a single saloonkeeper. In addition, many of the accusing witnesses and informers had been working on Sunday—sometimes with the arrested Sabbath observers—yet no one molested them, even though the courts found the Saturday keepers guilty.

A. T. Jones concluded that "there could be no clearer demonstration that the law was used only as a means to vent religious spite against a class of citizens guiltless of any crime, but only of professing a religion different from that of the majority." Thus "the only effect of the repeal of that exemption clause was to give power to a set of bigots to oppress those whose religion they hated."[6]

By late 1888 the focal point for Sunday prosecution had shifted to Tennessee, where local authorities would arrest large numbers of Adventists during the late 1880s and early 1890s. Some, including ministers, served on chain gangs as common criminals.

Events took on more ominous meanings for Adventists in 1887 when both the Prohibition Party and the Women's Christian Temperance Union openly sided with the National Reform Association in its drive to establish Sunday laws as a means of improving American morality. That same year saw Wilbur Crafts organize the American Sabbath Union for the same purpose.

Adventist eschatological excitement intensified in 1888 when Roman Catholic cardinal James Gibbons joined hands with the Protestants by endorsing a petition to Congress on behalf of national Sunday legislation. The Protestants were more than willing to accept such help. "Whenever they [the Roman Catholics] are willing to cooperate in resisting the progress of political atheism," proclaimed the *Christian Statesman* in 1884, "we will gladly join hands with them."[7]

The high-water mark in the excitement on the Sunday issue came on May 21,1888, when New Hampshire's senator H. W. Blair introduced a bill into the United States Senate for the promotion of the observance of "the Lord's day" "as a day of religious worship." Blair's national Sunday bill was the first such legislation to go before Congress since the establishment of the Adventist movement in the 1840s. Four days later Blair submitted a proposed amendment to the United States Constitution that would Christianize the nation's public school system.[8]

Seventh-day Adventists did not miss the prophetic significance of the Blair bills. It was obvious to them that the forming of the image to the beast of Revelation 13, the giving of the mark of the beast, and the end of the world loomed close at hand. It appeared that American freedom stood on the verge of collapse.[9]

Thus the eschatological excitement of the Sunday-law movement served as one factor contributing to heightened tensions at the 1888 General Conference session. That eschatological crisis created an emotional atmosphere directly related to two other issues that would surface at the Minneapolis meetings. The first was the interpretation of prophecy—especially in the book of Daniel. The second involved the kind of righteousness needed for salvation—an important concern since the end of the world seemed to be sweeping down upon the church with great rapidity. That second issue would bring the function of God's law in the plan of salvation into focus as Adventists struggled over its role in the book of Galatians.

It is impossible to understand the high emotional pitch of the participants at the 1888 General Conference session without grasping the fact that Adventists felt, because of the Sunday crisis, that they already faced the end of time. S. N. Haskell wrote shortly before the beginning of the 1888 General Conference session that all that Adventists had taught for their entire history was coming to pass, that their liberty as Sabbath observers would quickly be taken away, and that they might soon be bearing their testimony in courts and prisons. All they had taught for 40 years regarding prophecy pointed to their day.[10] With that in mind it is not difficult to see why some of their leaders reacted violently and emotionally when others of their number began to question the validity of the denomination's interpretation of prophecy and its theology of the law. Such questioning, they reasoned, threatened the very core of Adventist identity in a time of utmost crisis.

The Threat of Reinterpreting the Denomination's Prophetic Foundation

One dynamic factor that set the stage for the 1888 meetings was the debate between A. T. Jones and Uriah Smith over the identity of the ten prophetic horns of Daniel 7. Smith had been the acknowledged Adventist champion of prophetic interpretation for several decades. *His Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation* served as the standard Adventist work on the subject. Jones, on the other hand, was a relative newcomer both to Adventism and to prophetic interpretation, but he was an avid student of both scripture and history, as well as a rising star in the Adventist world.

The 1884 General Conference session had commissioned Jones to "write a series of articles gathered from history on points that showed the fulfillment of prophecy," a task that led him to study the book of Daniel. Smith initially expressed joy over the idea of Jones having the time to undertake a more complete examination of the ten kingdoms of Daniel 7, but suggested that it would be a difficult task—somewhat like

"hunting the pieces of a building" after it had been "struck by a hundred pounds of dynamite."[11]

The cordial relationship between the two men grew somewhat strained in early 1885 when Jones concluded that Smith's published list was incorrect. The younger man contended that the Alemanni were the tenth kingdom and not the Huns, as Smith claimed. Jones asked the older church leader to supply firm historical evidence for his positions, and he asked him to examine his evidence for the Alemanni and comment upon it. Unfortunately Jones received no answer to his first request, while Smith replied to the second one that he lacked time for the task.

As a result, Jones published his articles in the *Signs of the Times* without the *Review* editor having critiqued them. He then sent copies to Smith in October 1886.[12]

The irate senior editor replied on November 8 that he would have to counterattack through the *Review* since Jones had "scattered" his views "broadcast through the paper." In his reply Smith touched upon the nerve center of the problem. "If the Huns are not to be reckoned as one of the ten," he wrote, "I think *we are yet ten percent short on the fulfillment of Dan. 2 & 7.* You can readily imagine what the effect would be, if our preachers, after presenting the ten kingdoms as they have for the past forty years, should now change upon a point which has been considered so well established, that it has never excited a dissenting voice, nor called forth a challenge from anyone. *Thousands would instantly notice the change, and say: 'Oh! now you find that you are mistaken on what you have considered one of your clearest points; and so if we give you time enough, you will probably come to acknowledge finally, that you are mistaken on everything.'* Thus the tendency would be to unsettle minds upon all points, a[nd] create confusion."[13]

Jones shot back an epistle on December 3. If Smith had been bold in emphasizing the reasons that the traditional interpretation should be held to in the current crisis, Jones would be equally trenchant. He wrote that "the real battle

of the truth and for the truth has not yet begun" because Adventists had been "considered worthy of very little notice." But the Sunday crisis would change all that. Seventh-day Adventist beliefs in the end-time crisis would "become the principal subject of discussion in this whole nation. . . . Then our views are going to be noticed by the high in the land. Then every point is going to be analyzed and challenged by the scholarship and dignity of judges, statesmen, and the greatest in the land, as well as by the hypocrisy of religious bigots and the trickery of politicians. *Then it will be that our views will have to be examined by men who are acquainted with all the avenues of history,* and will have to pass the challenges that all these men can put upon the truth. . . . When we shall have to run down these lines through the history to show that we are right in our statement of the third angel's message, *we shall then to these men have to present some better reason for our faith than that 'it has been preached for forty years' or that Bishop Chandler said so*." Such men, Jones continued, would require valid historical references. He closed by challenging Smith to correct the errors in *Thoughts on Daniel* that "every well-informed person knows" to be "not true."[14]

Smith returned the implied insult in mid-December, accusing Jones of a "ransacking of history" in his attempt to prove him wrong. Once again the older man sought to rely on traditional authority. Jones replied on December 27 that traditional authority, "third rate names," and commentators could not substitute for the "standard historians." "If," he wrote, "you have any reliable authority at all to show the kingdoms of the Huns" fits the prophecy, he would be glad to publish it in the *Signs.*[15]

It is important to note that both Jones and Smith framed their justification for the importance of the ten horns in the framework of the contemporary Sunday-law crisis. That fact helps us understand why such a seemingly unimportant issue could generate so much heat. After all, the Adventist interpretation of the Sunday crisis was a prophetic one. It hardly

looked like a good time to be changing the denomination's position on prophetic interpretation. Thus Smith and his allies dug in for battle. The issue of the ten horns would receive special treatment at the 1886 General Conference session, but its major impact would be felt at the Minneapolis meetings in 1888. By the eve of those meetings Butler would be thundering that Jones had proved himself to be a troublemaker by bringing up an interpretation "contrary to the long established faith of our people taken forty years ago."[16]

The role of W. C. White in the ten-horns struggle did not contribute to a sense of security for the Smith-Butler faction. They viewed him as a key player because of his close relationship to his mother. Jones had sent W. C. White, who was in Europe, a set of his articles. White replied that it seemed to him that Jones had "established every point. I could find no flaw in your argument, nor can I criticize the authorities that you quote." Although White felt bad that Smith and Butler were making such a big issue of the topic, he was still quite certain that he could "persuade Eld. Butler that no great harm has been done." His optimism would soon shatter against reality. In fact, many would come to interpret his efforts to intercede to mean that he (and eventually his mother) were themselves linked in a conspiracy with Jones and E. J. Waggoner to produce major changes in the denomination's theology.[17]

Also contributing fuel to the fire under the problem of the interpretation of the ten horns was the fact that Smith's *Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation* was in the process of being translated into German. White noted in May 1888 that "those who are studying the matter here . . . are swinging around to Jones' position" and that "the idea is gaining ground that while it is important to be united in our positions," it is even more vital to be "correct."[18] Such a turn of events did little to comfort the embattled Smith and his colleagues. The ten horns would be a dynamic issue on the agenda of the Minneapolis meetings.

The Threat of Reinterpreting the Denomination's Theology of the Law

If the crisis over the ten horns was intense, that generated by the issue of what law the book of Galatians was talking about was literally explosive. With the Sunday crisis right upon them it was bad enough to be tinkering with the validity of Adventist prophetic interpretation, but to be making major changes in the denomination's theology of the law could spell total disaster. After all, Adventists had a hard enough time upholding the perpetuity of the law in the hostile environment of late-nineteenth-century evangelicalism. Their Protestant contemporaries had them on the defensive. Many opponents even sought to do away altogether with the idea that the ten-commandment law was still obligatory.

One of Adventism's major arguments in support of the law had been its position on the two laws: the ceremonial, done away with at the cross, and the moral, which was eternal. That approach was so central to Adventist theology that Smith wrote in 1884 that "if it can be maintained that the distinction" between the two laws "does not exist, Sabbathkeeping at once disappears from the list of Christian duties. . . . No question, therefore, more vital to the interests of Sabbathkeepers can be proposed."[19] Perhaps the position's foremost champion was Dudley M. Canright, the denomination's most successful evangelist of the period, a debater who had successfully represented the denomination against other religious bodies on nearly a score of occasions, and the author of more than 20 books and pamphlets defending Adventist doctrine. His *Two Laws,* first published in 1876, was a major contribution to Adventist thinking on the law.

An important text that the Seventh-day Adventists had to contend with was the "added law" of Galatians 3:19-25. For three decades Adventists had interpreted that law to be what they called the "ceremonial" law. That interpretation, Adventist leaders held, was important in guarding the perpetuity of the Ten Commandments. After all, did not Galatians 3:25 plainly

teach that once an individual had faith, he was "no longer under a schoolmaster"?

The law in Galatians had become a controversial issue between 1884 and 1886 when A. T. Jones and E. J. Waggoner began to teach that Galatians had the Ten Commandments in mind rather than the ceremonial laws. Waggoner published their view in the *Signs,* and both men taught it at Healdsburg College in California. Many regarded the "new" interpretation as a threat to the very heart of Adventist theology—the continuing sacredness of the seventh-day Sabbath embedded in the moral law. In order to defend their position on the Sabbath in a hostile religious context, Adventists had protected their theology by interpreting the law in Galatians as the ceremonial regulations. Thus the church leadership perceived Jones and Waggoner as endangering one of Adventism's central theological pillars.

The General Conference forces, led by Butler and Smith, felt quite confident in their perspective because they believed that the church had settled the question once and for all back in 1856. Before that time, many Adventists—including James White, J. N. Andrews, Uriah Smith, and Joseph Bates—had held that the law in Galatians was the Ten Commandments. The issue had come to a head when J. H. Waggoner published *The Law of God: An Examination of the Testimony of Both Testaments* (1854), which took the Ten Commandments view of the law in Galatians. In 1856 Stephen Pierce had challenged that position when he argued that the law in Galatians "was the law system including the ceremonial law." The participants in the discussion—including James and Ellen White—swung over to Pierce's viewpoint. Smith and Butler even went so far as to claim that Mrs. White had had a vision on the topic and had written to J. H. Waggoner that the law in Galatians could not be the moral law. While Smith and Butler never documented their claim, it is a historical fact that after the 1856 conference James White removed Waggoner's book from the market. For the next 30 years the church harmoniously taught that the law

in Galatians was the ceremonial regulations.[20]

It was into that settled theological atmosphere that E.J. Waggoner shot his articles on Galatians. Butler, as president of the General Conference and defender of the faith, immediately felt concerned. During a visit to Healdsburg College in early 1886 he became quite incensed over Jones and Waggoner's efforts. "When we learn that the . . . view held by the minority is being vigorously pushed in one of our colleges among our Bible students and published to the world in the *Signs,*" he penned, "I confess it does not please me very well."[21] That was probably an understatement of the depth of his emotions on the topic. The issue would soon become so important in his mind that he would come perilously close after the Minneapolis meetings to leaving the denomination of which he was president.[22]

Just what was it that so bothered Butler and his friends about Waggoner's position on Galatians? Butler supplies a partial answer in his 1886 critique of Waggoner's *Signs* articles. He observed that the *Signs* had a large circulation and that it "comes under the observation of many of our ablest opponents." Its treatment of the law in Galatians was particularly important *"because the apostle's references to the law in this letter are used by our opponents as a strong support to their antinomian doctrines." Thus Waggoner and Jones were providing "great aid and comfort" to the Adventists' antinomian enemies.*[23]

Butler supplied further reasons for the importance of the Galatians controversy in October 1888. By that time he viewed it as "the opening wedge" by which a "deluge" of doctrinal and prophetic changes were being "let in" to the Adventist Church. Beyond that, he claimed, it would "break the faith of many of our leading worker[s] in the Testimonies," since Ellen White had purportedly had a vision establishing that the law in Galatians could not be the ten-commandment law.[24]

Smith was one in heart and mind with Butler. For him, "next to the death of Brother White, the greatest calamity that ever befell our cause was when Dr. Waggoner put his

articles on the book of Galatians through the *Signs*." If the denomination ever changed its position on Galatians, he flatly stated, "they may count me out," because "I am not yet prepared to renounce Seventh-day Adventism." He firmly believed that if the traditional position was incorrect, "then we have been wrong for the past thirty years, and Seventh-day Adventism has been developed and built upon error." He held that position until his death. The *Review* editor could see no possible reconciliation between the beliefs of Adventism and a ten-commandment interpretation of the law in Galatians. Such a position, he held in concurrence with Butler, "overthrows the Testimonies and the Sabbath."[25]

Waggoner, on the other hand, believed (as did Jones on the ten horns) that it was more important to be correct than to uphold an erroneous traditional interpretation. *"As we approach the end, " he wrote, "all the forces of the enemy will be concentrated" upon the Adventist interpretation of the law.* "Every point in our argument will have to be subjected to the test of the most rigid criticism."

"I know," he continued, "you will say that it will be a humiliating thing to modify our position in the face of the enemy. But if a general has a faulty position, I submit that it is better to correct it . . . than to run the risk of defeat because of his faulty position." Waggoner personally saw nothing humiliating in a change of denominational interpretation. Such a modification "would simply be an acknowledgement that" Adventists "are better informed to day [sic] than they were yesterday."[26]

We should note that both sides in the Galatians struggle justified their positions in relation to the Sunday-law issue. The same was true in their magnification of the ten-horns issue. Therefore we must see the emotional battle that ensued within that all-important crisis context. Adventists believed by 1888 that they were arguing for the highest stakes and that they would soon be subjected to scrutinizing examination by the world's greatest tribunals of justice and scholarship as

they refused to come into harmony with the mark of the beast power as it related to Sunday laws.

The 1886 General Conference Session and Its Aftermath: Prelude to Minneapolis

Butler sought to resolve the struggles over the law and prophetic interpretation by the end of 1886. During the summer of that year he had begun a campaign to rectify the disagreements—in favor of the traditional positions, of course.

His first line of attack involved writing a series of letters to Ellen White, who was in Europe, to enlist her aid against the young men from the West Coast (Jones and E. J. Waggoner), who had been bold enough to advocate in print theological and prophetic viewpoints contrary to long-established Adventist positions.[27]

To say the least, Ellen White's silence to Butler's repeated request greatly frustrated him. As a result, he had shifted to tactic number two by the end of August 1886. He would compose a "brief comment on the Epistle to the Galatians" on the topic of the law, since the *Signs* had put forth the subject "in the most public manner possible." His "brief comment" turned out to be an 85-page book, entitled *The Law in the Book of Galatians.* It proved to be a thorough attack on Waggoner's position. In addition to Butler's book, the denomination's leaders brought out a new printing of Canright's *Two Laws,* which was first published in 1876. The 1886 printing sported only one obvious change—the section on the law in Galatians had expanded from 6 to 24 pages. That was the only major change in the volume.[28]

Butler's third tactic was to utilize the 1886 General Conference session to put Jones and Waggoner and their "false teachings" in their proper place and thus get the denomination back on track. The General Conference president provided every attendee with a copy of his *Law in the Book of Galatians.* More importantly, he organized a theological committee to settle the issues of the ten horns and the law in Galatians once

and for all. E. J. Waggoner, Canright, Smith, and Butler served on it. However, Butler's hope for a creedal statement that would establish the truth on the controverted points for all time met with frustration. The nine-man committee split five to four. "We had an argument of several hours," he reported, "but neither side was convinced." The next question, he noted, "was whether we should take this into the Conference and have a big public fight over it." Being an astute politician, he realized that such a move would only cause more trouble.[29]

The upshot of the stalemate was that President Butler had to settle for a compromise in which the delegates approved a resolution that "doctrinal views not held by a fair majority of our people" could not be made a part of the instruction in Adventist schools or published in denominational papers until they had been "examined and approved by the leading brethren of experience."[30] The regulation obviously had Jones and Waggoner, their editing of the *Signs,* and their teaching at Healdsburg College in mind. The compromise, however, was never really effective—it merely put off the showdown to a later date.

Both Butler and Ellen White would look back on the 1886 General Conference session as that "terrible conference." While he noted that the conference was one of the saddest he had ever attended, she pointed out that "Jesus was grieved and bruised in the person of His saints." She especially felt disturbed about the "harshness," "disrespect, and the want of sympathetic love in brother toward brother." The dynamics of Minneapolis were already in place.[31]

Perhaps the most visible casualty of the 1886 meetings was Canright—one of the denomination's most successful evangelists and a champion of the traditional approach to the law as interpreted by Butler and Smith. Canright had been in the center of the battle over the law and the covenants with Waggoner on the theological committee. In the heat of the debate he must have grasped the fact that Waggoner had a valid point. Unfortunately Canright came to believe that if

the denomination was wrong in its traditional interpretation of the law, "their [the Seventh-day Adventists'] cause is lost." But instead of adopting Waggoner's view of the Ten Commandments as leading individuals to Christ, Canright dropped both the perpetuity of the law and Adventism. Later he pointed back to the debate over the law in Galatians in 1886 as a major turning point, after which he reexamined the Adventist position on the law for several weeks. He then laid his findings before the leaders at Battle Creek, resigned all his official positions, and asked them to dismiss him from the church. The leadership granted his request on February 17, 1887. That same day Butler wrote to Mrs. White that Canright had left over the results of his study on the 'law question."[32]

Butler stated in the *Review* that Canright *"thought that we were exalting the law above Christ." At this point Butler touched upon what would become the central theological issue of the meaning of the 1888 General Conference session.* Canright comprehended the problem in late 1886, but could not adjust his law-oriented theology to account for the truth of the gospel of salvation by grace through faith. He saw no option but to throw over the law and join the gospel-oriented Baptists. Subsequently he would become the Adventists' most formidable opponent, publishing his influential *Seventh-day Adventism Renounced* in 1889.

The General Conference president found it "astonishing to us all how he could change so quickly and radically." He blamed it on Canright's unstable character. It is true that Canright had been erratic in his relationship to the church, but the evidence indicates that he had grasped the fact that the Adventist leadership was confused on the question of the covenants and had placed the law above the gospel. While Canright understood part of the truth that Waggoner was seeking to present, Butler, Smith, and their colleagues held blindly to their traditional Adventism with its major theological problems. That would become much more evident

in subsequent years. The loss of Canright over the Galatians issue should have awakened Smith and Butler, but his defection merely led them to dig their heels in deeper and to prepare for further battle. The apostasy certainly didn't help them soften their attitude toward Jones and Waggoner and their new theology that emphasized "the gospel in Galatians."[33] To the contrary, it raised the old guard's emotionalism on the issue. After all, hadn't they predicted that such would be the fruit of the new teaching?

Canright was not the only church thinker busy in the wake of the 1886 General Conference session. E. J. Waggoner, who Butler claimed had come to the conference "fully armed for the fray," penned a "letter," dated February 10, 1887, to Butler that was later published as the 71-page *Gospel in the Book of Galatians.* Waggoner's book was an extensive critique of Butler's *Law in the Book of Galatians* that the denominational president and his supporters had distributed at the recent General Conference session.[34]

The Road to Minneapolis

Ellen White's pen was also active during the early months of 1887. One of her most important letters went to Jones and E. J. Waggoner on February 18. In it she indicated that she had been looking for the testimony she had written to J. H. Waggoner in the 1850s on the "added law" of Galatians, but could not find it. She recalled that she had written "to him that I had been shown his position in regard to the law was incorrect," but that she could not recall exactly what was incorrect about it, since "the matter does not lie clear and distinct in my mind." Of one thing, however, she was certain: Adventists should present a united doctrinal front to the public. "Especially at this time," she said in an obvious reference to the vulnerability and visibility of the denomination in the Sunday crisis, "should everything like difference be repressed." She definitely faulted the two young editors for making their positions public in the *Signs.*

Mrs. White went on to claim that the various positions on the law in Galatians "are not vital points." Noting that it would take years to "wipe out the impressions made at our last conference [1886]," she said that she would refuse to attend another conference if the leadership placed such issues as Galatians or the ten horns on the agenda.

Moving beyond points that were "not vital," Ellen White highlighted what she considered to be essential. "There is danger," she emphasized, "of our ministers dwelling too much on doctrines, preaching altogether too many discourses on argumentative subjects when their own soul needs practical godliness. . . . The wonders of redemption are dwelt upon . . . too lightly. We need these matters presented more fully and continuously. . . . There is danger of keeping the discourses and the articles in the paper like Cain's offering, Christless." Such themes would form the backbone of her writing and preaching at Minneapolis and throughout the 1890s.[35]

Ellen White's letter was a definite rebuke to Jones and Waggoner for making divisive issues public in a time of crisis and for certain of their undesirable character traits. Both men replied positively, humbly apologizing for their public and their private faults. One result of the interchange was that Waggoner withheld the publication of his *Gospel in the Book of Galatians.* The manuscript would not enter print until shortly before the 1888 General Conference session.[36]

A copy of the letter reproving Jones and Waggoner also went to Butler. Ecstatic with its contents, he mistakenly interpreted it as confirmation of his position on the law. In his euphoria, he wrote to Ellen White that he had really come to "love" the two young men, noting that he felt sorry for them: "I always pity those who suffer keen disappointment." Despite his "pity," Butler joyfully published an aggressive article in the *Review* promoting his position on the two laws.[37]

To say the very least, Butler's use of her letter to Jones and Waggoner upset Mrs. White. On April 5, 1887, she fired off an epistle to him and Smith, claiming that she had not sent

them a copy of the Jones-Waggoner rebuke so that they could use it as a weapon against the younger men, but that they should follow the same cautions in bringing disagreements into public. Now that Butler had publicly reopened the battle, she stated adamantly, Waggoner would have to have his chance to present his views publicly. While stating that the "whole thing is not in God's order," she called for fairness. That demand for fairness eventually led to the publication of Waggoner's book on Galatians and to the controverted points becoming major items on the agenda of the 1888 General Conference meetings.

As Mrs. White began to see the issues more clearly, she became more aggressive toward the high-handed methods of the Battle Creek leadership. "We must work as Christians," she wrote, "if we have any point that is not fully, clearly defined and can [not] bear the test of criticism, don't be afraid or too *proud* to yield it. . . . *We want the truth as it is in Jesus,* we want to be filled with all the fullness of God and have the *meekness* and *lowliness* of Christ." Accusing Smith and Butler of being in the same boat with the apostatized Canright, she claimed that she would "burn every copy" of his book on the two laws "before one should be given out to our people." In response to Butler's repeated request for her to settle the Galatians question by making an authoritative statement, she claimed that *"we want Bible evidence for every point we advance."* The themes Mrs. White stressed in her April 5 letter would be ones that she would continue to emphasize throughout the Minneapolis experience. By April 1887 she had a distinct view of the nature of the problem facing the denomination.

In her letter to Butler and Smith, Ellen White once again referred to the lost testimony to J. H. Waggoner, pointing out that her counsel may not have been on doctrine at all. "It may be it was a caution not to make his ideas prominent at that time, for there was great danger of disunion."[38]

Butler and Smith disagreed with her recollection, holding that she had seen in vision that J. H. Waggoner had been wrong

theologically. Thus both men claimed that if they were in error on Galatians, both the Sabbath and Ellen White's Testimonies would be overthrown—a position that harmonized perfectly with that of Canright. Such thoughts continued to develop as the denomination drifted toward the Minneapolis meetings in the fall of 1888.[39]

Early in 1888 W. C. White began to correspond with Butler regarding a ministerial institute to precede the formal General Conference session. He proposed several lines of study for the institute that included an examination of Bible doctrines. The General Conference president, in his replies, suggested that the ten kingdoms and the law in Galatians should be included in the topics to be studied.

By that summer, however, the busy Butler had forgotten that he had ever made such a recommendation. As a result, W. C. White sought to convince him that nothing could be healthier for the denomination than for its differing brethren "to sit down together in a kind and Christian spirit and patiently hear each other present their views." After all, he noted, no one could prevent Adventism's opponents from examining its accepted points of faith, and merely relying on tradition would place Adventists in a position similar to that of the creedal churches.[40]

In August Ellen White jumped into the debate over the ministerial institute. Her circular letter to the delegates was a rousing call to "search the scriptures," since "the truth can lose nothing by close investigation." The Adventist people, she suggested, would be "called before councils" and "be criticized by keen and critical minds." Many, including those in the ministry, were deficient in Bible understanding. They had relied too heavily upon the authority of the leadership and Adventist tradition. "We are not," she penned in an obvious thrust at the Smith-Butler mentality, "to set our stakes, and then interpret everything to reach this set point." That was where the Reformers had left the path of biblical faith. *"The Bible,"* she proclaimed, *"must be our standard for every doctrine*

and practice. . . . We are to receive no one's opinion without comparing it with the Scriptures. Here is divine authority which is supreme in matters of faith. It is the word of the living God that is to decide all controversies." She went on to point out that they needed to study the Bible "in the Spirit of Christ" without "giving sharp thrusts." All "pharisaism" was to be set aside, and "all assumptions and preconceived opinions are to be thoroughly tested" by scripture.

Ellen White's August 5, 1888, letter reinforced her April 1887 call for fairness and equal time. Jones and Waggoner, she intimated in no uncertain terms, should have their hearing. Beyond that, she once again highlighted two themes that would become central to her at Minneapolis—the all-important authority of the Bible and the necessity of having the spirit of Jesus rather than that of the Pharisees.[41]

In the face of such an open call for Bible study and Christian justice, Butler had no choice but to capitulate. In the *Review* of August 28 he announced the holding of the ministerial institute and the fact that it would explore the debated issues.[42]

Butler finally agreeing to the institute and the discussion of the points of controversy did not mean that he ever came to terms with the prospect in a healthy way. To the contrary, by the beginning of October, on the eve of the meetings, he had worked himself up into an emotional state and was close to a breakdown. On October 1 he penned a more than 40-page letter to Ellen White. The president of the General Conference accused her of betraying him and pinpointed her son as having played a particularly distasteful role in the conflicts that had been shaking the denomination since 1884. Butler had never seen any justice in her April 5, 1887, letter, "and never expect to." As far as Jones and Waggoner were concerned, he had never observed "a more bare-faced and defiant course on a controverted question." He regretted that he and Smith "did not just wade into them and show them up in the widest channels possible" when they first put their ideas in print. In the days when James White had been president, "those young

men would have heard thunder around their ears . . . that would have made them tingle." White would have immediately gone "for them in public and private and ma[d]e them regret such boldness." He would not have hesitated to expose such "young fledglings" through the pages of the *Review*.[43]

Butler did not get into such a dither all by himself. A letter that he had recently received from William H. Healey, a pastor in California, fueled his reaction. Healey reported a meeting that had taken place between W. C. White, E. J. Waggoner, A. T. Jones, and other leading West Coast ministers in June 1888. They had met to study the Bible in relation to such issues as the ten kingdoms, the law in Galatians, and prophetic events. While the meeting was apparently an honest Bible and historical study, Healey—in the emotionally charged atmosphere—trumped it up into a sinister plot by the Western leadership to force a change in the denomination's theology.[44]

Healey's letter found fertile ground in Butler's emotionally exhausted mind. He had been smarting for 18 months from the letter Ellen White had sent him in April 1887 regarding his wrong attitude to Jones and Waggoner and their views. Suddenly it all came together for him. Now he could see why W. C. and Ellen White had urged that the ten horns and the law in Galatians be placed on the Minneapolis agenda. Certainly here was a conspiracy of the first magnitude and a threat to the denomination's traditional beliefs. He therefore shot off a series of telegrams to the delegates at Minneapolis, warning them to "stand by the old landmarks" and not to give an inch to the California conspirators. As a result, his followers dug in for battle, desiring to protect both their president and the "old landmarks."

Thus the stage was set for disaster at Minneapolis. "We are in for it," Ellen White quipped a day before the meetings began.[45]

Minneapolis and Its Aftermath

The Minneapolis *Journal* trumpeted the Adventists as

"A Peculiar People Who Keep Saturday as Sunday, Revere a Prophetess, and Believe the End of the World Is Nigh." The *Journal* reported that the Adventists "tackle difficult problems in theology with about the same industry that an earnest man would assail a cord of wood." The newspaper might have added that they were also just about that gentle with each other in their theological dialogue. The aggressive spirit evidenced was just what Ellen White had feared might happen.[46]

It quickly showed itself in the discussion of the ten horns. Smith, the champion of the traditionalists on the topic, considered it "evil" and "utterly unnecessary" even to deal with the topic. Such a course, he intimated, was the "tearing up of old truth" that "has stood the test 40 yrs." Why shouldn't any new interpretation endure the same test before its acceptance? "If we have diversity of testimony [,] why change[?]"[47]

Jones, Smith's chief opponent on prophetic interpretation, was equally gentle. " 'Elder Smith,' " the younger man blurted early in the meetings, " 'has told you he does not know anything about this matter. I do, and I don't want you to blame me for what he does not know.' " That was too much for Ellen White, who rebuked him, saying, " 'Not so sharp, Brother Jones, not so sharp.' "[48]

According to the Minneapolis *Tribune,* some of Smith's friends sought to force a vote on the issue, but E. J. Waggoner blocked that ploy, holding that the delegates should take no vote until they had thoroughly investigated the topic. "The matter was discussed in this manner," said the *Tribune,* "until it was high noon and time for adjournment."[49]

Despite the stalemate, the next week Smith claimed victory for his view in a *Review* editorial. "The sentiment of the delegates appeared. . . ," he pontificated, "to be overwhelmingly on the side of established principles of interpretation, and the old view." The editorial upset W. C. White, who noted that Smith neglected to report that the delegates had voted near the close of the discussion that "all should study the question faithfully during the year." White saw Smith's editorial procedure as

deceptive. "I told our people in the presence of Eld. Smith that while it was right to demand of the Editors of the *Signs* that they be cautious, . . . it was also demanded of the Editors of the *Review* that they be honest, and I showed them how this report was calculated to mislead the people."[50]

The discussions over the law in Galatians were at least as divisive as those over the ten horns. Butler, the champion of traditional orthodoxy on the Galatians question, could not attend the Minneapolis meetings because of illness. That prompted R. M. Kilgore (president of the Illinois Conference) to argue from the floor of the General Conference meetings that the Galatians issue should not come up at all. "It was," he accused, "a cowardly thing to broach this matter when Elder Butler could not be present." Once again Ellen White squared off with the traditionalists, noting that Kilgore's position "was not of God." As a result of her stand, the law in Galatians remained on the agenda until the delegates had heard both sides.[51]

Waggoner made at least nine presentations on the law/gospel theme at Minneapolis. The first six centered on righteousness by faith as it related to the law. The remaining lectures dealt more specifically with Galatians. Smith asserted that he could have agreed to the lectures on righteousness had he "not known all the while that he designed them to pave the way for his position on Galatians." As a result, the *Review* editor and his colleagues opposed Waggoner's message from the beginning.[52]

According to Waggoner's theology, the ten-commandment/schoolmaster law brings us "'unto Christ, *that we might be justified by faith*.'" Ellen White, while not agreeing with all of his positions, backed him on that central point in the struggle. "I see," she told the delegates, "the beauty of the truth in the presentation of the *righteousness of Christ in relation to the law* as the Doctor has placed it before us. It harmonizes perfectly with the light which God has been pleased to give me during all the years of my experience." In that passage Ellen White

highlighted what she considered to be Waggoner's central contribution to Adventist theology. *He had built a bridge between law and gospel by making explicit the gospel function of the ten-commandment law (i.e., to lead individuals to Christ for forgiveness and justification).* Such a linkage, as we shall see in the next chapter, became central in her understanding of Revelation 14:12 as it related to what might be called the message of 1888.[53]

Opposing Waggoner was J. H. Morrison, president of the Iowa Conference and an expert debater. Morrison claimed that Adventists had always believed in justification by faith. He feared, however, that the subject had been "overstressed," and *he was afraid that the law might lose its important place in Adventist theology.* Speaking after Waggoner, Morrison made at least seven presentations on topics related to Galatians during the meetings.[54]

As in both 1886 on the Galatians issue and earlier at Minneapolis on the problem of the ten horns, the Butler-Smith-Morrison faction sought to force a vote to establish the correct creedal position on the relationship of law and gospel. As Jones later put it: "At Minneapolis, in 1888, the General Conference 'administration' did its very best to have the denomination committed by a vote of the General Conference to the covenant of 'Obey and Live,' to righteousness by works." The attempt failed, but it was not an idle jest when Ellen White stated at the close of the conference that "Willie and I have had to watch at every point lest there should be moves made, resolutions passed, that would prove detrimental to the future work."[55]

The attitude of many of the ministers at Minneapolis—especially those aligned with Butler and Smith—deeply concerned Mrs. White. "I discerned," she wrote, "at the very commencement of the meeting a spirit which burdened me." It was an aggressive attitude that lacked Christian love and was the opposite of the spirit of Jesus. Later she would call it the "spirit of Minneapolis" (see chapter 4 for a discussion of the

problem). She had no doubt that Satan was seeking to divide and conquer Adventists in their time of eschatological crisis during the Sunday-law controversy. As a result, she decided to leave quietly during the middle of the conference, and would have done so, she claimed, except that her angel counseled her to stay.[56]

While Ellen White did not feel that the ten horns and the exact nature of the law in Galatians were vital questions, she was emphatic that "it is a vital question whether we are Christians, whether we have a Christian spirit, and are true, open, and frank with one another." She first began to doubt the traditionalists' interpretation of Galatians when she saw the attitude that sustained it. Furthermore, she deplored the fact that Butler's supporters had exhibited a "legal religion" when they desperately needed "Christ and His righteousness."[57]

Throughout the meetings Mrs. White uplifted the Bible as the only authority to settle theological issues. That topic would join the centrality of Christ's righteousness as a central pillar in her writing during the 1890s (see chapter 5 for a fuller discussion).

Unlike the battles over Galatians and the ten horns of Daniel 7, religious liberty did not divide the Adventist leadership at Minneapolis. All agreed that the proposed amendment to the Constitution, advocating that the public schools teach Christianity, and the Blair national Sunday bill represented ominous signs in prophetic history—a vindication of the Adventist interpretation of Revelation 13 and 14. Given such events, the delegates did not contend A. T. Jones' sermons on religious liberty. On the other hand, Ellen White felt discouraged because his messages on the crisis never got as much serious consideration as they should have because of the animosity over the disputed issues.[58]

Just as the General Conference session prepared to close, a disgruntled G. I. Butler sent in his resignation as president of the denomination. Smith also soon "bolted" from his position as General Conference secretary. The denomination elected

O. A. Olsen, then in Europe, to the presidency. S. N. Haskell would serve as interim president until Olsen could wind up his affairs and come to the United States. Haskell, however, managed to evade the job, and it went to W. C. White while he was out of the room conferring with his mother. "This was quite a shock to me," the retiring Willie related, "and almost made me sick." To his wife he wrote that it was not only "much against" his will, but it "was about the bitterest pill that I have had to take, and it seems as though some of us have been taking pills ever since we set foot on Minneapolis soil."[59]

While the non-Adventist St. Paul *Pioneer Press* noted that the session was "unusually animated" and characterized by "the utmost harmony," Ellen White perceived it as the "most incomprehensible tug of war we have ever had among our people" and as "one of the saddest chapters in the history of the believers in present truth." Despite that opinion, she believed that "this meeting will result in great good. . . . The truth wall triumph and we mean to triumph with it."[60]

W. C. White noted shortly after the conference that the delegates returned home with "a great variety of sentiments. Some felt that it had been the greatest blessing of their lives; others, that it marked the beginning of a period of darkness, and that the evil effects of what had been done at the conference could never be effaced." He personally believed God would work out things for the good of the church. To his wife he wrote that it was a "remarkable conference, and there were certain influences that had to be met at every step." He lamented that many in their search for harmony had sought to use forceful methods. "There is almost a craze for orthodoxy, a resolution was introduced into the college meeting, that no new doctrine be taught there till it had been adopted by the General Conf. Mother and I killed it dead, after a hard fight."[61]

Ellen White left Minneapolis discouraged with the ministerial leadership of the denomination, but she still had hope in the Adventist people as a whole. Before the close

of the conference she had told the assembled ministers that if they would not receive the light, she wanted to "give the people a chance; perhaps they may receive it." They certainly needed it. In September 1889 she would remark that "there is not one in one hundred" who really understood what it meant to be justified by faith, what it meant that "Christ should be . . . the only hope and salvation." Up through the fall of 1891 she, Jones, and Waggoner would tour the nation, preaching righteousness by faith to "the people" and to the ministry. After she left for Australia in 1891 and Waggoner had gone to England, Jones and W. W. Prescott continued to present the message in the United States. All through this period and beyond it, Ellen White emphasized that God had chosen Jones and Waggoner to bear a special message to the Adventist Church.[62]

The new General Conference administrations of O. A. Olsen (1888-1897) and George A. Irwin (1897-1901) responded positively to Mrs. White's endorsement by giving Jones and Waggoner broad exposure throughout the 1890s. They had access to the people through the churches, the Sabbath school lessons, the colleges, the inservice schools regularly held for the ministry, and the denomination's publishing houses. Especially important was the fact that during each General Conference session from 1889 through 1897 Jones and Waggoner received the leading role in the study of the Bible and theology. Beyond that, the fact that the denomination made Jones editor of the *Review* (with Smith as his assistant) in 1897 (it would have taken place in 1894, but was delayed because of Jones's problem with Anna Rice) was more than symbolic. The denomination's foremost editor, he used the *Review* as a channel for his teachings. As early as February7 1890, R. A. Underwood (an opponent of Jones and Waggoner) would complain to Olsen that Waggoner had had the "*widest possible berth* both in public and in print that the denomination could give him to present his views . . . untrameled [sic]." Such a statement would have been even more true (especially for

Jones) in the middle and late nineties. It would have been hard to conceive of a program that could have given the reformers more prominence during the 1890s.[63]

The preaching of Jones, Waggoner, and Ellen White met with varied results. On the one hand, Mrs. White could say in July 1889 that "in every meeting since the [1888] General Conference, souls have eagerly accepted the precious message of the righteousness of Christ." Likewise, she could write of the 1889 General Conference session that many of the ministers had grasped the essence of justification by faith and the righteousness of Christ during the past year. One could multiply such statements many times in the post-1888 period as both ministers and people responded to the "message of 1888" concerning Christ and His righteousness. By 1895 W. C. White could write that his mother had claimed that the message of 1888 had been both *"presented and accepted."*[64]

On the other hand, Ellen White could also say in August 1890 that she could see the denomination's Laodicean condition as never before. Many of its churches were "weak and sickly and ready to die" because they had not yet discovered Jesus. Likewise, in 1895 (the very year that her son wrote that she claimed the message had been both "presented and accepted") she could state that "many have listened to the truth [of the 1888 message] spoken in demonstration of the Spirit, and they have not only refused to accept the message, but they have hated the light." Once again, we could document such statements many times over.[65]

How do we harmonize the fact that the message was both "accepted" and "rejected"? We will cover that topic more fully in the last two chapters of our study. Meanwhile, now that we have set forth the explosive context of the Minneapolis meetings, we need to ascertain the nature of the 1888 message.

Endnotes

1 [US], *RH,* Jan. 3, 1888, p. 8.

2 GIB, "A Circular Letter to All State Conference Committees and Our Brethren in the Ministry-," [January 1888].

3 ATJ, ST, Jan. 20, 1888, p. 39; cf. JNL, *ST,* Oct. 5, 1888, p. 603.

4 [US], *RH,* Sept. 26, 1882, p. 616; *ST* Supplement, Sept. 14, 1882, pp. 1-4; Warren L. Johns, *Dateline Sunday,* U.S.A. (Mountain View, Calif., 1967), pp. 79-94; Eric Syme, *A History of SDA Church-State Relations in the United States* (Mountain View, Calif., 1973), pp. 26-28.

5 *Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia,* 1976 ed., pp. 1264, 1265.

6 ATJ, *Civil Government and Religion* (Battle Creek, 1894), pp. 117-156.

7 Everett Dick, "The Cost of Discipleship: Seventh-day Adventists and Tennessee Sunday Laws in the 1890's," *Adventist Heritage,* Spring 1986, pp. 26-32; R. W. Schwarz. *Light Bearers to the Remnant* (Mountain View, Calif., 1979) p. 252; Francis P. Weisenburger, *Ordeal of Faith: The Crisis of Church-Going America. 1665-1900* (New York. 1959), p. 13; Christian Statesman, Dec. 11, 1884, quoted in AT], *Civil Government,* p. 58. Cf. G. Wilbur F. Crafts. *The Sabbath for Man* (New York, 1885), title page.

8 For the texts of the two Blair bills see ATJ, *Civil Government,* pp. 43, 44, 68, 69. See Robert T. Handy, *A Christian America: Protestant Hopes and Historical Realities.* 2nd ed. (New York. 1984), pp. 87-90, for a discussion of the attempt to Christianize the public schools in the 1880s.

9 By the late 1880s and early 1890s the Sunday-law problem was not merely an issue in the United States. Australia, Switzerland, Norway, and England also had passed Sunday laws and had arrested Adventists for breaking them. Even China faced Sunday legislation. 1895, *GCB,* pp. 146, 334; *RH,* Apr. 9, 1889, p. 240.

10 SNH, *RH,* Oct. 16, 1888. pp. 648, 649.

11 ATJ to US, Dec. 3, 1886; June 5. 1885.

12 ATJ to US, May 18, 1885; June 3, 1885; Oct. 29, 1886.

13 US to ATJ, Nov. 8, 1886. (Italics supplied.)

14 ATJ to US, Dec. 3, 1886. (Italics supplied.)

15 ATJ to US, Dec. 27, 1886.

16 GIB to EGW, Oct. 1, 1888.

17 WCW to ATJ, Jan. 6, 1887. See chapter 4 for a full discussion of the problem of purported conspiracy at Minneapolis.

18 WCW to JHW, May 18, 1888.

19 US, *Synopsis of the Present Truth* (Battle Creek, 1884), p. 258.

20 GIB to EGW, Oct. 1. 1888; US to W. A. McCutchen. Aug. 8, 1901; US to H. J. Adams, Oct. 30, 1900.

21 GIB to EGW, June 20, 1886.

22 See chapter 3 for more on Butler's struggle.

23 GIB, *The Law in the Book of Galatians* (Battle Creek, 1886), pp. 6, 7, 66. (Italics supplied.)

24 GIB to EGW, Oct. 1, 1888.

25 US to EGW, Feb. 17, 1890; US to ATR, Sept. 21, 1892; US to C. F. Trubey, Feb. 11, 1902.

26 EJW. *The Gospel in the Book of Galatians* (Oakland, 1888), p. 70. (Italics supplied.)

27 See chapter 5 for a discussion of these letters and Mrs. White's response to them.

28 GIB to EGW, Aug. 23, 1886. The 1886 printing of Canright's *Two Laws* carries an 1882 introduction and imprint. Since the 1876 edition was also published in 1882, there is some question as to whether the new edition first came out in 1882 or 1886. It appears that the denomination did not advertise the second edition until 1886. The fact that Canright temporarily left the Adventist ministry in 1882 somewhat clouds the picture. At any rate, the changes in the section on the law in Galatians were just what Butler's side needed in 1886.

29 GIB to EGW, Dec. 16, 1886.

30 *RH,* Dec. 14, 1886, p. 779.

31 GIB to EGW, Oct. 1, 1888; Dec. 16, 1886; EGW to GIB, Oct. 14, 1888; EGW, MS 2 1, cir. Nov. 1888.

32 EJW, *The Gospel in the Book of Galatians.* p. 55; D. M. Canright, Seventh-day Adventism Renounced, 5th ed. (Cincinnati, 1894), pp. 309, 50, 51; GIB to EGW, Feb. 17, 1887. I am indebted to Tom Norris for pointing out the connection between Canright's defection and the 1886 General Conference session.

33 GIB, *RH,* Mar. 1, 1887, p. 138; ATJ to EGW, Mar. 13, 1887.

34 GIB to EGW. Mar. 31, 1887; EJW, *The Gospel in the Book of Galatians.* p. 3.

35 EGW to EJW and ATJ, Feb. 18, 1887.

36 ATJ to EGW, Mar. 13, 1887; EJW to EGW, Apr. 1, 1887.

37 GIB to EGW. Mar. 13, 1887; GIB, *RH,* Mar. 22. 1887, pp. 182-184.

38 EGW to GIB and US, Apr. 5, 1887. (Italics supplied.)

39 US to ATR, Sept. 21, 1892; GIB to EGW, Oct. 1, 1888.

40 WCW to DTJ, Apr. 8. 1890; WCW to GIB, Aug. 16. 1888.

41 EGW to Brethren who shall assemble in General Conference, Aug. 5, 1888. (Italics supplied.)

42 GIB, RH, Aug. 28, 1888, p. 560.

43 GIB to ECA\0oct. 1, 1888.

44 EGW to WMH. Dec. 9, 1889; US to EGW, Feb. 1 7, 1890; WCW to DTJ, Apr. 8, 1890. For more on the Bible study session, see "Notes Made by W. C. White at "Camp Necessity,' " June 25 and 26, 1888, in Manuscripts and Memories of Minneapolis 18S8 (Boise, Idaho, 1988), pp. 414-419. Cf. WMH to EGW, [Sept. 1901 J; EGW to WMH, Aug. 21, 1901.

45 ATJ to CEH, May 12, 1921; EGW, MS 15, Nov. 1888; EGW, MS 2,

Sept. 7, 1888; EGW to MW, Oct. 9, 1888.

46 Minneapolis *Journal,* Oct. 13, 1888, p. 8; Oct. 19, 1888, p. 2.

47 WCW, handwritten notes on the 1888 GC, book 1 ("E"), Oct. 15, 1888, p. 27.

48 ATR, "Did the Seventh-day Adventist Denomination Reject the Doctrine of Righteousness by Faith?" unpub. MS, Jan. 30, 1931; interview of J. S. Washburn by RJW and DKS, June 4, 1950.

49 Minneapolis *Tribune,* Oct. 18, 1888, p. 5.

50 US, *RH,* Oct. 23, 1888, p. 664; WCW to JHW, Feb. 27, 1889.

51 EGW, MS 24, cir. Nov. or Dec. 1888; EGW, MS 9, Oct. 24, 1888; WCW, handwritten notes on the 1888 GC, book 1 ("E"), p. 55.

52 US to EGW, Feb. 17, 1890.

53 EJW, The *Gospel in the Book of Galatians.* p. 45; EGW, MS 15, Nov. 1888. (Italics supplied for EGW only.)

54 R. T. Nash, *An Eyewitness Report of the 1888 General Conference* (privately pub., n.d.), p. 4; C. McReynolds, "Experiences While at the General Conference in Minneapolis, Minnesota, in 1888," unpub. MS, cir. 1931.

55 ATJ, *God's Everlasting Covenant* (n.p., [1907]), p. 31; EGW to MW, Nov. 4, 1888.

56 EGW, MS 24, cir. Nov. or Dec. 1888; EGW to Brethren, letter B-85-89, cir. April 1889.

57 EGW to WMH, Dec. 9, 1888; EGW, MS 24, cir. Nov or Dec. 1888.

58 Ibid.; ATJ's religious liberty sermons were later published as *Civil Government.*

59 WCW to JNL, Nov. 20, 1888; WCW to OAO, Nov. 27, 1888; WCW to MW, Nov. 19, 24, 1888; EGW to MW, Nov. 4, 1888.

60 St. Paul *Pioneer Press,* Nov. 2, 1888, p. 6; EGW to MW, Nov. 4, 1888; EGW to C. P. Bollman, Nov. 19, 1902; EGW to MW, Nov. 4, 1888.

61 WCW to JNL, Nov. 20, 1888; WCW to MW, Nov. 3, 1888. Cf. WCW to OAO, Nov. 27, 1888.

62 EGW, MS 9, Oct. 24, 1888; EGW, *RH,* Sept. 3, 1889, pp. 545, 546. For a fuller treatment of the post-1888 period, see GRK, *From 1888 to Apostasy: The Case of A. T Jones* (Washington, D.C., 198 7), pp. 46-60.

63 RAU to OAO, Feb. 7, 1890.

64 EGW, RH, July 23, 1889, p. 320; EGW, MS 10, Oct. 1889; EGW, MS 22, Oct. 1889; WCW to DAR, Sept. 10, 1895. Cf. EGW, *Testimonies for the Church* (Mountain View, Calif., 1948), vol. 6, p. 89.

65 EGW, RH, Aug. 26, 1890, p. 514; EGW to OAO, May 1, 1895.