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**The Religion Teacher as Prophet:**

**Lessons from a Case Study in Imposing Orthodoxy.[[1]](#endnote-1)**

In their 1968 classic book on pedagogy, *A Teacher is Many Things*, Earl Pullias and James Young describe teaching as a complex multi-dimensional task.[[2]](#endnote-2) The teacher, they point out, is the conserver of a heritage. He is also an authority and a guide to what is known about that heritage. But she is also a modernizer, an explorer in new territory and, more provocatively at times, “the breaker of camp.”[[3]](#endnote-3) Could Pullias and Young be describing the College Religion teacher as prophet?[[4]](#endnote-4)

On Sunday, October 21, 1888 in a challenging address to the contentious General Conference Session at Minneapolis, Ellen White may have used more theological terms than Pullias and Young but she essentially described the same explorer, change-agency role that is a vital part of the Adventist Religion Scholar’s task. “The Lord has need of men who are spiritually sharp and clear sighted,” she said, men upon whose minds “God’s word flashes light” revealing to them “the safe path.” Citing the familiar metaphor from the apocalypse she saw that through such teachers “the scroll is being unrolled to the world.” She was of course thinking at the time particularly of two young West Coast religion teachers. With these two teachers in mind, she went on to make one of her most provocative public defenses of the teacher’s change-agency function or “prophetic” role, and of a needed academic freedom for such a role.

Ellen White was opposed to legislative or policy attempts to restrain Bible Teaching. In opposition to just such a proposed policy in 1888 she asserted: “Instructors in our schools should never be bound about by being told that they are to teach only what has been taught hitherto. Away with such restrictions.” Was this just prophetic hyperbole – not to be taken literally? Did she really mean, “never be bound?” Ellen White continued. “There is a God to give the message His people shall speak. Let not any minister feel under bonds or be gauged by men’s measurement . . . That which God gives his servants to speak today would not perhaps have been present truth twenty years ago, but it is God’s message for this time.”[[5]](#endnote-5) Later she would add, apparently in a letter drafted for deposed General Conference president George Butler who had encouraged such restrictive policy initiatives, “When the resolution was urged upon the conference that nothing should be taught in the college contrary to that which has been taught, I felt deeply, for I knew whoever framed that resolution was not aware of what he was doing.”[[6]](#endnote-6)

This paper will explore the historical background of Ellen White’s 1888 outspoken statements and view the context as a case study. We will look first at Ellen White’s situating of the declarations and seek to understand the historical developments that led up to the occasion that called them out. We will then need to look briefly at the hermeneutical disputes that lay at the heart of the episode and consider the political dimensions that were at play as they related to the appointment of religion teachers at Battle Creek College at the time and their access to important pulpits. Hopefully a revisiting of the episode will help elucidate principles that might guide the church today as it seeks to understand its relationship to contemporary Bible Scholars.

**Situating the Statement**

Ellen White clearly saw the religion teacher as having a change-agency, prophetic, forward-looking role. The religion teacher at least in some respects was an innovator, helping new insights to become “present truth.” At the 1888 Minneapolis General Conference session, senior church leaders in a focused effort seeking to conserve the status quo and constrain Bible teachers, proposed a policy that would require them to teach only already established positions – no new doctrinal insights were to be introduced in their teaching or preaching. Ellen White found herself fighting hard during the conference to protect the prophetic role of the Bible Teacher. Her declaration on Sunday morning, October 21 addressed policy initiatives attempted unsuccessfully during the previous week, one of which was the proposed resolution to require teachers to teach only status quo perspectives. Apparently several proposals were attempted. On the day that the conference ended, Sunday, November 4 she wrote a note to her daughter-in-law reporting that the session had produced the “hardest and most incomprehensible tug of war, we have ever had among our people.” It had been “a most laborious meeting” she reported for “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.”[[7]](#endnote-7)

Three months later in January 1889 Ellen White would write a long letter of rebuke to Rufus. A. Underwood, president of the Ohio Conference and an influential member of the General Conference Executive Committee. He was probably the one who had chaired the committee that had framed the restrictive policy resolution on teaching in an attempt to impose and maintain orthodoxy.[[8]](#endnote-8) She deplored the fact that he had persisted with the resolution even after she had spoken and counseled against it pointing out the very real dangers of adopting it. They had looked at each other across the room, she reminded him, and she had observed his scowl. She reminded Underwood of what she had told the conference delegates: “what had been shown me in the past in reference to resolutions which covered the same ground.” She was apparently alluding to earlier resolutions adopted in 1886. In any case, she further reminded Underwood that she had asserted to the brethren that she was “a stockholder” in Battle Creek College and on those grounds too “I could not let the resolution pass.” It was simply “not right that every avenue should be closed in our school,” she asserted, so that the students could not have the benefit of the new teaching from Waggoner and Jones. “The resolution was not called for.”[[9]](#endnote-9)

What is of particular interest about the Underwood letter is Ellen White’s juxtaposition of a discussion of the futility of legislating orthodoxy with a discussion about former General Conference President George Butler publishing and promoting erroneous speculative ideas on the nature of biblical inspiration. Ellen White was certain that Butler’s ideas were not right and that they should not have even seen the light of day because they could cause injury. Furthermore some teachers at the College were using “infidel” authors to teach the students how to respond to and defend against infidel ideas. She saw this too as carrying risk. But in spite of this, enacting the kind of restrictive legislation that would prohibit teachers from teaching anything that might be considered doctrinally new was absolutely not the way to proceed. It was not the way God worked, she argued.

**A Context**

What is the larger context of Ellen White’s vigorous defense of the prophetic, change-agency role of the Bible teacher at the 1888 General Conference? Clearly the intention of the proposed 1888 GC policy initiative for controlling Bible teachers was to control if not silence A. T. Jones and E. J. Waggoner. It had antecedents. Two years earlier at the 1886 GC session, (held when Ellen White was absent in Europe) General Conference President George Butler had engineered the forming of a “Theological Committee” to propose the adoption of a resolution by that session that “doctrinal views not held by a fair majority of our people” were not to “be made part of the public instruction” in Colleges, Sabbath Schools or in periodicals, unless “approved by the leading brethren of experience.” The “introduction of points of doctrine contrary to the established faith” needed to be avoided. Why? Because the faith of the body had already been settled. The declared purpose of the policy resolution was to achieve the very laudable goal of “unity” for “unity in the work of God is of paramount importance.”[[10]](#endnote-10) But by 1888, the 1886 policy prohibition framework seemed insufficient. At least it had not worked as intended as a mechanism of unity. Major disagreements over biblical interpretation continued to disturb the church and its leaders.

**Hermeneutical Disagreements**

Several disagreements over biblical and prophetic interpretation formed a major part of the back-story to the episode. As is well known to most of us, the primary issue in contention among the brethren at the time of the Minneapolis Conference was the interpretation of Galatians 3.24-25. Was the law as “schoolmaster” referring to the moral law or the ceremonial law? A. T. Jones had followed E. J. Waggoner in his moral law interpretation and highlighted it. Jones’ greater appeal as a charismatic preacher tended to amplify the teaching more effectively. How to interpret and apply Revelation 13 was also an issue – did it apply to the then burgeoning “Lord’s Day” reform movement and the resultant National Reform bill submitted to Congress in May, 1888 by Maine Senator William Blair? From Uriah Smith’s perspective, this new teaching on eschatology contradicted all the church had published on the topic and it threated the reputation of the church. Jones’ new take on the passage “undermined the positions held for thirty years.”[[11]](#endnote-11) Uriah Smith and Jones also disagreed over which European nation comprised the tenth toe of Nebuchadnezzar’s statue in Daniel 2.[[12]](#endnote-12)

For George Butler and Uriah Smith and their supporters, the really serious issue was the Galatians issue. It is important to understand why. To reinterpret this passage as applying to the moral law posed two serious problems. First it undermined a deeply entrenched Adventist apologetic for the Seventh-day Sabbath. In fact the two senior leaders viewed the new interpretation as recklessly undermining pillars of the faith. Already the argument that Galatians 3 referred to the moral law not the ceremonial law had precipitated Dudley M. Canright’s 1887 abandonment of the Sabbath and his rejection of the Adventist church. Arguing the view that the “moral law” was the referent in Galatians, might sound spiritually insightful to the uninitiated, asserted the respected editor of the *Review* and established defender of the faith, but it threatened in fact to undo teachings “vital to the existence of our faith.” Both Butler and Smith genuinely thought that they were upholding historic Adventism and defending the foundations of the church’s key Sabbath doctrine. They felt it their duty to defend the church against such subtle and insidious attacks from the upstart West Coast teachers. The unorthodoxies Jones and Waggoner were espousing were neither trivial nor inconsequential errors to Butler and Smith.

What complicated the issue for the two leaders was that they both clearly recalled that when the interpretation of Galatians 3.24-25 had previously been discussed in the church in 1854 it had involved a disagreement between James White and Joseph Waggoner (Ellet Waggoner’s father). At the time, Ellen White had written a letter to Joseph Waggoner expressing the view that his interpretation of Galatians 3.24 as referring to the Moral Law was wrong. Ellen White’s intervention when she had settled the matter among the men at the time and had persuaded George Butler to change his own mind 180 degrees on the question.[[13]](#endnote-13) Now in 1888 he could not understand how Ellen White would entertain another viewpoint. In his mind and in the mind of Uriah Smith, accepting the teaching of the West Coast teachers would undermine the authority of the Spirit of Prophecy and cause wide spread confusion. For the two leaders, this was as much a problem as the undermining of the Sabbath truth. Both men, therefore, felt they had reason to be super-cautious over the name of Alonzo T. Jones when, in April 1888, six months before the Minneapolis session, Jones was proposed as a teacher for the church’s flagship ministerial training center at Battle Creek College. Church politics soon greatly complicated things – another important set of issues to understand as part of the background to Ellen White’s opposition to the policy restrictions on religion teachers.

**The Politics of College Teacher Employment**

The energetic 38-year old Jones had attracted attention as Bible and History Teacher at Healdsburg College in California. He was popular with students and his fresh insights had impressed W. C. White and his mother and also W. W. Prescott, the General Conference Educational Secretary and President of Battle Creek College. At Battle Creek, the current History Teacher, Professor E. B. Miller, had become rather staid and stale, and both W. W. Prescott, the College President, and W. C. White had figured that Jones would bring new life to the program in Michigan. In early April of 1888 Prescott and White, perhaps with the support of Ellen White, persuaded the General Conference committee to recommend to the College Board that Jones be appointed and that Miller be given the chance to find spiritual and professional renewal in California. At the April 8 College Board meeting, the Jones appointment “was the subject of lengthy discussion but no formal action was taken.” The issue was shelved. Jones, it seemed, was just too risky an appointment. According to later information from Ellen White, rumors had come to the ears of the Board Chair, George Butler, that because of Jones’ unorthodox teaching out at Healdsberg, parents in Northern and Central California had threatened not to send their children to the college arguing that the young people would not be safe. Butler had reportedly received a number of such letters.[[14]](#endnote-14)

At the next Battle Creek College Board on November 13 after the brethren returned from Minneapolis, discussion over Jones as Bible teacher was taken up again and once more the name was “discussed at considerable length.” The prospect of Jones also being a lead teacher at a church-wide Ministerial Institute scheduled for the winter of 1889-1890 now gave the matter more weight. Again, however, the trustees turned down the proposal and turned instead to the relatively unknown Frank D. Starr. The difficulty with this appointment was that General Conference leadership had another assignment in mind for Starr. They needed him for the Indiana State Conference presidency.

The impasse over who should be the new teacher eventually necessitated a highly unusual joint meeting of the General Conference Committee and the College Board on Thursday morning, November 22. The interpersonal Board dynamics were complicated by the unexpected election upheaval at the session. Although George Butler was no longer president of the General Conference nor a member of the executive committee, he still served as the College Board Chair. Uriah Smith, who had resigned as General Conference Secretary in solemn protest at the direction of matters in Minneapolis (after he had been elected), also continued serving on the College Board. Among the ten senior leaders who sat down together in joint session that day to seek to resolve the issue were some severely bruised egos and indignant men who considered themselves the last defenders of the orthodox faith. The Board minutes record that nearly all present took part in the extended discussion. The reasons behind the initial General Conference recommendation were explained and “the reasons why the Board took no action on it were set forth.” In the process it was explained that “the fact that Eld. Jones took so prominent a part in pressing vigorously at the recent General Conference points of doctrine concerning which there exists differences of opinion among the body of S. D. Adventists was stated to be the reason why the Board had hesitated about employing him.”[[15]](#endnote-15) After lengthy discussion it was determined that Butler, Smith and Prescott should interview the non-conforming teacher about how he might fill the position.

Three days later, Board Chairman Butler reported that following a long conference with Jones, the candidate “had assured them in a very positive manner that if he should be employed to assist” in the college he “would not knowingly teach any opinions contrary to those which the Board desired to be taught recognizing fully the right of the Board to determine what views should be presented.”[[16]](#endnote-16) What Ellen White had labored so hard to prevent at Minneapolis by her protests, Butler and Smith had now achieved – control over Jones’ teaching. Butler’s report was discussed at great length, “fully and freely” with “differences of opinion being expressed strongly but in a brotherly spirit.” The final vote to appoint him carried by three in favor and two against, with the Chair reserving his vote. On this occasion the voting names were noted. The contentious minutes with its preamble and record of discussion was the second longest Board Minute on record to that time. It was clearly a heavily freighted topic.[[17]](#endnote-17) By securing Jones’ acquiescence to silence on the new ideas Butler felt he had protected the church and had prevented the spread of a cancer. As things turned out, Jones taught for only one quarter at the College and the politics of the situation meant he could not be utilized at the Ministerial Institutes.

A few days after the drama of the Jones appointment, at the regular annual meeting of the College Stockholders, Butler was re-elected to the Board but declined to be Chair. He was elected as such anyway. Clearly this was some sort of political push back in reply to his perceived poor treatment at Minneapolis. In spite of the submission of his letter of resignation the Board declined to accept it. Nevertheless, Butler did not attend any further meetings for the following year and Uriah Smith served in his place. Butler was finished with the College.

Ellen White was more than a little unhappy with what she saw as the “arrangements to shut him [Jones] out of the School for fear something should come that would be at variance with what has been taught at the school.” She was highly indignant. This way of doing things was not “a conscientiousness inspired by the Spirit of God.” It was “from another source.”[[18]](#endnote-18) So were the attempts to control the content of preaching – another important contextual issue in this episode.

**Controlling the Pulpit**

Ellen White was further deeply disturbed upon her return to Battle Creek from Minneapolis over the conditions that local elders attempted to place on her own preaching. Shortly after her return, she had participated in what she assessed as a helpful and clarifying debriefing meeting at the Tabernacle – the large headquarters church. She felt she had been given a fair opportunity to explain herself and defend her role at the recent session. She argued that she had not changed either as a person or as a leader and she claimed to still have the spirit of God. She reported that people at the debriefing session recognized this. Following the debriefing she had been invited with the approval of Uriah Smith, the senior elder, to preach at the Tabernacle. Early on Sabbath morning, however, two of the church elders called on her to check out what she was going to preach about. This was not a visit to see what information they might need to put in the church bulletin. Ellen White read the unexpected visit as being prompted by senior elder Smith now regretting having given her the invitation to preach and fearing that she would further exacerbate the conflict. Ellen White’s reply to the two delegated elders was direct: “I said, Brethren, you leave that matter with the Lord and Sister White, for neither the Lord nor Sister White will need to be dictated to by the brethren as to what subject she will bring before them.”[[19]](#endnote-19) She would certainly not be muzzled. Furthermore, she reminded her Sabbath morning inquisitors that Jones, the Bible Teacher, should not be muzzled either. She expected that he too should have an invitation extended to him to occupy the Tabernacle pulpit. She accepted though that there was a protocol. The two elders would need to consult with Smith because “he was older than they.”

After some days passed and Ellen White had not heard anything about an invitation to the West Coast Bible Teacher she formally requested an interview with the two elders again and inquired further. They reported to her that “Elder Smith thought he [Jones] had better not be invited to speak.”[[20]](#endnote-20) The reason? “Because he took strong positions and carried the subject of national reform too far.”[[21]](#endnote-21) This was too much for Ellen White. She became irate. The delicate way she wrote about it months later when emotions had cooled a little was “I then felt my spirit stirred within me, and I bore a very plain testimony to these brethren.” Such restrictions and prejudice reminded her of the attitudes in her home church in Portland in 1843 when as a 15 year old she had experienced the pain of her family being excluded from Methodism because of their convictions about William Miller’s Advent teaching. Adventism, she feared had come full circle – back to where her creed-encrusted Methodism had been when she left it. “As reformers,” she wrote, “they [early Adventists] had come out of the denominational churches, but they now act a part similar to that which the churches acted. We hoped that there would not be the necessity for another coming out,” she lamented, using a well-understood and fateful Millerite expression. But she resolved to resist. “While we will endeavor to keep the ‘unity of the Spirit’ in the bonds of peace,” she recollected, “we will not with pen or voice cease to protest against bigotry.”[[22]](#endnote-22) Legislating in the church to prevent and prohibit new perspectives and muzzling a Bible Teacher she felt was a muzzling of the Spirit. It was not the way forward. For Ellen White the Bible was “a progressive book; the communication of intelligence grows with the opening of God’s Word to the understanding.”[[23]](#endnote-23) True students and teachers of scripture must keep growing in understanding.

Two years later, at the second Bible Institute in 1891, unable to have Waggoner or Jones utilized as teachers, Prescott himself undertook to teach the Letter to the Galatians and introduced the new interpretation on 3.24-25. “Great Scott,” exploded Butler from Florida. “Has it come to this that such things are to be indoctrinated into the minds of our young people in our theological classes?” He had heard that Prescott had taught the “absurd position” on the moral law in Galatians, in the “minutest detail.”[[24]](#endnote-24) The development persuaded him further that there had indeed been a West Coast conspiracy to push the idea for sure. “What can such things mean? We have fallen upon strange times indeed. I know not how to harmonize such a course with propriety, right or truth.” He never expected to be able to “harmonize with such a course as has been pursued or think it is right.”[[25]](#endnote-25) But he was learning that church legislation could not stop an idea that for many had the relevance of *present truth*.

As a kind of coda to this extended episode it is worth noting that in 1896, eight years after Minneapolis Uriah Smith and his circle of defenders of the orthodox view on Galatians 3.24 continued to resist the new insights. This led them to reject a manuscript submitted by W. W. Prescott entitled “The Law in Christ,” because they saw it as expressing “fundamental errors.” Ellen White’s ire would again rise. She would assert, this time with bible scholar Prescott in mind, “The God of heaven sometimes commissions men to teach that which is regarded as contrary to the established doctrines.” And in a prophetic but subversive tone she would add, “men in authority are not always to be obeyed.”[[26]](#endnote-26)

**Conclusion**.

The contextual background to Ellen White’s 1888 and continuing opposition to the use of legislative policy as a means of imposing conformity clearly indicates that in her view, the innovator role of the Bible teacher was an important dimension of their work. Church legislation or policy regulation and the muzzling of the scholar’s voice was not the way forward for a church led by the Spirit.

What Jones had to offer she considered was vital “present truth” even as she would contend that the differences in exegesis were not differences over “vital points.” But, how to decide what was vital and what was not vital was not at all easy. Smith and Butler perceived that Jones and Waggoner’s exegesis would undo teachings “vital to the existence of our faith.” The departure of Canright over the issue of Galatians served as an alarming recent warning. They could not see how the Sabbath could be defended on the basis of Jones’ and Waggoner’s interpretation and they felt they were carrying out a pastoral duty to the church and protecting its core teachings. For Ellen White, protecting a church teaching by church legislation (or by encoding it in a creed like statement) was to muzzle the spirit.

Ellen White did not advocate unfettered libertarianism. Furthermore, she was deeply committed to the unity of the church. But she also saw the need for the church community to live with the creative tension between preserving the faith of the fathers and having a faith that was relevant “present truth.” The prophetic role of the Bible teacher/scholar was essential to maintaining that balance.

This important Minneapolis episode suggests that the prophetic dimension of the Bible Teacher’s role needs to be protected. It suggests that some administrative approaches to ensuring orthodoxy are inappropriate if they put authority for orthodoxy in the hands of small groups, or if they reflect a disposition to control the minds of others, or if they in effect legislate against new interpretations and new ideas.

The task of balancing openness to the freshness of the spirit, and the keeping the faith relevant, with the need for church unity and the ensuring of orthodoxy continues to be a demanding task for any church leader today. But if the episode teaches anything it suggests that legislating orthodoxy is not the way forward for a community of the spirit.
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