

Who Will be G.C. President After 1990?
Report From Nicaragua

SPECTRUM

Journal of the Association of Adventist Forums

Volume 18, Number 5

UNDER THE SOUTHERN CROSS

Australia Experiments for the Church
Pacific Islands in the Wake of *Pitcairn*
SDAs Enter New Zealand Politics

Spectrum

Editor

Roy Branson

Senior Editor

Tom Dybdahl

News Editor

Bonnie Dwyer

Book Review Editor

Beverly Beem

Production

Barry L. Casey

FastForWord

Publication Services

Editorial Assistant

Lori D. Kuehnert

Editorial Board

Beverly Beem
English
Walla Walla College

Roy Benton
Mathematical Sciences
Columbia Union College

Roy Branson
Ethics, Kennedy Institute
Georgetown University

Molleurus Couperus
Physician
Angwin, California

Gene Daffern
Physician
Frederick, Maryland

Bonnie Dwyer
Journalism
Folsom, California

Tom Dybdahl
Editor
Allentown, Pennsylvania

Alvin L. Kwiram
Vice Provost
University of Washington

Gary Land
History
Andrews University

Rennie Schoepflin
History
Loma Linda University

Charles Scriven
Senior Pastor
Sligo Church

Consulting Editors

Earl W. Amundson
Church Administration

Karen Bottomley
History
Calgary, Alberta

Bonnie L. Casey
Writer/Editor
Washington, D.C.

Raymond Cottrell
Theology
Loma Linda, California

Geri Fuller
Public Relations
Washington, D.C.

Lawrence Geraty
President
Atlantic Union College

Fritz Guy
Theology
Loma Linda University

F. E. J. Harder
Educational Administration
College Place, Washington

Jorgen Henriksen
Artist
Walla Walla, Washington

Edward Lugenbeal
Health Care Administration
Kettering, Ohio

Donald R. McAdams
Senior Vice President
American Productivity Center

Margaret McFarland
Asst. Attorney General
Annapolis, Maryland

Ronald Numbers
History of Medicine
University of Wisconsin

Edward E. Robinson
Attorney
Chicago, Illinois

Gerhard Svrcek-Seiler
Psychiatrist
Vienna, Austria

Carolyn Stevens Shultz
English
Walla Walla College

Helen Ward Thompson
Vice-President
Loma Linda University

L. E. Trader
Education
Mariehoehle Gymnasium
West Germany

Louis Venden
Senior Pastor
Loma Linda University Church

Association of Adventist Forums

Officers

President
Glenn E. Coe
Attorney
Hartford, Connecticut

Vice President
Verla Kwiram
Business
Seattle, Washington

Executive Secretary
Virginia Murray Mendoza
Administration
Silver Spring, Maryland

Treasurer
Richard C. Osborn
Superintendent of Education
Potomac Conference

Editor
Roy Branson
Ethics, Kennedy Institute
Georgetown University

Directors

Of Chapter Development
Walter Douglas
Church History
Andrews University

Of Harvest '90
Arthur R. Torres
Senior Pastor
Glendale City Church

Of Promotion
Richard B. Lewis, Jr.
Advertising
Boston, Massachusetts

Of Special Projects
Lyndrey A. Niles
Communications
Howard University

Of Campus Relations
Iris Yob
Education
Harvard University

Of Membership
Connie Saxton
Nursing Home Administration
St. Joseph, Missouri

Regional Representatives

Atlantic
Gary Gilbert
Physician
Melrose, Massachusetts

Central
Joseph Bozovich
Business
Denver, Colorado

Central Pacific
Larry Mitchel
Hospital Administration
Roseville, California

Columbia
Susan Sickler
Kettering, Ohio

Eastern Canada
Beverley Connors
Oshawa, Canada

Lake
Wesley Amundson
Missions
Andrews University

Northern Pacific
Terrie Aamodt
English
Walla Walla College

Southern
Laura Gladson
Psychology
Atlanta, Georgia

Southern Pacific
Jim Kaatz
Education
Lakeside, California

Staff

Legal Consultant
Bradley Litchfield
Attorney
Washington, D.C.

Office Manager
Scott Sanchez
Silver Spring, Maryland

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

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

Editorial Correspondence: *SPECTRUM* is published by the Association of Adventist Forums. Direct all editorial correspondence to *SPECTRUM*, 7710 Carroll Avenue, Takoma Park, Maryland 20912. Manuscripts should be typewritten, double spaced (submit the original and two copies), or on either IBM and IBM-compatible single-sided floppies or Apple Macintosh disks. Please include a self-addressed, stamped envelope. In matters of style and documentation articles should conform to the *SPECTRUM* style sheet which will be sent, upon request, to prospective authors. Letters to the editors may be shortened before publication.

Subscription Information: In order to receive *SPECTRUM*, enclose a membership fee (\$20 per 5 issues, \$25 in Canada and in other foreign countries, \$18 for students) by check made to the Association of Adventist Forums, Box 5330, Takoma Park, Md 20912. Phone: (301) 270-0423. Single copies are \$4. For address changes, send old address label along with the new address.

Under the Southern Cross

All ships from around the world sailed into Sydney Harbor this year to celebrate the centennial of Australia's founding. Just three years ago leaders of the world church gathered to celebrate the centennial of Adventism's arrival on Australian shores. But there are other reasons for devoting almost an entire issue to Adventism in the South Pacific.

First, the South Pacific Division today faces in microcosm some of the greatest challenges facing the denomination as a whole. In what may be the most comprehensive analysis of a division ever to appear in a single essay, Norman Young highlights how the "first-world" minority membership in Australia and New Zealand, with its money, education, and institutions, has differing needs and resources from the majority membership in the Pacific Islands (almost three-quarters of the division membership). The largely Polynesian and Melanesian Adventists of the Pacific Islands are rapidly growing in numbers and are assuming increasingly prominent positions of leadership in their societies, but within the Adventist denomination they remain administratively and financially dependent on Australia and New Zealand.

Another reason for highlighting the South Pacific Division is the prominence of Australia, New Zealand, and the Pacific Islands in the history of Adventism. In the 1880s the *Pitcairn* galvanized Adventist missions. During the 1890s Ellen White sat in her Australian home writing for the world church such important volumes as *Christ's Object Lessons*, *Desire of Ages*, *The Southern Work*, *Thoughts from the Mount of Blessings*, and Volume Six of *Testimonies to the Church*. During this decade Ellen White, her son William, and A. G. Daniells, also explored in Australia and New Zealand administrative structures and styles that dominate Adventism to this day. Theologically, ferment in Australia has repeatedly spread throughout the church, from Robert Brinsmead in the fifties to Desmond Ford in the eighties.

We are grateful for permission to reprint, in edited form but in their original style, three essays from *Adventist History in the South Pacific, 1885-1918*, edited by Arthur Ferch. An issue of *Spectrum* devoted to Adventism in the South Pacific may lead readers to reflect on similar challenges and responses in other parts of the world church.

—The Editors

Articles

Letter from Managua	Herold Weiss	2
Who Will Be Elected General Conference President in 1990?	Richard Hammill and Ronald Graybill	4

Special Cluster: Under the Southern Cross

Adventism in the Antipodes	Norman H. Young	13
The Making of a President—E. G. White and A. G. Daniells in Australia	Milton R. Hook	26
Early Adventists Plunged into New Zealand Politics	Peter H. Ballis	40
In the Wake of the <i>Pitcairn</i> —Establishing Adventism in the South Pacific Islands	Alexander S. Currie	57

Responses		63
-----------	--	----

Letter from Managua

by Herold Weiss

Approaching the Managua airport one night the second week of March, 1988, my wife and I could see no lights marking the city or the airport. Just before we landed, airport emergency equipment finally outlined the runway. From the airport to the capital we drove in darkness. For a week I would lead a Bible seminar for the Adventist pastors of the Nicaraguan Mission. Just a year before, in March, 1987, I had conducted a similar week-long seminar. We quickly learned some things had not changed: Wednesdays and Saturdays there was still no water.

Throughout Latin America, Nicaraguans have been known for their *joie de vivre*. No more. Today, smiles are hard to come by, outbursts of joy are out of place. The Nicaraguan people who actively fought Somoza are becoming cynics; many see no hope for the future with either the Sandinistas or the contras. Medicines and basic foods are in short supply. To get the staples of their diet—rice, beans, sugar, corn flour, and oil—Nicaraguans must get coupons from the government. Everyone told us their rations only last until the fifteenth of the month. After that they are at the mercy of the high-priced, open market. These capitalist markets and other businesses operate freely because government officials make fortunes from their share of the profits. Meanwhile, the people suffer from a revolution conducting a grand experiment and from a foreign policy fueled by President Reagan's obsession with Daniel Ortega.

Popular forms of Catholicism, receiving strength from the "communities at the base" rather than the hierarchical church, helped start the revolution and continue to provide some of the prominent leaders. Nicaraguan Bishop Obando y Bravo has opposed the Sandinistas, but Ernesto and Fernando Cardenal are two of the priests who occupy very powerful positions in the government. But not only priests are involved. Methodists, Baptists, and Pentecostals, have also become active partisans of the revolutionary cause. Organizations like CEPRES (Congress Ecumenico para la Responsabilidad Social) make it very clear that a genuine, prophetic Christianity must oppose capitalistic oppression and give unswerving

Herold Weiss, professor of religious studies at St. Mary's College, Notre Dame, Indiana, was born and raised in Uruguay. He received a B. A. from Southern Missionary College, an M. Div from the SDA Theological Seminary, Andrews University, and a Ph. D from Duke University. He taught New Testament for several years at the SDA Theological Seminary and is the author of *Paul of Tarsus*, Andrews University Press, 1986.

commitment to the Sandinistas' ongoing revolution.

The leaders of the Adventist Nicaraguan Mission, while maintaining cordial relations with the leaders of other Protestant churches in Nicaragua, have wisely remained uncommitted to the current leadership of the revolution. True, the prophetic voice of the Church must speak out against oppression and demand justice for the poor. And certainly the policy of the United States to engage in an economic blockade and to support the violence of the contras has hurt Nicaraguans. Still, the Nicaraguan revolution itself must bear considerable responsibility for the suffering of the Nicaraguan people.

After Eden Pastora, a gallant patriot who led the assault on the National Palace that precipitated the revolution, became disenchanted with his revolutionary colleagues, extremists took over. In 1982 land reform became violent. Large country estates were seized. Military officers took all the cattle for themselves, leaving the peasants with small parcels of land without the means to cultivate them. Church properties were also savagely overrun. Bibles and hymnals were burned.

Organizations with foreign connections, including Protestant denominations, became targets. Some Adventist evangelists were harassed by the police. Everything was confiscated from the Adventist mission; the office equipment was sold for the private gain of some colonel. All records were destroyed. After a few months the buildings were returned, but the mission's files now begin with 1982.

The situation has changed in important respects since 1982. Adventists now enjoy religious freedom. Many Adventist young persons have successfully refused to bear arms, and have been given noncombatant work. Evangelistic meetings may be advertised and conducted in not only church buildings but rented halls and huge tents. Even foreign evangelists can come to Nicaragua and hold crusades. Baptisms are held constantly, and the Nicaraguan Mission is ahead of schedule in reaching its goal for Harvest 90.

Although conditions have improved, the Adventist Mission in Nicaragua continues to work against heavy odds. Right now, the whole country has only three ordained ministers. Many foreign pastors have left, and it has been impossible to get new pastors from outside Nicaragua. A pastor earning about \$250 a month in Guatemala, Honduras, or El Salvador is not eager to take his family to Nicaragua with all its hardships, and a

salary of about \$30 a month.

With the Nicaraguan currency almost worthless, it is impossible for poor Nicaraguan Adventists to study abroad. The Nicaraguan Mission Seminary must train the young men and women who will pastor the churches. Right now, 14 students, including four women in the first-year class, are being trained.

With so few ordained ministers, unordained workers conduct evangelistic campaigns and baptisms. Sister Martinez, an unordained bible instructor (and a mother of two), pastors two churches in Managua, including the largest church in the nation's capital. All the pastors in the mission say a bit reluctantly—Nicaragua is an unabashedly male chauvinist culture—but proudly that Sister Martinez is doing a magnificent job of pastoring their flagship church.

Indeed, precisely because of Nicaragua's economic hardships, the opportunities are great, and the world Adventist church could be doing much more in Nicaragua than it is. Although relief workers from other U.S. denominations are active throughout the country, Adventist relief work is meager. With the currency so devalued, a modest church building, made of concrete blocks, with a baptistry, and a capacity for 200 persons, may be built for \$3,000. Visiting a church built just a few months ago, I noticed three benches were still missing. I asked how much would it take to purchase the three remaining benches, and was told \$15.

Because of the flight of the middle class, many fine

properties are for sale at very reasonable prices. Adventists could and should acquire many of them now. With the help of very modest sums from individuals in the United States, the mission has been able in the last year to secure property in the hills, only five miles from downtown Managua on which to locate its secondary school. Previously, the school was 159 kilometers away from the capital and had poor water. The new property includes a hill with municipal water for drinking piped to it, an orchard with its own well for irrigation, and a mansion big enough to provide living quarters for the families of four or five teachers.

When we visited the school, we found dormitories crowded beyond belief. One hundred students had been expected, but 210 had been admitted. Every day others were turned away. Some boys had to sleep on the dining room tables. The menu every day consisted of tortillas, rice, and beans cooked in big kettles on an open fire in the patio. Sanitary facilities left much to be desired.

But the students were irrepressibly joyous. They had a special sense of community, of identity, of common goals. In Managua and other cities we felt a thick blanket of gloom suffocating everyone. Not here. The students were not innocent children. They knew the harsh realities around them. But they were able to face up to them because of their faith and eschatological vision. As one little girl said, smiling to my wife, "I came here to prepare myself for the world." The world church would do well to follow her lead.

Who Will Be Elected General Conference President in 1990?

by Richard Hammill and Ronald Graybill

Dr. Richard Hammill, who retired in 1980 as a general vice-president of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, has been a delegate to nine General Conference sessions. At the 1966 General Conference session he was secretary of the nominating committee and in 1975 was elected by the nominating committee as its vice-chairman.

Hammill's life in the church has not only been distinguished, but varied. Growing up in a Church of the Brethren congregation, he became a baptized Adventist at 19. After graduating from Walla Walla College with a bachelor's in theology, he pastored for four years in the Washington Conference. In 1941 he began his missionary service by pastoring in Danang, Vietnam. His district included Hanoi.

When war broke out in the Pacific he and his family were transferred to the Philippines, where he was appointed director of the home missionary department of a union conference. The Japanese conquest of the Philippines meant Hammill and his family—along with other missionary families such as the Blakes, Eldridges, Stumps, and Wittschiebes—were imprisoned in a Japanese concentration camp for four years (1941-1945).

After World War II, Hammill earned his master's in biblical languages at the SDA Theological Seminary, then served on the faculty of Southern Missionary College for nine years (1946-1955), the last three as academic dean. During that time he earned his doctorate in Oriental languages and literature from the University of Chicago. For eight years (1955-1963) Hammill was the associate director of the General Conference department of education, responsible for collegiate education.

Hammill left his enduring mark on denominational history as president of Andrews University, where he served longer than any president (1963-1976), going back to the founding of the school as Battle Creek College. During his 13 years as president, the master's of divinity degree was officially required of all beginning ministers in North America, the first doctorates at Andrews in education and religion were accredited, and the construction of not only the seminary but also a new university library and other buildings was completed. He was also instrumental in establishing the Geoscience Research Institute.

Hammill completed his denominational career as a general vice-president, chairing committees studying church doctrine and counseling executive committees of the world divisions. He is the author of *In Full Assurance*, published by Southern Publishing Association, and the commentary on the book of Judges in the *SDA Bible Commentary*.

Hammill was interviewed by Dr. Ronald Graybill, associate professor of history at Loma Linda University and an authority on SDA church history. In addition to earning a master's of divinity from the SDA Theological Seminary and a doctorate in American history from Johns Hopkins University, Graybill worked for 13 years, until 1984, at the Ellen G. White Estate in Washington, D.C. In addition to scores of articles, he has written *Mission to Black America: The True Story of Edson White and the Riverboat Morning Star*. It was Graybill who drafted and successfully moved, at the 1980 General Conference Session, the adoption of the crucial introductory paragraph to the 27 Fundamental Beliefs, which includes the words, "Revision of these statements may be expected at a General Conference session when the church is led by the Holy Spirit to a fuller understanding of Bible truth or finds better language in which to express the teachings of God's Holy Word."

—The Editors

What Kind of President?

Graybill: What kind of a leader do you feel the church will need in 1990?

Hammill: There are times when the church needs a good executive, and organizer; someone who will set up policies and help the church function more smoothly. But as I see it, we've had several people like this at the helm of our church. Our church has for some time shown what one poet called "the blessed rage for order." What we

need is a mover and shaker, a president who can arouse us from the ruts we are in.

It seems to me, that as we're nearing the year 2000, when the third millennium of the Christian church will begin, we should elect someone who is an innovator, a person with new ideas who could help the church get a new vision of itself and of its task and the way to accomplish that task. We need a person who can articulate a vision of Adventism not only in church papers but in major addresses to national audiences via radio and television as he travels throughout the world field.

Graybill: What does the international character of the church require of a General Conference president?

Hammill: You have put your finger on a very important point. We don't want a president who comes across to the rest of the world as a North American. Neither do we want a person who would project a colonial view. For a long time, the Adventists from the former colonial powers in Europe had to have mission fields that reported directly to them. At one point our African believers were administered from four different centers, only one of which was on the continent of Africa.

In the late 1970s, some Africans were resenting this a great deal and wrote letters to the General Conference insisting that they be given more responsibility for the direction of their own work or, at the very least, have the headquarters that administered the work in Africa on the African continent. And so the church addressed itself to this problem and established African divisions with their headquarters on the continent. That was a forward move in my thinking. Recent experience in overseas fields clearly demonstrates that when indigenous believers lead their own divisions the result is enthusiasm, vigor, and solid church growth.

Graybill: This raises the long-standing question of representation and division status for North America. What's your perspective on that issue?

Hammill: In 1967 or 1968, Elder Robert Pierson appointed a committee to look into the possibility of making the North American Division quite independent, somewhat like the other divisions. At that time, I favored it. I was a member of

that committee and voted for it. The idea, however, was voted down. It was felt that the North American Division is so necessary to the welfare of the work in the other divisions, because of its financial strength, that to move it farther apart from the General Conference would probably, in effect, weaken the work in the other divisions. For



Neal C. Wilson

Present Position
President
General Conference
of SDAs

Age 70 in 1990

Education
B.A. Pacific Union
College, 1942; two
years language study,
SDA Theological
Seminary, 1942-1944

Birthplace Lodi, California


Positions

- 1 year (1942) Wyoming Mission Pastor/Evangelist
- 2 years (1942-1944) Two years language study at SDA Theological Seminary
- 14 years (1944-1959) Egypt
 - 1 year (1944-1945) Pastor/Evangelist
 - 5 years (1945-1950) President, Egypt Mission
 - 9 years (1950-1959) President, Nile Union
- 1 year (1959) Central Calif. Conf. Dir. of Rel. Liberty
- 6 years (1960-1966) Columbia Union
 - 2 years (1960-1962) Dir. of Rel. Liberty
 - 4 years (1962-1966) President
- 21 years (1966-1988) General Conference
 - 12 years (1966-1978) Vice Pres. for North America
 - 9 years (1979-1988) President

Honors

- D. D. (Honorary) 1976 Andrews University

now, I don't think the North American Division should be made independent like the other divisions are. It should be kept closely tied to the General Conference, but I wouldn't be adverse to maybe providing for more membership by Americans on the General Conference Committee, let us say.



**Charles E.
Bradford**

Present Position
President
North American
Division of SDAs

Age 65 in 1990

Education
B.A. Oakwood
College, 1946

Birthplace Washington, D.C.

Positions

- 6 years (1946-1952) Southwest Region Conference
Pastor
- 5 years (1952-1957) Central States Conference
 - 1 year (1952-1953) Departmental Director
 - 4 years (1953-1957) Pastor
- 4 years (1957-1961) Northeastern Conference
 - 2 years (1957-1959) Departmental Director
 - 2 years (1959-1961) Pastor, City Tabernacle,
New York
- 18 years (1970-1988) General Conference
 - 9 years (1970-1979) Associate Secretary, North
American Division
 - 9 years (1979-1988) Vice President for North
American Division

Honors and Publications

- D. D. (Honorary) Andrews University, 1978
- Two volumes including, *Preaching to the Times*,
and *The God Between*.

Graybill: What about the notion, discussed by Elder Wilson informally with the General Conference officers and then raised again by him at the General Conference Colloquium this spring, of basing representation at General Conference sessions partly on financial support? That is, the number of delegates representing each division at General Conference sessions after 1990 would depend not only on the number of members in the division, but also on the amount of money the division contributes to the denomination's world budget.

Hammill: I believe it would be demeaning. I think that it would be much better to encourage our believers in the other parts of the world to raise

their financial contributions rather than to set up a new discriminatory policy based on finance.

Graybill: Do doctrinal issues in the church call for any particular qualities in a General Conference president?

Hammill: I think so. While our General Conference presidents have had a good grasp of Adventist theology, we've never really had a president of the General Conference who has had very much theological training. They, of course, perceived major issues, but not in the depth that I think would be desirable for the person who is the chief leader in the church. We are now coming to the place where some of our emerging leaders have had better theological training, and it might be a good time, now, to give some thought to electing a president with this background. We very much need a president with a biblically based view of the church and its message for the world.

This is particularly true since the church is experiencing certain tensions. We have noted in the past 10 years that the orientation of some Adventists is to look back to where we came from and keep their eyes fastened on the past. They've become quite reactionary. They look on the church as a city of refuge or an embattled fortress that must be defended. At the same time, there are many Adventists who, realizing the changes that are taking place in the world, choose an orientation that is more toward the future. These members regard the Christian life as a pilgrimage and the church a movable tabernacle.

We are facing a new millennium. We're coming very close to 2000 A.D. and probably it would be a great advantage for the church, facing these questions of unity and possibly facing some doctrinal problems in the next decade, to have as its president one who has undergone real depth in the study of the Bible and is acquainted with the major doctrinal issues.

Graybill: You have mentioned the desirability of unity and at the same time stressed the diversity of views of the church. How can a General Conference president relate to these divergent tendencies?

Hammill: Too many church leaders believe unity means uniformity, whereas the Apostle Paul clearly states that the church, though one body,

has many members, each with specialized and necessary functions. Adventism needs a president who is not threatened by the rich diversity in our church, but looks upon it as a potential gold mine of talent, vision, and energy, which can contribute toward a great forward thrust for the Adventist church.

The Most Likely Possibilities

Graybill: Who are the possible candidates for the next president and what might their strengths and weaknesses be?

Hammill: Obviously, Elder Neal Wilson may be reelected. He has proven himself to be a very good executive. He is an articulate person who speaks well and can very forcefully set forth his views. He possesses remarkable skills in dealing with important religious and political leaders around the world. At the same time he is renowned for involving himself pastorally with the problems of individual workers and members around the world.

During his administration the church has made some forward moves. For instance, consider the way in which he has greatly strengthened Adventist World Radio with a major station in the Far East that reaches large parts of the world. This, to my mind, is a very notable achievement.

I think too of Harvest 90. I recognize that growth in numbers alone isn't all we need; still, organizing the church for an evangelistic thrust forward is an important accomplishment. In this he's done very well. And it may be that Elder Wilson could still give effective, innovative leadership. The church will have to decide whether at his age, and by 1990, having already given 12 years to leadership, it might be better to choose someone else.

Graybill: What other church leaders might be likely to receive consideration as possible General Conference presidents?

Hammill: We all recognize Elder C. E. Bradford is regarded as perhaps the best preacher in Adventist leadership circles. He would provide a strong spiritual mold to the presidency. Certainly, he has thrown his energies behind the

evangelistic thrust of the church. He's also developed the concept of the "Caring Church." He has given evidence of being a leader of broad vision and a person who can galvanize individuals into action. He is not afraid to take positions that may not be universally popular, such as his strong stand in favor of permitting qualified women to be ordained as ministers. He certainly does have qualities that would make an effective leader for the church. He's had a broad background as a pastor, conference president, associate secretary of the General Conference, and now as president of the North American Division.

When I was a General Conference vice-president, I saw up close what I had noted before: Elder Bradford is probably the most voracious reader in the General Conference; not only theology, but history, sociology—everything. Inevitably this



G. Ralph Thompson

Present Position
Secretary
General Conference of
SDAs

Age 61 in 1990

Education
B.A. Atlantic Union
College, 1956
M.A. Andrews
University, 1958
B.D. Andrews Uni-
versity, 1962

Birthplace Connell Town, St. Lucy, Barbados

Positions

25 years (1950-1975) Caribbean
3 years (1950-1953) South Caribbean Conf.
Evangelist
11 years (1953-1964) Caribbean Union College
5 years (1959-1964) Teacher/College Church Pastor
2 years (1962-1964) Chairman, Dept. of Theology
6 years (1964-1970) East Caribbean Conf. President
5 years (1970-1975) Caribbean Union Conf. President
13 years (1975-1980) General Conference
5 years (1975-1980) General Vice President
8 years (1980-1988) Secretary

Honors

D. D. (Honorary) Andrews University, 1983

gives him breadth of outlook. At the same time, he would bring a new perspective, representing what has been a racial minority in the church.

Graybill: But Elder Bradford lacks overseas mission service. Isn't that a prerequisite to serving



Walter R. L. Scragg

Present Position
President
South Pacific
Division of SDAs

Age 65 in 1990

Education
Ministerial course,
Avondale College,
1943-1945; B.A.
Univ. of Adelaide,
1947-1949

Birthplace Auckland, New Zealand
Positions

- 16 years (1947-1966) Australasia
 - 6 years (1949-1955) Victoria Conf., Pastor/
Evangelist
 - 9 years (1956-1965) Voice of Prophecy, Australasian
Division, Speaker/Program Dir.
 - 4 years (1961-1965) Australasian Division, Dir. of
Communications
 - 1 year (1965-1966) Longburn College, New Zealand
President
- 8 years (1967-1975) General Conference, Radio and
Television Dept. (Director, 1973-1975)
- 8 years (1975-1980) Northern European Division,
President
- 4 years (1984-1988) South Pacific Division,
President

Honors and Publications

- D. D. (Honorary) Andrews University, 1982
- Eight volumes including, *Such Bright Hopes*

as General Conference president?

Hammill: I can't think of a General Conference president in recent memory who hasn't served as a missionary. Elder Bradford has not served as an overseas missionary, but certainly the churches he pastored in his younger days, some of them in the ghettos of New York, would have provided him with culturally diverse experi-

ence. I'm sure he would consider those churches a mission field. I wouldn't consider this to be a major impediment to his becoming a president, in view of his particular background and experience.

Graybill: Who else might the church look to when the time comes to choose a new General Conference president in 1990?

Hammill: In the past we have elected to the presidency persons who have been the secretary of the General Conference. By 1990, Elder **G. Ralph Thompson** will have served for a decade as secretary of the General Conference. Prior to that time he served one term as a general vice-president, during which time he chaired several committees, including some revising the *Church Manual*. He is a native of Barbados and has served in the Caribbean as a conference and union president. Even while serving in the General Conference, he has for years prepared tapes for broadcasting on the radio back in the Caribbean countries. He would have an international viewpoint. I'm sure he would want to accelerate the move toward giving greater responsibility to indigenous churches. So, I think Elder Thompson will receive consideration.

Also, our church has often chosen its presidents from those who have been division presidents. A couple come to mind in this category. One of these is Elder **Walter Scragg**, currently serving as president of the South Pacific Division and before that as president of the Northern European Division. He has served as a president longer than any of the other division leaders, and is the only one to have been the president of two divisions. In both, Elder Scragg strongly supported the development of educational institutions, including ministerial training programs in West Africa, Newbold College in England, and Avondale College in Australia. As director of the General Conference Department of Communication, Scragg became well acquainted with how the church operates throughout the world. He is a ready speaker and writes well. In fact, he has written eight books, including commentaries on his two Sabbath school quarterlies in 1987, *The God Who Says Yes* and *The In-Between God*, as well as the devotional book for 1988, *Such Bright Hopes*. Scragg would be able to articulate his

vision for the church to Adventists in both public meetings and articles. More than any other possible president, he also would perform effectively in communicating on radio and television to the general public during international travels. He is a person of real stature who will receive serious consideration.


Graybill: How does his age compare with that of Elder Wilson?

Hammill: He's probably approaching the years of normal retirement but is younger than Elder Wilson. We all know that lately people have been serving longer than they used to. In this country there is a trend in this direction in laws relating to retirement. Elder Scragg would have the vigor to serve as president, but the church would probably have to recognize that it might be a one-term appointment.

Graybill: What about other division presidents?

Hammill: I think of Dr. **Jan Paulsen**, president of the Trans-European Division. He is a person who has had very careful and excellent training in mission theology. He holds a doctoral degree from Tübingen University in Germany. His roots are in Scandinavia, but he's served as a missionary in Africa and as a teacher of religion and head of the Bible department at Newbold College. He has had the experience, as an executive, expected of a General Conference president. He was president of Newbold College and secretary of the Northern European Division. He is now president of that division under its new name, the Trans-European Division.

He brings not only a wealth of administrative experience, but his fine background and training in the Bible would make him an outstanding candidate in terms of being able to handle doctrinal issues that might arise within the church. In fact, he might foster theological renewal. His book, *When the Spirit Descends*, from the Review and Herald Publishing Association, is both pastoral and grounded in solid academic research. Of all the administrators, I think perhaps he is exceptional in combining high-level executive experience with theological training. He is also the youngest of the likely General Conference presidents.



Jan Paulsen

Present Position
President
Trans-European
Division of SDAs
Age 55 in 1990

Education
B.A. Andrews University, 1957; M.A. SDA Theological Seminary; Th.D. University of Tübingen, West Germany, 1962

Birthplace Narvik, Norway

Positions

4 years (1954-1955, 1959-1961) Norway, Pastor
6 years (1962-1968) West Africa
2 years (1962-1964) Bekwai Teacher Training College, Ghana, Bible teacher
4 years (1964-1968) Adventist Seminary of West Africa, Nigeria
3 years (1964-1967) Head of Religion Dept.
1 year (1967-1968) President of seminary
20 years (1968-1988) Trans-European Division
12 years (1968-1976) Newbold College, England
8 years (1968-1976) Chairman of Rel. Dept.
4 years (1976-1980) President
3 years (1980-1983) Secretary, Trans-European Div.
5 years (1983-1988) President, Trans-European Div.

Publications

Two volumes including, *When the Spirit Descends*.

Less Likely, But Qualified

Graybill: Are there other individuals who are unlikely to be chosen as General Conference President, but if by some unforeseen sequence of events, they were elected, would serve with distinction?

Hammill: Yes, there are some very promising and able leaders who aren't as well known in the church. I think, for instance, of Dr. **Calvin Rock** who is now one of the general vice-presidents of the General Conference. He has a wealth of experience as a pastor, part of the time in the large Ephesus Church in Harlem, New York. For many

years he gave outstanding leadership as president of Oakwood College, during which time he traveled extensively in the African divisions. He is a well-educated person with a doctorate in Christian Ethics from Vanderbilt University, a powerful preacher and a successful evangelist—a recent series of meetings in Kenya where he was the principal speaker resulted more than 1,000 baptisms. He could represent the views of much more than just black American Adventists.

It may be that as we come to a new stage in the development of the church, we ought to look to someone outside the regular ranks of administrators.

Other names come to my mind. One of these, Elder **Alf Birch**, has served the church as a president of local conferences and as secretary, or second in command, of the Southern Africa Division. When that division was reorganized out of existence, he was elected president of the South African Union, attached directly to the General Conference. He carried out graduate study in theology, in the United States, and is currently serving in Australia as director of the church-ministries department of the South Pacific Division. He's a very charismatic leader. Wherever he has served, people have enjoyed very much serving under him. His concept of the church, of the equality of all members, and of the right of self-determination for churches in all areas of the world field is a quality greatly to be desired in the president of the General Conference. There is no doubt his administration would be innovative, spiritual, and effective.

It may be that as we come to a new stage in the development of the church, we ought to look to someone outside the regular ranks of administrators. Dr. **Russell Staples**, formerly a missionary in Africa, is the chairman of the Mission Department at Andrews University. Before coming to the United States he was principal of Solusi College. He is one of the best-read theologians in the church. Dr. Staples has a very strong vision of the

role national leaders should play, and what this might do to revitalize the work in some places where our church is somewhat moribund. Here's a person who, as chief leader of the denomination, could help us to clarify and articulate the vision of what the mission of the church is; move us on to a new and more active concept of mission than we've thought of so far. He is a person who could bring leadership to the General Conference.

If we decide that this is the time to break out of the usual patterns of doing things and look outside the usual administrative echelons, we should remember that perhaps the most important person of all in the development of the church is the pastor of the local congregation. That is why many denominations choose their chief officer from among their pastors. It might be a very good idea to elect a senior pastor of wide experience as the next president of the General Conference.

Maybe we ought to look for someone like Dr. **Louis Venden** who served as a missionary for several years in Japan. He has a doctorate in pastoral theology from a first-rate university, Princeton, has taught many years at the SDA Theological Seminary, and now serves as senior pastor of one of the largest—if not *the* largest—Adventist congregations in the world, the Loma Linda University Campus Church. He is familiar with the challenges and opportunities of large Adventist institutions. With the power and influence of the General Conference presidency, Pastor Venden could revitalize the pastoral ministry, one of the denomination's, greatest needs. This suggestion of considering a practicing pastor as General Conference president should not be dismissed as impractical. It deserves careful, prayerful consideration.

How Presidents Are Elected

Graybill: The politics of choosing a General Conference president would virtually rule out the possibility of some of these less-prominent individuals, wouldn't it?

Hammill: Probably. Yet there are plenty of people who are beginning to think that individuals who have come up stage-by-stage, through the

echelons of administration in the church, probably have been placed within a mold that would be very hard for them to break out of.

Graybill: So that if we wanted someone with a new vision, we ought to look outside that conditioning process? Is that what you're saying?

Hammill: That's what I'm saying. There is a tendency among leaders to develop what some have called "group think." You're trying to be helpful, you want to be cooperative, you sit in committees and see programs, and you sort of develop a "going along" orientation that tends to curb real creativity. It may be that now is the time to look outside the administrative echelons to find an academic or a pastor who could be placed in the top leadership role in the church; a visionary leader who would help us break out of the pattern we are in and really make a surge forward.

Graybill: Let's look at the actual process of selecting a president. Doesn't the fact that the incumbent travels around the world, meeting people, pastors, and leaders, give him a tremendous advantage over any other possible candidate?

Hammill: Yes, I think undoubtedly it does. He's the most well-known individual in the whole church and is quite uniformly respected. Our past history has shown that with very few exceptions when a General Conference president wanted to go on he usually was reelected. There have been a few cases where this was not so. For instance, A. G. Daniells, after he had served for 21 years, still wanted to be reelected. The nominating committee was divided so that they were not ready to report by the time the session was ready to end and the session had to be extended for several days. It took a great deal of persuasion to get Elder Daniells to withdraw.

Graybill: Have the dynamics of the nominating committee changed over the last few General Conference sessions?

Hammill: It's changed markedly. Probably more in the last few sessions than it has in the past 50-70 years. As the church has grown larger, there is naturally a larger representation from overseas. And during the last two sessions, the overseas delegates have asserted themselves as they never did before. I've been on the nominating commit-

tee a number of times. The first time was in 1966 when I was secretary of the committee. At that time the overseas delegates didn't say much. The North American delegates spoke most often; they assumed the leadership role. It was taken for granted that a union president from North America would be the chairman of the committee—nobody ever questioned that.

In the 1975 session in Vienna, when I was vice-chairman of the nominating committee, the overseas delegates on the nominating committee became more vocal. They would disagree with the delegates from North America. They even con-

If one could really have a very outstanding person from the Third World who was articulate, bright, and aggressive, I think the church would accept him.

tested whether the chairman of the committee should be a North American union president.

In 1980 I was not a member of the nominating committee, but I was told that the overseas delegates were the most active they had ever been. They are better educated now; they're more self-assured; they're more aware of how the process works. Then finally, in 1985, the nominating committee elected Dr. Leshner, president of Andrews University, to chair their committee. The North American Division union presidents' hold on that post was broken. I think it's a real asset to the church to have these leaders from around the world developing the way they are.

Graybill: What would be the reaction of North America if an African or a South American was elected president of the General Conference?

Hammill: That's hard to say. We did have one General Conference president who was an Australian—C. H. Watson. He was well received. And at one time the president of the North American Division was an Australian.

Graybill: But these were still white, English-speaking leaders.

Hammill: Yes, and the work in Australia is very much like it is in North America. If one could

really have a very outstanding person from the Third World who was articulate, bright, and aggressive, I think the church would accept him. Such a person would have some built-in disadvantages in knowing how to deal with the problems in North America, problems connected to finances and large institutions, for instance.

Graybill: Don't you suppose that third-world pastors feel just as uneasy about the capabilities of North American-born-and-bred administrators to handle their problems as we would if they were in charge of our work?

Hammill: That's a good point. That's exactly the way they now feel.

Adventism in the Antipodes

by Norman H. Young

The declaration of American independence in 1776 terminated Britain's custom of banishing her convicts to the New World. The habit, however, remained ingrained. Faced with the problem of the overcrowding in their prisons, the British House of Commons, after some debate due to the cost, voted to transport the wretched human contents to the recently charted east coast of New Holland (as Australia was then called). Captain James Cook had mapped and claimed the area for His Majesty's government only a few years previously in 1770. The aborigines who dwelt in the land had not developed the weaponry to defend it against the Europeans, and the logic of the day concluded that that gave the modern powers the right to take possession of the land.

The 11 ships of the "First Fleet" with their cargo of "scarcely human creatures" initially anchored in Botany Bay, but the surroundings were less than enticing even for a penal colony, so within a week the whole fleet had relocated to "Sydney Cove." The Union Jack went up, a salute was fired, and Captain Arthur Phillip, the new governor, and his officers drank to King George's health. Thus, 200 years ago on Saturday afternoon 26 January 1788, the nation of Australia inauspiciously began as a British penal colony.

Three years short of a century later, the first official contingent of American Adventists arrived in the still-fledgling nation of Australia. In fact, Australia was not yet even a nation, but

rather a group of independent and jealous colonies. There had been some unofficial Adventist presence in Australia and New Zealand prior to the arrival of the 11 missionaries in 1885, but those efforts had not established the Advent faith in the new lands. The newly arrived Americans, including Elders S. N. Haskell, J. O. Corliss, and M. C. Israel, were destined to have that honour.

The American evangelists faced a daunting prospect: no black debris had blotted out the sun in the expansive antipodean skies in 1780, no falling "stars" had peppered the parched Australian land in 1833, and no saints had gathered in barns or in fields to await the Lord's return on 22 October 1844. The doyen of Australian historians, Manning Clark, has truly noted that "no prophets have come out of the deserts of Australia," and "unlike most other countries, we have no legends that the Christ figure ever wandered in our ancient continent." Thus, the American missionaries found no Millerite foundation in Australia upon which to build. Indeed, they had come to a colony with a tenuous Christian tradition.

Gains and Losses

It is a tribute to the early American Adventist missionaries that just over a century after their arrival, there are in the South Pacific Division (in round figures) 200,000 (54,456 in Australia and New Zealand) believers worshipping in 1,000 church buildings, sending 22,500 (8,000 in Australia and New Zealand) of their children to 300 schools and colleges, and running five hospitals, 16 retirement villages, 10 hostels for the aged, seven nursing homes, a

Norman H. Young, professor of New Testament at Avondale College, and a native of Perth, received his B. A. from Pacific Union College and his Ph. D from Manchester University in England. He is the author of *Rebuke and Challenge: The Point of Jesus' Parables*. Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1985.

publishing house, a media center, and a giant food-processing conglomerate.

The division budget for 1987 was \$13.7 million; \$7.3 million of which was allocated to the mission unions, the remainder to fund the division office and institutions. A substantial portion of the division's budget is generated by the Sanitarium Health Food Company's profits. Tithes in 1986 was \$24.22 million dollars, and total offerings amounted to \$12.95 million.

In the festive atmosphere of Australia's bicentennial, celebrating Adventism's successes may seem appropriate, but celebration must be tempered by the realization that the heirs of those intrepid Americans will need a vision as bold as that of the founders just to maintain the original achievements, let alone surpass them. Technology has partially tamed "the tyranny of distance" that challenged the Adventist pioneers, but new barriers to growth have arisen in modern Australia and New Zealand.

The South Pacific Division stretches from Australia's west coast southward to Tasmania, then eastward to South New Zealand and onward as far as Pitcairn Island, finally veering northward to the islands below (and some above) the equator. The change of the division's name from Australasian Division to its present title in 1985 is a recognition that the membership growth is outside the first-world countries of Australia and New Zealand, even if the wealth remains within their borders. The reduction in the home field's growth in membership has reached the point where it is barely maintaining the status quo.

The actual growth rate in Australia and New Zealand has been steadily waning from a 3.35 percent annual increase throughout the decade 1932-1941 to a 1.27 percent annual growth in membership during the 1980s. This compares with an annual growth in North America of 3.6 percent. The decline is not simply due to a post-Glacier View plunge, for it has been a clear trend during the past six decades. The major problem is not declining baptisms—though the eighties are experiencing a reversal of a 50-year upward graph—but increasing apostasies. Glacier View had a visible impact on this pattern, but it was an exacerbation of a trend and not its cause.

The calculation of apostasies as a percentage of baptisms indicates that in the three decades 1932-1961 one person left for every four baptized. For the next two decades, 1962-1981, one person defected for every three baptized. But in the period 1982-1987 one person seceded for every two that were baptized. (See table below.)

Apostasy Rate— South Pacific Division

1932-1941	24.6 percent
1942-1951	22.8 percent
1952-1961	21.6 percent
1962-1971	31.0 percent
1972-1981	34.9 percent
1982-1987	48.5 percent

Aftermath of Defrocking Desmond Ford

A loss of confidence in the self-understanding of the church and claims became manifest during the 1980s with the challenges of Desmond Ford, Walter Rea, and others. Such researchers merely expressed some of the incipient doubts that had lain below the surface of Australasian Adventism for some time. During the eighties it became increasingly difficult for many Adventists under the Southern Cross to affirm the faith in the form that the American evangelists had delivered it to their spiritual forefathers.

The institutional church reacted conservatively and required the doubters to affirm the orthodox view. Those who could not accept that the Adventist church was a holy remnant with a unique hold on divine truth and destined to trigger the *Parousia* felt alienated as the church reemphasized the traditional formulae. The apostasy rate in the home unions leapt in 1982 to a staggering 62.7 percent. In 1981 New Zealand experienced a net loss in membership for the first time in


the history of the Advent mission there. Besides the number involved, the quality of the people lost in the carnage added to the tragedy. The younger ministerial workers were decimated. Of 170 who graduated from the theology course in the period 1973-1982, 75 either did not enter or have left the ministry.² This is a significant loss in the home fields where only 206 ordained ministers are currently active as church pastors.

There is consequently a shortage of experienced young pastors in the home conferences. In North New South Wales (one of the largest conferences in Australia), of 26 ministers in the field,

only one is under 30 years of age, whereas of 100 teachers in the same conference, approximately 25 are under 30. This is probably similar to the situation throughout the division where 44.3 percent of the 587 teachers (excluding national teachers) are in their first five years of service. Thus there appears to be a generation gap between the teaching and pastoral branches of the ministry.

New graduates will not remedy the shortage of trained ministers, since student enrollment in the ministerial course at Avondale College is at its lowest for decades, with only 65 ministerial students at Avondale this year (1988) compared with

The South Pacific Division Today



Map adapted by FastForWord from Adult Sabbath School Quarterly, April-June 1988.

Unions	Population	Churches	Church Members	Sabbath School Members
Central Pacific	1,193,081	197	21,719	23,195
Papua New Guinea	3,267,646	479	88,451	93,945
Trans-Australian	8,387,400	182	18,962	15,679
Trans-Tasman	10,285,354	272	33,916	28,586
Western Pacific	612,200	169	19,816	20,278
Division Totals	23,745,681	1,299	182,864	181,683

an average of 115 throughout the 1970s. Presently the theology students are generally more mature than students in other courses, the average age being 28 years. It is not true that only dull men are applying for the ministry—though many bright Adventist students go to university—but the younger Adventist men do not seem to be much attracted to it.

The church has attempted to reassert the validity of its self-claims by emphasizing in the schools those aspects of its structure that have been challenged: the role of Ellen White, the sanctuary, the uniqueness and divine origin of the Adventist church. It has been only partially successful. The focus on the church's doctrine has bred considerable cynicism among students, for many of them perceive the church as placing the perpetuation of its own institutional identity above the nurturing of persons and community. Symptomatic of this is the widespread attitude of students toward Ellen White: she is not attacked, just largely ignored. The field secretary of the division wrote in the *South Pacific Record* of 19 July 1986 that the years have seen the disappearance of the clouds of Glacier View. It is true that the clouds have dissipated, but certain effects remain.

One in five Australians was born overseas, making Australia one of the most ethnically diverse countries in the world. That diversity is reflected in church membership.

Partly to assure the constituency that its teachers and administrators believe in a six-day Creation, a short chronology, and a universal flood, the division invited the Geoscience Research Institute to run two field conferences this summer (January-February 1988) at a cost of \$150,000. The first group was composed mainly of science educators, and the second was mostly administrators. A statement of affirmation was put to the second group only. There was one dissenter—an Australian scientist who was present to give a lecture. There is little doubt that the discussion would have been more lively if the statement had also been presented to the first group. The empha-

sis in these conferences augurs ill for those who cannot affirm a totally fundamentalist interpretation of Genesis.

Innovations

In an effort to reverse the trend in membership loss the church is attempting to introduce changes in evangelistic methods, pastoral care, ethnic outreach, use of the media, and the like. One response to the rapid social change has been the commissioning of a small task-force committee with the significant title "Toward 2000" to explore new evangelistic approaches.

In 1986 the division founded the Institute of Church Ministry and Evangelism on the Avondale College campus. The institute provides demographic studies (120 churches have already used this service), long-term consultations, workshops, and various resources in all aspects of church growth and evangelism. The director, Alwyn Salom, has organized two church-growth study tours for pastors to the United States.

Five ministerial conferences for workers were held in Australia, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, and Fiji in 1986 and 1987. The issues addressed were those raised by the ministers themselves in a preconference survey. Don Reynolds of the General Conference Christian Leadership Seminars was the featured speaker. He addressed the issues of conflict management, problem-solving, and administration. Other speakers were George Reid, director of the Biblical Research Institute, and Werner Vyhmeister, head of Asia Adventist Theological Seminary.

For the first time some of these conferences were held in the island unions. However, only expatriates and nationals with advanced degrees were included. In 1988 several three-week seminars will be held involving a broader spectrum of national workers.

The church ministries department, directed by Alf Birch, is in the process of holding another series of short seminars in both Australia and New Zealand (the "home unions") and in the island missions. Already, 7 of the 11 home con-

ferences have been visited. The purpose of these conferences is to assist the pastor to become skilled in a relational model of ministry stressing a cooperative style of working with members. The seminars encourage the pastors to adopt a facilitating role within their congregations. The authority figure model is eschewed.

There is, according to the Church Ministries department, a "cry for openness" among the ministry: openness to change, to dialogue, to fairness, to innovation in worship and mission, to the centrality of the local congregation, to the needs of the year 2000. The department believes that unless the church becomes more democratic, secular Australians and New Zealanders will dismiss it as irrelevant, if they have not already done so.

The church ministries department is also running family-life seminars to assist the ministry in their professional standards of pastoral premarital and marriage counseling. The four-year program in family life education that the church ministries department has arranged with Loma Linda University commences in July 1988. Already 33 pastors and laity, including several women, have enrolled.

More than one in five Australians was born overseas, making Australia one of the most ethnically diverse countries in the world. That diversity is beginning to be reflected in church membership and evangelism. Within the two home unions there are 3,300 ethnic Adventists worshipping in 25 church buildings. Among the ethnic groups represented are Russians, Finns, Greeks, Italians, Poles, Yugoslavs, Chinese, Samoans, Fijians, Cook Islanders, Hispanics, and Portuguese. A seminar in professional awareness will be held early in 1989 for the 28 ethnic pastors. For Australian Adventism to take the gospel to every nation, kindred, tongue, and people, it need only enter its own cities. The ethnic portions of Australian society offer the best potential for both Christian services and membership growth.

Adventist film and video production in Australia is of a high quality at a relatively low cost. An Adventist, Russell Gibbs, received the "Angel Award" in 1966 for the best religious music. Another member, Babe Reynaud, won a National

Target Award for his video promoting a theology course.

The "Focus on Living" TV series is screened without cost on 32 of a possible 40 stations. However, the program's classification forbids the mentioning of religion, or the use of the church's name, and allows only limited discussion of controversial social issues. The church buys commercial time to advertise its Bible courses during the program. Many believe that a better result would be achieved if the \$400,000 budget was spent on producing top advertising to screen on prime-time TV and save the bother of producing the program. However, the program is gaining a following among daytime viewers, and hopefully in the future the church will be permitted to publicize its association with the series.

Aborigines

In 1980 the division took over the administrative responsibility of the church's work for Australia's 150,000 aborigines. Until this change the work for aborigines had depended on the spasmodic efforts of individual pastors and conferences. It had not previously enjoyed the concentrated effort of the island work. The division's aboriginal office is in Kempsey where there is a significant aboriginal population and where the Adventist work for the aborigines belatedly began in 1910 or 1914. There are presently 2,000 aboriginal Adventists and about 15-30 are being baptized annually. Two of the six men assigned to this ministry are themselves aboriginal. The success of the work is partly due to the aboriginal community being encouraged to work out their own spiritual life.

The church is involved in two schools for aboriginal children: Karalundi in Western Australia with 100 pupils and Mirriwinni Gardens in New South Wales with 60 pupils. The schools have an aboriginal majority on their governing boards. Both schools are dependent on government funding, though they are operated by Adventists. The government has invested \$1.2 million in the capital development of Mirriwinni

Gardens. The principal is Fay Oliver, an aboriginal woman dedicated to the betterment of her people. Karalundi is a large property that was once owned by the church. The government recently purchased the estate for \$230,000 after the church had declined the offer.

Publications

Another encouraging event was the recent assigning of two youthful and talented editors (James Coffin and Gary Krause) to the task of upgrading the two journals published by the division. The South Pacific Division *Record*, a monthly magazine somewhere between the *Adventist Review* and the union papers in the United States. The other publication is the Australian version of the *Signs of the Times*, edited for a non-Adventist readership. The Signs Publishing Company has annual gross sales of \$3.8 million with a small profit margin, but its two journals were in trouble. The new editors have recaptured a wide readership for the *Record*, including younger members. Subscrip-

tions for the *Signs* had declined from 69,436 in 1977 to 42,249 in 1986. To restore the *Signs* to its former evangelistic role, the editors modernized its style and contents. This revamping lost as many subscribers as it gained. The innovations are a "do or die move," according to management. If they do not save the moribund *Signs*, nothing will.

A significant book emerged from a history symposium conducted by the division in 1986 at Macquarie University. Both Adventist and non-Adventist scholars attended and presented papers. The papers were published as a monograph (*Adventist History in the South Pacific, 1886-1915*, Wahoonga, 1986), which has been well received by institutions around the world. A second symposium, studying Adventism between the first and second world wars, will be held in 1988, with a volume published later.


Oceania

The picture in the Pacific Island regions is generally dramatically different from the home unions. Even allowing

Burgeoning Membership in the Island Missions

According to growth projections, the island unions will represent 82 percent of the South Pacific Division by the

year 2000. The membership in Papua New Guinea alone now accounts for 50 percent of the division totals.



Adventist Membership per 1,000 Population

Vanuatu (formerly New Hebrides)	
Mission	51.5
Central Papua Mission	46.3
North Solomon Islands	31.6
Samoa	24.5
Fiji	16.5
South N. Z. Conference	2.4
Greater Sydney Conference	2.1
Victoria Conference	1.9

for the fact that only a tithe or less of the apostasies are recorded, the growth in the mission fields is dramatic. Based on 1986 figures, Papua New Guinea Union is growing at the rate of 8.8 percent annually, the Central Pacific at 6.9 percent, and the Western Pacific at 4.9 percent. This growth has brought its own problems. The economies in these unions are generally poor and rely heavily on overseas aid. In the South Pacific Division, 73 percent of its membership is in the mission field, but 88 percent of its tithes and offerings come from the home field. The membership growth in the three mission unions and the stagnation in the two home unions have brought enormous strains on the resources of the division. (See box, opposite page.)

The Stretching of Resources

The resources of the church, both in personnel and finances, are severely stretched in the South Pacific Division. The growth in the Adventist school system has been a significant factor in this. There has been a swing from state schools toward private schools in the Australian community for a number of years now. Currently, some 27.6 percent of Australia's primary and high school students are in private schools. The trend is expected to continue and some researchers estimate that as many as 40 percent might be in private schools by the year 2000. The reasons for the increasing dissatisfaction with the state system are multiple, being both perceived and real, but the situation has reinforced the desire of Adventist families to have their children taught in Adventist schools.

The Adventist school system in Australia and New Zealand has experienced an average annual growth of five percent since 1930. Currently, total enrollment represents approximately 14.7 percent of the membership. The parallel percentage in the three mission unions is 9.7 percent (1986 figures). The number of teachers employed by the church has increased phenomenally over recent years. This growth in numbers of pupils

and teachers is taxing the church's ability to meet the school system's needs, and the difficulty is exacerbated by the church's struggle to hold its teachers.

Avondale now awards degrees with state recognition, which has given Adventist teachers wider employment options. Many of them are exercising their prerogative to teach outside the Adventist system. Young teachers often consider the mission field detrimental to vocations and frequently refuse calls. Six of Avondale's 1987 education graduates turned down mission calls compared to two who accepted. Overall, 35 teachers declined mission service compared to 16 who accepted an appointment. It would be easy to attribute this to a loss of vision, but the causes are more complex. The church may have to review the conditions and treatment of missionaries, especially on return, if it wishes to improve the acceptance level for mission service.

The recent tragic murder of one of the author's former students, Peter Knopper, in Papua New Guinea will cause some hesitation in going to certain areas. The thousands of nationals who lined the road for his memorial service, though moving, may not be enough to assure would-be missionaries of their safety. Pacific Adventist College (PAC), just outside Port Moresby, is surrounded by a high protective wire fence and a patrol car circles its perimeter throughout the night. This justified security costs the college \$7,500 annually. However, few other expatriate workers in Papua New Guinea can be given the same protection.

The demands placed on young teachers in small rural schools and in the mission field are often inordinate. The situation of David Rogers, principal of Aore School in Vanuatu during 1985-1986, is not atypical. The school has 286 elementary and high school students. Besides being principal and teacher of upper French for external exams, Rogers managed the copra and cocoa plantations, the market garden, and the dairy and beef herds (200 head). Since he was mechanically minded, he also carried the major responsibility for maintaining the equipment, which included an irrigation system, pumps, three tractors, two diesel launches and a slipway.

Hospital and Health Food Company

The staffing of the impressive and prestigious Sydney Adventist Hospital (300 beds) places an enormous demand on the comparatively small Adventist population base. The Sydney Adventist Hospital employs 1,200 persons, 90 percent of whom are Adventists. Its annual budget of \$30.8 million is generated entirely by its own services. Indeed, it pays a very substantial tithe to the division on its earnings, the balance being ploughed back into hospital budgets. The hospital is about to rebuild its maternity wing at a cost of \$5.7 million. The 2,000 babies that are born there annually will soon be ushered into Australian life in an idyllic domestic setting with the hi-tech medical back-up discreetly blended into the decor.

The Sanitarium Health Food Company employs 1,300 full-time staff, the majority of whom are Adventists. With estimated gross earnings of \$126 million, the *Business Review Weekly* ranks Sanitarium 425th (from 367th in 1986) among the 1,000 Australian companies with the largest turnovers. The profit to earnings ratio in the food industry is not high, but even on a low 10-12 percent, the tax-free profit is substantial. Again this large enterprise is drawing its expertise from a relatively small Adventist population base.

Despite the needs of such corporations as the hospital and the food company, Avondale's Bachelor of Business graduates frequently go elsewhere for their careers. The reason for this is not generally a lack of dedication. Many of Avondale's business students accept the offers of private industry, not primarily because of the church's inability to match the remuneration of big business, but because the church lacks a professional approach to potential top management. Career paths in the church are not well defined, in-service training is minimal, incentives are lacking and equal opportunity for women—more than half of Avondale's business graduates are women—has yet to be fully achieved in church employment.

Women

Women in the South Pacific Division remain the great untapped human resource. There are between 20 and 25 percent more women in the Adventist church in Australia and New Zealand than men, yet their role in the church seldom proceeds beyond the Sabbath school (especially the lower divisions), nursing, and teaching (mainly elementary level). In a recent random survey conducted among nine churches in the North New South Wales Conference, five favoured the ordination of women, two by a narrow margin. The four opposed were also by small margins. The South Pacific Committee on the Role of Women decided in its March 1988 meeting to recommend to the General Conference that no decision be made on the matter of the ordination of women until further study had been undertaken, since the church in Australia and New Zealand "remains unsettled." The ordination of women could have the salutary effect of enhancing their participation in an increasing variety of roles throughout the institutional church. Unfortunately, the only immediate hope for women in this part of the vineyard is that the shortage of men for ministry might force the church to turn to women on the unflattering wartime premise that female ministers are better than none.

Administration

The fact that one in 13 of Australian and New Zealand Adventists is also a denominational employee is an evidence of the strain on personnel in the division. However, the personnel who interface with the people are becoming fewer. In 1977 there were 303 ordained ministers in the two home unions, compared to 32 in the division office and institutions. In 1987—despite a membership increase in Australia and New Zealand over the decade of 6,867—the ratio had become 280 to 50. If Parkinson's Law follows (administration increases to fill the space

available), the current \$3 million expansion of the division's office space in Wahroonga will intensify the imbalance. Of the 280 ordained men in the two home unions, 74 are not pastoring a congregation. Thus the shortage of trained pastors in the field is being exacerbated by a growing administrative hierarchy.

Wage structures in the church favour the burgeoning administrative body. The concept of a basic equitable wage filled out by needs-oriented benefits is no longer an equitable arrangement. The major losers are teachers, but local pastors are also disadvantaged.³

Someone of the Avondale College staff tired of this dual standard and appealed to the Trade Union for Lecturers in Independent Tertiary Education. The college is currently engaged in a costly legal defence of its right as a religiously autonomous body to pay below union wage levels. Few college staff are demanding union wage levels; most simply wish the church's claims of equality to become more of a reality. Out of this pain has come some gain: after July 1988 the more senior lecturers at Avondale will receive the full car allowance.

Government Financial Aid

The first strategy employed by the church to ease financial pressures is to accept—contrary to the ideals of the American founders—massive amounts of state aid. A whopping 45-50 percent of the budget of the Adventist school system in Australia comes from state grants (the state and federal grants are based on complex needs formulae, but \$7.5 million is a fair estimate of the extent of the government's investment in the operating and the building, of Australia's Adventist schools). The rest of the budget is raised through fees (40-45 percent) and levies on the local churches (10 percent).

The cost of education for the conferences is thus virtually limited to the wages of the education director and his secretary. However, the church has demanded that conferences establish a buffer fund against the possible cessation of state aid. This is being accomplished by allocating 15

percent of the tithe to the buffer fund until an established amount is reached (\$3 million in the case of the North New South Wales Conference). The buffers would give conferences no more than two years to adjust to the new situation if they lost the government funds. The alternative is either higher fees, which would mean the end of the phenomenal growth of the Adventist private school system, or higher church subsidies for an already stretched budget, which would mean less for the ministerial work. This is a classic Catch-22 situation.

Avondale College relies on the government for \$1 million of its \$5 million operating budget. Furthermore, many of its students are dependent on government living allowances. A group of "friends" known as the Avondale College Foundation, have established enterprises whose profits support the college. Since its inception in 1978 the foundation has assisted the college development with grants of \$1.1 million. However, the foundation could not replace the government's funds. Unlike the conferences, the college has no buffer fund. Should government aid cease overnight, so would the college—at least in its present form—unless fees were raised and/or the church increased its allocation to the college dramatically.

The Adventist Development and Relief Agency (ADRA) in Australia is listed by the government as the third most important Australian body involved in overseas aid. In 1987 ADRA/Australia administered \$4.5 million in aid to projects outside the country. Only 15 percent of that was directed to disaster relief, for ADRA is increasingly becoming oriented toward development aid. Furthermore, as a recipient of \$900,000 direct from the public and \$400,000 from the government, ADRA has felt obliged to become less sectarian in its largess. ADRA recently took over the administration of Asian Aid, which raises \$600,000 annually. The Asian Aid fund was begun in 1966 by an Adventist laywoman, Maisie Fook. The original founders are still very active in the organization, which follows the lines of support-a-child programs. The more successful ADRA is, the more money it attracts from governments, and the less dependent it becomes on

the church.

Sopas Regional Hospital (60 beds plus aisles) in New Guinea is a nurse-training institution that is completely funded by the Papuan New Guinea government with a grant of \$360,000. Atoifi Hospital (100 beds) in the Solomons, also a nurse-training center, is not dependent on government grants. Such grants are tenuous, as ultimately governments prefer to fund their own hospitals. Aore Hospital in Vanatu (formerly New Hebrides) closed when government funds ceased, and the church opened several clinics instead. Adventists operate 50 clinics in the Pacific Islands and in many ways these are more cost-efficient and less duplicating of government facilities than regional hospitals.

Nationalization

The second strategy embraced by the church to help solve its economic problems is nationalization. The church is not only nationalizing for noble Christian motives, but also for pragmatic economic ones. National workers cost a tithe of an expatriate's wage. The church pays nationals only a third of what they could earn as experienced medics or teachers in their government's institutions. One missionary described the sacrificing nationals as the "unsung heroes" of the island work. As part of the church's austerity policy, the Papua New Guinea union has been asked to eliminate 15 expatriate budgets over the next five years. The other two Pacific Island unions are to surrender a similar proportion.

Part of the pressure on the church to nationalize is secular in nature. Nationalism in the third-world countries of the Pacific is politically active and socially important. The church cannot continue to operate in defiance of these forces. It is quite predictable that in the future the presidents of the three mission unions will be nationals.

Rationalization

The third strategy aimed at relieving the pressure on resources is the

rationalization of the education system. The division has declared that the work in the islands is to operate according to its own economic levels. The disparity between urban incomes and village economies in the mission countries means that in many areas Adventist schools are too costly for the people. Consequently there is a high closure rate of schools in the poorer areas. Papua New Guinea is closing seven schools a year: it is expected that only about 45 of the 105 schools that operated in 1983 will survive. Government education is cheaper and of a better standard than the Adventist schools, hence most Papuan and New Guinean Adventist children are in government schools. This is also true at tertiary level where two-and-a-half times more Adventists are in the university than the 100 students enrolled in Pacific Adventist College located near Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea.

Pacific Adventist College is a large institution that was built with little consultation with members in New Guinea, at a cost of \$9 million. Not only were the buildings originally designed for construction in Sydney by an Australian architect, but the facilities are too grand, given the weaknesses of the feeder system. Expatriates seem not to have grasped that Pacific Adventist College's graduates are destined to replace them. They urge the merits of the humble Omaura Bible Training School because, in their experience, it produces better and cheaper field workers than Pacific Adventist College. It is hoped that Pacific Adventist College will supply the trained persons greatly needed for national leadership. With persons of the caliber of John Geheno, who was foreign minister in Prime Minister Somare's Papua New Guinea government; Nigel Angonia, a senior public servant; and Oma Nombe, premier of the Eastern Highlands Province in New Guinea, who has seven Adventists in his cabinet, the church cannot continue to place most of the administrative control in white expatriate hands.

Some small isolated one-teacher schools in Australia and New Zealand are closing, doomed by the mounting costs and sophistication of modern education. Boarding schools are also struggling to survive. Many Adventist families have decided that it is better to keep their children

at home in the wicked city than to send them away from home to the salubrious countryside. The trend in the home unions is toward bigger schools in areas of Adventist population clusters, which are generally urban and/or institutional. For example, to keep Carmel College outside Perth in Western Australia operational, the Victoria Park High School was closed and Carmel largely became a day school. Some small schools have stayed the day of execution by increasing the number of non-Adventist students well beyond the recommended 10 percent maximum. Lilydale Academy, not too far from Melbourne, continues by taking in large numbers of day students and overseas boarders (43 percent). Longburn College in New Zealand exists by Sanitarium Health Food Company dollars and New Zealand pride.

Thus, the harsh realities of economics are changing the face of Adventist education in the Antipodes.

The Public Image of the Church

The church's medical and welfare work creates enormous public good will. Sydney Adventist Hospital is the most comprehensive private hospital in Australia. Its excellent reputation has enhanced the church's image in numerous ways. Its facilities have been enjoyed by celebrities and leading citizens including members of the federal government. The annual National Bioethics Conference that the hospital hosts joined with its Bioethics Center has made the hospital the focus of Protestant discussion in the field of medical ethics. A medical team of 52, under the auspices of the hospital, volunteered their time and skills to perform open-heart surgery in Tonga and attracted considerable positive and deserved media attention. Corporations and individuals contributed \$450,000 to the venture. The hospital is considering a similar outreach to Nepal.

Fifteen years ago patients stayed for 10-15 days, whereas bed occupancy is now only five days. It is indicative of the quality of the Sydney

Adventist Hospital that it has been able to maintain the full utilization of its facilities despite the shorter hospital stays. Australian medical services are of a high standard and cost-efficient and therefore attract many overseas patients. The Sydney Adventist Hospital is beginning to receive some of these overseas patients. Austrade, a semigovernment agency, has included the Sydney Adventist Hospital among those Australian hospitals to which overseas patients can be referred.

The smaller Auckland Hospital (64 beds) in the capital of New Zealand is operating successfully,

Despite Adventists being present in Australasia for more than a century, the Chamberlain case revealed how little-known Adventists were in Australia.

employing some 200 staff of whom 50 percent are part-time. Its wages total \$2.7 million. The Warburton Center near Melbourne (38 hospital beds and 70 health-care beds) is not as financially viable as the Sydney Adventist Hospital. Nevertheless, its work in alcohol rehabilitation receives warranted praise. The center is possibly the most successful facility in Australia doing such work, having assisted 500 alcohol-dependent persons to overcome their habit.

The Chamberlain murder trial exposed the church to saturation publicity beyond anything it had ever experienced. The church did its best to support the Chamberlains without uniting its own reputation with theirs. To the chagrin of some church officials, the media identified the Chamberlains with their church. The church was not always comfortable with the association. For instance, the communications department regretted Mrs. Chamberlain's media references to Satan, which meant that Mrs. Chamberlain was expected to distinguish between a public relations Adventism and the religion of her upbringing. After the Chamberlains were convicted, the previous editor of the *Australasian Record* was anxious to assure the world that "a church's integrity does not stand or fall on the record of one or two of its members" (November 27, 1982). He was

swift to deny the suggestion that the “church has fallen under condemnation and that its image has been damaged.” The facts, according to a report prepared by the Anti-Discrimination Board, were otherwise:

There can be no doubt, however, that the combination of the Chamberlain case and reports of theological schism in the church have had deleterious effects on its image in the eyes of the general public.⁴

To defend itself the church was obliged either to support the Chamberlains or distance itself from them. To its credit the church has supported the Chamberlains through the whole ordeal. Without the church’s financial assistance the Chamberlains would have been hard-pressed to clear their names. It was in the Chamberlains’ best interests that the public agitation not be a church-orchestrated lobby, thus the general approach of the leadership was wise. However, there were occasions when a less hesitant public assertion of the church’s belief in the Chamberlains’ innocence was warranted.

The church’s anxiety to be seen as loyal to the state and its desire to support a wrongly convicted pastor and his wife posed a dilemma. It tried to do both, but concern for its law-abiding image took preeminence. After the Chamberlains lost their appeal to the High Court, readers of the *Australian Record* were informed that “the church does not support such actions” as “confronting government authorities in order to help the Chamberlains” (March 31, 1984). The editor wrote on 14 April 1984:

Now that the decision of that court [High Court] has been handed down... it would be improper for the church as a body to engage in any activity that could involve confrontation with the authorities appointed to preserve law and order. ... the church cannot, must not, dare not be seen as a body that challenges or defies judicial procedures or civil authority, or engages in any activity that appears to discredit that authority.

The editor went on to say that if Adventists acted as individuals, they must dissociate themselves from the church and be very careful what they say lest it “in any way bring injury to the church or tarnish its name.”

Fortunately for the Chamberlains there were individual Adventists and private citizens who

did confront the authorities. There is no doubt that without the public agitation no amount of money or legal submissions would have forced the Northern Territory to hold an inquiry. This is widely recognized. Following the completion of Justice Morling’s report of the inquiry, Senator Christopher Puplick stated in the Australian Senate that:

at the end of the day, it was necessary to take political action to secure the protection of the rights of an Australian citizen. I was in the process of paying tribute to those—I include Senator Mason, my very old and dear friend William Charles Wentworth [a former parliamentarian] and members of the Seventh-day Adventist community in New South Wales and throughout Australia—who worked throughout the processes available in a free and open democratic society to expose the defects which exist in the Australian legal system and to have those eventually to secure some justice in this matter (April 6, 1987).⁵

Despite Adventists being present in Australia for more than a century, the Chamberlain case revealed how little-known Adventists were in Australia. For example, the Anti-Discrimination Board of New South Wales referred to a journalist who enquired of a university professor of religion concerning Adventist books on child sacrifice. Adventists are still commonly thought to be opposed to blood-transfusions. The Chamberlain case has made Adventism more widely known in Australia, but less understood by the public.⁶

As part of a campaign to improve the identity of the church, the communications department has produced a pleasing logo to be used on all visual displays that incorporates a cross within its symbolic design. That has stimulated more letters of protest to the division paper, the *Record*, than has any other topic. The real issue is whether the small Adventist community is ready to incarnate the cross and permeate society with its effects.

Australia’s bicentennial has caused as much national reflection as it has celebration. The 200th birthday has been the occasion for some serious heart searching in society concerning the aborigines, migrant groups, women’s roles, the environment, poverty, and the family. The Adventist Church has accompanied Australia for much of its 200 year history. If it wishes to be true to its own heritage and to influence the nation into the next

century, the church must manifest great creativity and boldness in addressing those issues that dis-

turb many of the other 99.7 percent who live on the Australian continent.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. The figures were kindly supplied me by Dr. Alwyn Salom, Director of the Institute of church Ministry and Evangelism on the Avondale campus. Pastor Roy Clifford, the division statistician, was also most obliging with data. Some items were not freely available as policy puts certain aspects of the division's finances and statistics on the list. I am indebted to several of my colleagues and friends for helpful corrections and criticisms of this essay, though I alone am responsible for its remaining faults.

2. If non-graduates and those who graduated prior to 1972 are included, then the total number of ministerial workers who resigned for various reasons is much larger than this figure. Mr. Peter Ballis, a doctoral candidate at Latrobe University, is researching the sociological causes and implications of this enormous loss of workers. Ballis estimates that 135 ministerial personnel left the field in the post-1980 period. A large number of teachers also pulled out for various reasons of which doctrinal conflict was only one.

Elder Alan Sonter, the Academic Dean at Pacific Adventist College, is also engaged in a doctoral study in sociology with the University of New England. Drawing on three Australian conferences, Sonter has analysed a stratified, randomly selected group of 25-30 year-olds who were brought up in Adventist homes. His tentative results have identified four distinct clusters.

First, a group of 72 who have zero involvement in the church, of whom six percent consider themselves to be Adventists. Second, a cluster of 42 who occasionally attend church and have a strong Christian commitment and devotional life, but who repudiate the Adventist distinctives and authoritarianism. Of this group, 36 percent consider themselves to be Adventists. Third, a group of 122 who are lukewarm, attending church an average of 50 percent of the time, 61 percent of whom affirm that they are Adventists. Fourth, a group of 177 who accept most things and regularly attend church, 97 percent of whom state that they are Adventists, but who have a low interest in witnessing and personal piety.

The second group appears to be the tragic product of the disturbances of the 1980s, and, judged by sociological crite-

ria, seems in many ways more Christian than group, the orthodox Adventists.

3. Senior accountants, for example, receive a full car and telephone allowance, lecturers and teachers do not. The travelling *per diem* is not awarded to teachers, pastors or college lecturers, only senior administrators qualify for this "need." Many local pastors can pay up to two-thirds of their visitation mileage out of their own pockets (the general allowance in North New South Wales Conference is 600 miles per month). Senior administrators receive numerous other exclusive benefits that follow them into retirement: the "needs" argument is usually abandoned at this point and "responsibility" becomes the rationale. Present discussion indicates that the superannuation scheme which is soon to replace the old sustentation system will favour retired senior administrators.

4. New South Wales Anti-Discrimination board, *Discrimination and Religious Conviction* (Sydney, 1984), p. 197.

5. The Chamberlain legal saga is continuing, having reached its seventh judicial hearing in as many years. The Northern Territory government amended its criminal code in September 1987 to allow the Chamberlains to apply to the Court of Criminal Appeals to have their convictions quashed. The Appeal Court held a two-and-a-half-hour hearing in March, 1988. Chief Justice Asche adjourned the case until September 12, 1988. Michael Adams, counsel appearing for the Northern Territory, was granted until June 16 to make a written submission "drawing attention to sections of the Commissioner's [Justice Trevor Morling] findings that should be queried, further examined or rejected." John Winneke, for the Chamberlains, would then have two months prior to the September sitting to frame a written reply. If, after receiving the written submissions, the Court decided that there was not a reasonable doubt about the Chamberlains' convictions, Winneke would be permitted to make further representations.

6. Scholarly appreciation of Adventism is an exception to this as is clear from the references in A. N. Patrick's "Seventh-day Adventists in the South Pacific: A Review of Sources," *Journal of Religious History* 14 (1987): 307-326.

The Making of a President: Ellen G. White and A. G. Daniells in Australia

by Milton R. Hook

During the 1890s colonial Australia was the arena in which Mrs. White and Pastor Daniells pioneered together. Mrs. White was already a recognized church leader in America prior to her work in Australia. Daniells, whose leadership qualities were forged in New Zealand and Australia, was, by comparison, relatively unknown until his return to America, when he was elected General Conference president in 1901. During their years in Australasia they corresponded frequently, counseled together, confided in one another, established church institutions, and preached at the same conventions. Daniells was in his mid-thirties. Mrs. White was in her mid-sixties. Did Daniells see in her a mother-image? Were their dealings with each other always cordial? To what extent did Mrs. White foster the growth of leadership qualities in Daniells? Did Daniells influence the attitudes of Mrs. White? What was the nature and extent of the relationship between these two people who remain household names in Seventh-day Adventism?

It would appear to be a fruitful exercise to read the exchange of letters as the primary source of

information, noting the significant events in the developing scenario and how the two personalities related to each other. As far as we know, between 1892 and 1900 Daniells wrote 48 letters to Mrs. White. She wrote him 33 letters.

Arthur White wrote the most definitive source on the term of service in Australia of his grandmother, Ellen White (*The Australian Years: 1891-1900* [Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1983]) but his general biography did not analyze in depth the specific interaction between persons he discussed. Similarly, John J. Robertson's book on A. G. Daniells, while making use of Daniells' extensive letter collection from the 1890s to the 1920s, only occasionally made reference to the Ellen G. White collection. He apparently did not intend to study in depth the relationship between Ellen G. White and A. G. Daniells.

The farmlands of northeast Iowa provided Arthur Grosvenor Daniells, Sr. his childhood memories. He was born at West Union, September 28, 1858. Two years later, twins Charles and Jessie were added to the little family. His father, Dr. Thomas Grosvenor Daniells, a graduate of the University of Vermont, died in the American Civil War. Throughout his life Arthur carried little more than a genetic legacy from his natural father.

Poverty forced his mother, Mary Jane (McQuillian) Daniells, then only 28 years of age, to place her three little ones in a nearby orphanage until, in 1865, she remarried and the children were united with her once again. For Arthur, the

Milton R. Hook, born in Western Australia, has been a teacher and minister in various states of Australia, New Zealand, New Guinea, and the United States. He holds an M.A. and Ed.D. from Andrews University, and is a prolific writer whose articles and books have been published both in Australia and overseas. This essay first appeared in *Adventist History in the South Pacific, 1885-1918*, edited by Arthur J. Ferch.

experience was undoubtedly not without its moments of trauma since he was such a tender age. The speech impediment of his prepreaching days may be attributed to adverse childhood circumstances.

Arthur's new home provided mixed happiness. In mid-life he reflected on those years saying, "My mother was a good woman but my stepfather was bad."¹ His stepfather was a local West Union farmer, a Mr. Lippincott. Arthur, Charles, and Jessie all retained the surname of Daniells.

Throughout his life Arthur held a deep respect for his mother. It was about the time of her remarriage that she became a Seventh-day Adventist. Not long after, Arthur, "at the tender age of ten. . . was converted to Christ." As a youth he did what he could to help his elderly and ailing stepfather work the farm, but he grew restless for some further education. At the age of 17 he left the farm home.

With the help of odd jobs and the little financing his mother could send, Arthur managed study for a spartan year or two, one being at Battle Creek College. At the age of 19 he married Mary Ellen Hoyt, whom he had known since childhood. They returned from Battle Creek College to teach public school for one year in hometown West Union.

At the end of his first year teaching public school, Daniells experienced the growing conviction he should enter denominational work. He applied to the Iowa Conference executive committee for ministerial work but was rejected, perhaps because of his speech impediment. Undeterred, he paid his fare to Texas in order to work as tentmaster for Elder R. M. Kilgore, who was preaching at Rockwall, just northeast of Dallas. His wife joined him a little later.

While engaged in the tent-mission work a significant experience, albeit brief, occurred in Daniells' life. In December 1878, James and Ellen White, with their helpers, joined the preaching team in Texas. Arthur and Mary lived in the White's home for six months, assisting where needed. It was the beginning of a close association between the two families. Fourteen years later Daniells recalled affectionately:

The fact is I would like to be back in that pleasant

time. I shall remember my pleasant stay with you always. I have not had a mother since I was a lad, and it seemed the most like having a mother and sisters of any experience since I was small. But there was a hallowed sacred influence that did not pervade my home when a child.²

Daniells' two-year stint in Texas was followed by a return to Iowa, where, this time, he was accepted as preacher and was ordained in 1882. Four years later, he and Mary sailed for New Zealand as pioneering evangelist-missionaries. Pastor Daniells' ill health prompted a transfer to Australia in 1891. He was at the Sydney dockside among the welcoming party when Mrs. White, her son W. C. White, and their assistants, arrived to supplement the missionary work force. The Whites stayed briefly in Daniells' Darlinghurst home before traveling on to Melbourne.

Throughout the following nine years their paths would cross many times in the Australian colonies, and they would frequently be brought together at church camp meetings and worship services. More often than not, however, they were living, working, and traveling in different localities. Letter communication bridged this gap. From the extant letters something of the relationship between the two personalities can be deduced.³

Scenarios: 1892-1900

When Daniells was elected president of the Australian Conference in 1892 he began to communicate regularly with Ellen G. White. Initially, this was not for the purpose of soliciting advice. It was simply to keep her informed of committee decisions and sundry news reports. After he returned home from his first council meeting he wrote, "As you are deeply interested in all the plans. . . I will tell you of our decision. . . ." There follows a detailed report of plans for the forthcoming week of prayer and conference sessions, together with the decision not to hold a camp meeting in the near future.⁴

In the plans for the week of prayer Daniells was appointed to go to Adelaide to lead in special

meetings. He first journeyed to Adelaide to organize the forthcoming program. On his return he wrote to Mrs. White, reporting snippets such as school principal L. J. Rousseau's eye malady caused by studying at night by lamplight, and the crowds on the Adelaide to Melbourne train who stood in the pouring rain the following day to watch the Melbourne Cup. More importantly, the letter contains a touch of diplomacy. Apparently it was Mrs. White's desire to have Pastor G. B. Starr transfer from his Bible teaching at the Melbourne School to pastor the Adelaide Church. Daniells reported he had shared these thoughts with W. C. White and Starr, but these two men thought Rousseau could not do without such help at the school. Instead, Starr remained at the school. Daniells felt he had discharged his obligations in the matter and the responsibility for the decision rested with the other two men themselves. Daniells concluded the letter with the affectionate words, "I hope and pray that you will be kept from harm and pain and that your heart will be full of the good Spirit of God. I would like to be with you."⁵

At the conclusion of the week of prayer meetings Daniells wrote from Adelaide to report they were well attended. Among other readings, he had read to them an article written by Mrs. White entitled, "The Source of the Church's Power." He lauded the merits of the article but then deplored the condition of the church members in relation to the standards established in it. "They don't truly repent of sin," he wrote.

They do not die to self. They cherish their darling idols and they are trying to exercise faith to have the righteousness of Christ imputed to them while self lives and the heart is full of sin. But I do not believe God will cover anyone with his robe of righteousness while their hearts are corrupt. . . . I know for a fact that the masses of our people are strangers of real Bible study and communion with God. Like most European Christians they depend on Sabbath sermons.⁶

In her reply Mrs. White chided him for striking such a gloomy note.

You are in danger of judging persons and things too strongly. . . . Never carry the whip. Never try to drive. . . . Never leave in spirit, in word, in testimony, the impression that the Lord is not full of goodness, compassion, tenderness and love.⁷

A. G. Daniells—Adventism's Most Enduring and Influential President

by Gary Land

Arthur Grosvenor Daniells was, according to the *SDA Encyclopedia*, the son of a Union Army physician and surgeon who died in the Civil War. Arthur converted to Adventism at the age of 10 and entered Battle Creek College when he was 17. He left after one year, got married, and taught in public schools for a year. At the age of 20 he started his ministry in Texas, where James and Ellen White met him and for one year employed him as their secretary. Daniells then worked as an evangelist in Iowa, until going to New Zealand.

The following excerpt, explaining Daniells' enduring importance for the Adventist church, is taken from "Shaping the Modern Church 1906-1930," a chapter in *Adventism in America*, Gary Land, ed. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1986). Gary Land is professor of history at Andrews University and has

also edited *The World of Ellen G. White* (Hagerstown, Maryland: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1987.).

—The Editors

One man dominated the church from 1901 to 1922. Arthur G. Daniells, the General Conference president who led the church through the organizational and theological changes of that period, had greater influence on the Seventh-day Adventist church than had any other president, according to one student.¹ An Iowan born in 1858, Daniells had left the United States for New Zealand in 1886 as the first Adventist missionary to that country; he served in the New Zealand and Australian area for 14 years, 10 of them in administrative positions. This experience had considerable effect on Daniells and,

She suggested he speak kindly and lift up Jesus Christ.

On receipt of this letter Daniells was contrite. He immediately dashed off a page saying,

I am glad to receive any words of warning you may have for me. I know very well that my labours are defective and many times I fear that they are well nigh useless, but I desire to know where the fault is and correct it as far as it is possible.

He concluded by wishing her bon voyage for her journey to New Zealand.⁸

While Ellen G. White was in New Zealand throughout much of 1893, Daniells continued to communicate news items to her in his letters. He speaks of improving the spiritual tone among workers at the Echo Publishing Company by conducting midday prayer meetings in the print shop.⁹ He reports on church happenings in South Australia and Tasmania, and especially his own public meetings in Sydney, particularly those at Parramatta. He said he was holding Bible studies with new interests in the Newtown area, and kept busy assisting with Tract Society business and the ship mission work in Sydney harbor.¹⁰

In May 1893 he received a letter from Mrs. White that activated his self-defense. His assessment of his earlier work in New Zealand was that he ought to preach less and personally visit the people in their homes more frequently, rather than sending his wife or others adept at giving Bible studies. She wrote,

Here in New Zealand you, my brother, and others who have laboured here, have failed. We must get acquainted with the people in their homes. You can never supply this by proxy.¹¹

Daniells waited some weeks before he replied. "At first I hardly knew what to say," he began. He had read counsels of this nature in the *Testimonies*, but confessed "I have not carried this knowledge out as I should. . . . I have at times failed to do the visiting that I should have done and that I had a desire to do." He claimed he had made a self-examination of his work in New Zealand, saw his failures, and had already rectified the problem since transferring to Australia. Also, he felt the new light that had since come to him about the righteousness of Christ had given him fresh hope. He concluded the matter courteously by saying,

through him, on the development of the church. The administrative experience he gained in Australia included the presidency of the Australian Union Conference (later called the Australasian Division), the first union conference to be established by Seventh-day Adventists.²

It was also in Australia that Daniells was closely associated with Ellen White, whom he had previously served as a secretary, and with her son, William C. White.³ This relationship contributed to his emergence as a General Conference leader in 1901 and affected his position in the later dispute over the inspiration and authority of Ellen White's writings. Daniells and his associates—particularly William White and William A. Spicer—differed from most previous leaders of the General Conference primarily in that they had had significant foreign-mission experience. Daniells took the position of General Conference executive committee chairman, he said, "to get things in order here so as to benefit the weak fields. That is my hope. I can do more for Australia from here than from there."⁴ This interest in foreign missions was one of crucial importance to the Adventist church in the 20th century, for under Daniells the church shifted from its 19th-century emphasis on North America to its 20th-century worldwide emphasis on the

basis of Christ's gospel commission to go into all the world.

The worldwide mission idea and Daniells' organizational ideas were separate yet connected influences, and together they shaped the church during the first third of the 20th century. The reorganization inaugurated in 1901 and carried out under Daniells' leadership provide the vehicle that made the missionary vision effective and permanent.

Notes

1. John J. Robertson, "Arthur Grosvenor Daniells: The Effect of Australasia Upon the Man and His Work as Revealed Through Correspondence With W. C. White and Ellen G. White" (M. A. thesis, Andrews University), 1966, p. 3.

2. For a brief biographical sketch on Daniells, see Don F. Neufeld, ed., *Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia* (Washington, D. C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1966), s. v. "Daniells."

3. Robertson, *Daniells*, pp. 111-130.

4. Daniells to E. W. Farnsworth, April 3, 1901 (General Conference Publishing Department Historical Files, Daniells folder).

I am thankful for your interest in me and shall try to take kindly any reproofs the Lord may send me. While I cannot undo the past, I know that I can by God's help do a better work in the future.¹²

Mary Daniells, in her customary postscript, offered a further explanation of Daniells' poor work record. The illness that Daniells suffered in New Zealand was basically a dental problem. "I am glad to tell you that Arthur has not been so well in years as he is now," she wrote.

He found out it was his teeth that made his face ache and he had one filled and another pulled and now his face ache has all disappeared, and this climate up here [in Sydney] is building him up. He is of good courage all round, and so am I.¹³

For the following 12-month period, that is, from June 1893 to June 1894, there is only one

Mrs. White did not spare her words in denouncing the conduct of these two women. She called on them to stop their criticisms of Mrs. Starr. She spoke against the "idolatrous love" and "sickly sentimentalism" that Mary had toward her husband Arthur.

extant letter from Daniells to Mrs. White. In it he shares news items, wishes he had some good advice about purchasing a suitable tract of land to establish a school (they were in the throes of a vast search for such), and mentions the upcoming camp meeting, the first held in Australia, which took place December 30, 1893 to January 15, 1894, at Brighton, Victoria. "If you have any light for us on this matter I shall be so glad to get it," he wrote.¹⁴ This is the first occasion he departs from his news writing to call for her advice on a specific problem. No advice was forthcoming because apparently there was no reply from Mrs. White prior to the camp meeting. Later, occasional advice did come for the 1897 camp meetings.

Mrs. White arrived back in Melbourne from New Zealand in time to attend the Brighton camp meeting and remained there until her transfer to Sydney, March 26, 1894. Just before leaving

Melbourne, while staying in the Bible School premises, she wrote three letters of criticism to Daniells and his wife, and Mrs. Emma Rousseau. Another in a similar vein was addressed to Daniells shortly after her arrival in Sydney. A total of 38 pages were dispatched on the subject in the space of a month.

The letters were prompted by the fact that during the Brighton camp meeting Mrs. White had apparently spotted some Adventist ladies inside and outside the main tent doing "common work" while the meetings were in progress. While staying at the school she had also become aware of friction between Mrs. Starr and her two contemporaries, Mrs. Daniells and Mrs. Rousseau. (Mrs. Starr, Pastor G. B. Starr's wife and formerly Nellie Sisley, had grown up in Battle Creek with Mrs. White's own children and was then acting as matron at the Melbourne Bible School.)

This group of letters was aimed especially at Mrs. Daniells and Mrs. Rousseau. Mrs. White did not spare her words in denouncing the conduct of these two women. She called on them to stop their criticisms of Mrs. Starr. She deplored the influence Mary had on Arthur's judgment and warned him of this. She spoke against the "idolatrous love" and "sickly sentimentalism" that Mary had toward her husband, Arthur. Once again, Mrs. White told Daniells himself not to be too critical of his fellow-workers, especially Joseph Rousseau, who was overburdened with work. She also lamented the fact that Mrs. Rousseau had, at times, not supported school discipline standards by advocating leniency in social relationships between the school youth.¹⁵

There is no known written response to this group of letters. The fact that Mary thereafter wrote no more postscripts on Arthur's letters to Mrs. White may be explained by the fact that Anna Ingels had by that stage largely taken over the secretarial work for Daniells. Daniells' June and July letters, immediately after these reproofs, carry merely news items from Melbourne and Adelaide churches and make no references to the reprimands. However, the reprimands may partly explain the negative attitudes Daniells and Rousseau adopted throughout the remainder of 1894.

Prior to Daniells' September 19, 1894, letter, Mrs. White had written another (not extant) to Arthur Daniells and Joseph Rousseau, but it was no doubt about a new issue—the choice of the Brettville (or Avondale) Estate for the permanent training school for church workers. Much of significance had occurred in the interim. Both Mrs. White and Daniells had visited the estate in May 1894. With some misgivings, aroused in part by a government agriculturalist's unfavorable soil report, the decision was nevertheless made to buy it.¹⁶ In a June 10, 1894, letter to the Foreign Mission Board in America, W. C. White shared his misgivings and triggered a negative response from the mission board. The response reached Australia in August and served to heighten the misgivings, especially those of Daniells and Rousseau.¹⁷ Plans were virtually thrown into neutral until the matter could be fully discussed at the Ashfield camp meeting in October/November 1894.¹⁸ Just before leaving for that meeting Daniells wrote to Mrs. White, "We are expecting to leave for Sydney early next week and we trust by that time we shall know better what to say with reference to the school question."¹⁹ The matter did receive extensive discussion at the camp meeting, resulting in a vote to go ahead and purchase the estate.²⁰ However, lingering doubts persisted as evidenced by the fact that in December 1894, Mrs. White herself, son W. C. White, Rousseau, and others were still searching for better land near Penrith.²¹ Three months later Daniells wrote:

Since the Ashfield campmeeting my mind has been exercised almost daily with reference to the matter you read to me on the camp ground, and which was forwarded to me by post a few weeks later. I have desired to write to you, but my reason for not doing so is that I have not known what to write. I have been tempted to feel that you have little confidence in me, and that anything I might say would lead to more severe criticism. But I believe that all this is from Satan, and I had desired to say nothing until the Lord had delivered me from wrong thoughts and put into my mind right views of this matter. . . .

I have read the testimony which you send me many times, and have endeavoured to do so with a prayerful heart. Some portions I do not as yet understand. Other parts are plain. I do not cast any of it aside, but pray the

Lord to help me to be admonished by it all. Some of the points I would like to write about, but I do not know as it would be right to do so. I am sorry that I have not counselled with you more about the perplexities of my

These are the words of a man groping his way back from a fractured relationship. Previous reprimands had shaken him. He admits his uncertainty, his despondency, his struggling within his own soul.

work, but at first I thought you would not care to be troubled with me. But I feel that my course had increased your burdens, and now if you are willing I feel that I should like to write you freely with reference to the plans we are trying to carry.²²

These are the words of a man groping his way back from a fractured relationship. Previous reprimands had shaken him. He admits his uncertainty, his despondency, his struggling within his own soul. And the words, "Some portions I do not as yet understand," could even be a euphemism for his feelings that some of the criticisms were unjustified. We can only guess the exact nature of these criticisms. The immediate contention, of course, concerned the choice for school land, but that may only have been the capstone in a build-up of previous issues. Not for another two years did Daniells seek reconciliation on the school land issue, and in the interim there was another period of almost 12 months (April 1895 to March 1896) when apparently no communications were exchanged between them, Daniells preferring instead to write news reports to W. C. White and assuming these letters would be passed on to Mrs. White.²³

Finally, while Daniells and S. N. Haskell were in Adelaide in 1897, dealing with the defection of two ministers, Daniells wrote to Mrs. White:

I have felt for a long time that I would like to tell you of the change in my feelings with reference to some features of the school. At the Adelaide camp meeting [October 1896] I was led to see that my attitude on this question had not been right in all respects. I have reviewed the matter from time to time. I have seen more

and more that I have not viewed things in their true light. This had opened my mind to doubts and fears about the outcome, and this had weakened my hands, and this again has prevented me from being the help to you and Brother White that I should have been in the past trying times. It has thrown heavier burdens on each of you, and increased the perplexities. I feel very sorry about this,

Daniells' reply in the next mail was defensive, explaining the circumstances and justifying his conduct of the matter. "I sincerely wish we had heard from you earlier," he lamented.

and have asked to be forgiven. But as I feel that I have injured you, the Lord's servant, I ask your forgiveness.²⁴

The June 1, 1896, letter of Mrs. White broke a 15-month silence in her letters to Daniells. A crisis at the Echo Publishing Company in Melbourne prompted her to write to Daniells and two other members of the company's board condemning them for their treatment of W. H. B. Miller and J. H. Woods, leading printers in the establishment.

Apparently the previous eight months of business showed a loss. The manager, W. D. Salisbury, had called everyone together to explain the financial difficulties. Miller and Woods were led to believe it was largely their poor handling of things and so they offered to leave. They, together with two other workers, did leave and began to set up their own printing business.²⁵

Mrs. White, who had donated £50 toward Miller's fare to America in order for him to learn more of the church's printing operations, felt keenly about the loss. To Daniells and W. A. Colcord she wrote, "If, when cramped for means, you let your competent workers go, to set up business for themselves, you will in a short time wish you had them back." It would be better, she advised, to persuade all the workers to accept less wages rather than let key workers go.²⁶

Daniells' reply in the next mail was defensive, explaining the circumstances and justifying his conduct of the matter. "I sincerely wish we had heard from you earlier," he lamented. It was his conviction that printing jobs accepted from out-

side the church were the nonprofitable ones, and they also crowded out the church work. He explained that Miller and Woods' suggestion to leave was really held in abeyance by the board until advice from Mrs. White and her son could be received. Then Daniells and Salisbury had dashed off to Adelaide and while there they both agreed to offer the two men other church work, but when they returned to Melbourne they found the men had already set up their own printing business. Daniells scrambled to repair the problem, but without success.²⁷

Later, Mrs. White wrote that all parties were at fault in the fiasco—Miller and Woods robbed God of their talents by leaving church employ, the company's manager was wrong for not suggesting lower wages all round, and executives such as Daniells were wrong for relinquishing the printers without offering some better alternatives.²⁸

Six months after it all began Mrs. White wrote again to Miller and Woods asking them to return, outlining steps and conditions for their reemployment. Daniells was skeptical about a favorable response²⁹ but was delighted when the two men wrote asking to come back.³⁰ They returned on February 8, 1897.³¹ Additional men had already been engaged to fill the gap left by Miller and Woods. To avoid discharging them, Daniells, who had previously highlighted the unprofitable nature of "outside" printing jobs, suggested to Mrs. White that a city branch office be opened to handle these kinds of jobs. She agreed to this suggestion. Daniells wrote of the whole ordeal:

I think it will teach me a lesson that I shall not soon forget. I thank you most heartily for the warning and admonition that you have sent to us, and to me especially.³²

Interwoven throughout this drama were other issues of perhaps less significance but all illustrative of Daniells' occasional requests of advice. He sought and received her counsel on the operation of camp meetings.³³ He grew anxious about the potential stir from other church groups in Victoria when a young Wesleyan minister, C. R. Hawkins, became a Seventh-day Adventist.³⁴

Mrs. White, preferring to leave probabilities alone, sought simply to rectify realities and sent word not to damn the Roman Catholics in the

Echo magazine because its pages were meant to soften Catholic prejudice.³⁵

Glancing at the list of correspondence between Mrs. White and Daniells during the 1890s one cannot help but notice the bulk occurs in 1897. No doubt the reason for this was the absence of W. C. White, who spent a large proportion of that year in America attending, among other work, the General Conference session. Daniells, therefore, is led to consult directly with Mrs. White rather than via her son. And Mrs. White's directions regarding church matters in Australia are channeled through Daniells.

Over the Christmas/New Year period of 1896-1897 there was a crisis on the Avondale Estate. An employee, L. N. Lawrence, was suggested as a candidate for local church elder. Mrs. White regarded him as disloyal and dishonest.³⁶ Matters were brought to a head when she called a special meeting on the banks of Dora Creek to air the problem. Lawrence was not elected and soon after left the estate. Arising out of this trauma was Mrs. White's request to Daniells for Pastor S. N. Haskell to transfer to Avondale and take a supporting role with her in the establishment of the new school.³⁷ Daniells acted on the request immediately, calling for Haskell to come from New Zealand.³⁸ What Mrs. White had not told Daniells was that she had earlier written to the South African mission field requesting that Hetty Hurd transfer to Australia. (Haskell had confided in Mrs. White that he and Miss Hurd wished to marry.) Daniells was taken by surprise when, immediately after Miss Hurd's arrival in Australia, the marriage took place in Sydney. He had plans for Miss Hurd to go as a Bible worker to Adelaide, but, on learning of her marriage, was quite happy for the couple to work at Avondale as Mrs. White had requested.³⁹

Just as the Miller and Woods crisis was being resolved and frantic efforts were being made to have Avondale College open on schedule, Pastor A. S. Hickox, who was canvassing in the Riverina, left with his wife (formerly Carrie Gribble) and child for New Zealand without consulting with Daniells or anyone else. Hickox owed

Daniells £20, the tract society £75, and members in Adelaide various amounts. While canvassing he hoped to pay these off. His sales were good but then suddenly he decided to use much of his earnings to pay passage to New Zealand. Daniells wrote him a forthright five-page letter expressing dismay and calling for him to retrace his steps and meet his obligations.⁴⁰

When Mrs. White heard about these facts two months later she defended Hickox by writing to Daniells, again instructing him to treat kindly those who had made mistakes in church work. "You have managed this case, from first to last, in an evidently faithless manner. Take your hands off your brother. He is God's property. He is in God's service," she said. "No man whom God has chosen to do His work is to be under the control of any other man's mind. . . . When a man is educated and trained to do as another man tells him to do, he ceases to rely on Christ." She also accused Daniells of persuading other workers in New Zealand to ignore Hickox. In her spirited protest against

Daniells explored ways of financially assisting Avondale students. One proposal was to use the tithe from the student-aid fund.

what she called "Pharisaism" she asked, "How do you know if it was not God's Spirit which prompted Hickox to think he could serve in New Zealand?"⁴¹

A month later Daniells replied with a masterly defense of his case, including with his letter a copy of the one he had originally written to Hickox. Referring to a testimony Mrs. White herself had written about the responsibilities of canvassers he said, "I did not dare to speak anything like as pointedly as you had written." He admitted sending to the man in charge in New Zealand a copy of his letter to Hickox, adding, "I thought it proper to let him know how he stood with us. I did not ask them to prohibit him from working in that field."⁴² Daniells' defense was apparently acceptable because the whole matter was immediately dropped.

One other matter on which Daniells received a

reprimand, and justifiably so, was arranging for teacher Herbert Lacey to travel by train from Melbourne to Sydney while ill with typhoid fever. Worse still, as a penny-pinching measure, Lacey was placed in a second-class compartment with smokers and drinkers. He was near death on arrival. A. W. Semmens desperately nursed him back to health with hydrotherapy in Sydney.⁴³

At the same time Daniells was exploring ways for financially assisting students to attend Avondale. One proposal was to use some of the tithe

from the student-aid fund, but before making a final decision Daniells sought Mrs. White's counsel on the issue. She replied in the negative, suggesting instead that the conference loan students their fees, which could then be repaid after their graduation and during their employment by the church. However, the suggestion of the tract society treasurer, E. M. Graham, was followed instead—for local churches to sponsor their own young people with systematic offerings.⁴⁴

Daniells was busy. Another problem had

Willie White and A. G. Daniells Start Union Conferences

This excerpt is taken from "A. G. Daniells, Administrator, and the Development of Conference Organization in Australia," a chapter in *Adventist History in the South Pacific, 1885-1918*, edited by Arthur J. Ferch.

by Gilbert Valentine

It is a commonly held misunderstanding that A. G. Daniells was the architect of the Union Conference organization in the Adventist Church. It is often assumed that he introduced it in Australia, and then in 1901 implemented the concept throughout the church. The basis for this misunderstanding probably lies in the leading role that Daniells played in the 1901 reorganization. His frequent use of the collective "we" and "our" in his explanation to the 1901 session of how the system worked in Australia could leave one with the impression that he was largely responsible for the idea.¹ In fact, the originator of the idea was W. C. White. Daniells acknowledged him as the "father of that new departure."² The story of how this new development came about is worth noting.

Up until 1893 Australia and New Zealand functioned as two separate conferences directly responsible to the General Conference. The only move to coordinate the activities of the two fields was by the creation of an advisory committee to the Foreign Mission Board in July 1892. The multiplicity of church organizations which included the General Conference, the local conferences, the Tract Society, the Sabbath School, the Medical Association, and the Foreign Mission Board (each with their own constitutions,

annual meetings, appointed officers, and committees), made coordinating the work of the church quite complicated. Given the slowness of mails and the fact that the executive bodies of the major employing organizations were in America the local planning and administration of the work of the two conferences in Australasia was made even more complex.

When White arrived in Australia he quickly saw the need for some intermediate constitutional body in the Australasian area that could officially coordinate the work of the separate conferences. As early as December 1892, just one year after his arrival, he suggested the idea to O. A. Olsen, president of the General Conference.³

I would like to propose . . . the organization of some ecclesiastical body to stand half-way between state and colonial conferences, and the General Conference. . . . Would it not be well for the General Conference to take this matter into consideration now, and see if some plans cannot be devised for Europe which could afterwards be adopted by us here? If some day we should have five conferences each meeting annually, it would be desirable for us to have an Australian General Conference once in two years. . . . The same Australian council could appoint the trustees of our various institutions and take general control of the work here.

Although the General Conference met in session two months later White was "disappointed." The session failed to act on his suggestion.⁴

What W. C. White did learn from the 1893 bulletin was that the Australasian area had been designated as a separate General Conference district (No. 7) and that he had been formally appointed by the executive committee as district superintendent.

The formalizing of the district superintendency in Aus-

Gilbert Valentine, president of Pakistan Adventist Seminary and College, received his M.A. and Ph.D from Andrews University. He was working in his native Australia when he wrote on Daniells' experience there.

arisen in Western Australia. A ministerial worker, J. E. Collins, had apostatized and been disfellowshipped by the members. Pastor Robert Hare, in Perth, requested that Daniells visit the West to stabilize the church. Mrs. White advised Daniells to stay, believing Hare was capable of handling the situation by himself.⁴⁵ Further, Mrs. White asked why she was not consulted before Daniells organized a petition regarding the Australian constitution then in process of formation. Daniells pleaded urgency. "It was sprung upon us in a moment," he replied. Daniells acquiesced on

the matter of his suggestion to delay the opening of the Avondale School one month, leaving the final decision to those in charge at Cooranbong.⁴⁶

In 1897 a further crisis arose in Adelaide. Two ministers, S. McCullagh and C. F. Hawkins, handed Daniells their resignations, denounced Adventism at the tent mission they were conducting, and began independent meetings against the church. "Their main trouble," Daniells wrote to Mrs. White, "is the Spirit of Prophecy. They utterly reject your claims to inspiration." Daniells and Colcord hurried to Adelaide from Melbourne.

tralia and the delegating of larger powers did not solve many problems. As 1893 wore on, an increasing number of conflicts began to develop between Daniells, then president of the local Australian Conference, and W. C. White, particularly over the calling of workers. With the stress mounting considerably, White wrote to the Foreign Mission Board in September of 1893 suggesting again the urgent need for an "Advisory Conference or Union Conference."⁵

Among other reasons, White argued that the international character of the Ship Mission work in Sydney meant that it should be handled by an intercolonial body or by the Foreign Mission Board itself, not just the Australian Conference.⁶

White's protestations to the Foreign Mission Board apparently bore fruit. Several months later, in January of 1894, White announced in a general report to the churches that an "intercolonial conference" would be formed at a meeting of the Australasian District Conference to be held later that month in Melbourne. O. A. Olsen, president of the General Conference, visited Australia to be present at the landmark meeting. Two hundred and fifty church members, of whom 40 were delegates, were in attendance. Olsen acted as chairman. Daniells was appointed to chair the committee assigned the task of drawing up the constitution. On January 19, 1895, Daniells' committee submitted its report. It was adopted by unanimous vote. The union conference was a reality.

President of the new conference was White. Daniells was vice-president and a committee of nine was chosen. Its role included coordinating calls and transfers from the General Conference and the Foreign Mission Board, taking responsibility for the publication and circulation of the *Bible Echo*, and managing the school.

Eighteen months' experience as president convinced White that his talents were not in administration. In June 1896 he wrote the Foreign Mission Board, "It seems to me that personally it would do me good to have a change of field and work. I think that I am much better fitted to work as

someone's assistant, than as Supt. The responsibility which leads some to do their best, confuses me, and I lose heart." He felt that he could hail with pleasure a proposal to go to some other field but thought it was more important for him to take up editorial work with his mother. "You are aware that I have some care in connection with mother's work. She wishes me to devote my whole time to it, if you will free me from the General work."⁷

W. C. White still represented Australasia at the 1897 Conference⁸ session held during February at Union College in Nebraska. Finally, in early March, White was able to write home to his new Australian wife, May, informing her that he had a new job, working for his mother. To A. G. Daniells, he wrote congratulating him on his election by the General Conference as president of the Australasian Union.⁹ The appointment was ratified in October by the Australasian Union Conference in session. For the next three years Daniells directed the work in Australia.¹⁰

Notes

1. Seventh-day Adventist Church, *General Conference Bulletin*, 1901, p. 89.
2. A. G. Daniells to W. C. White, 23 March 1905.
3. W. C. White to O. A. Olsen, 21 December 1892.
4. W. C. White to O. A. Olsen, 8 May 1893.
5. W. C. White to W. A. Spicer, 27 September, 1893.
6. Ibid.
7. W. C. White to O. A. Olsen, 3 June 1896; W. C. White to Foreign Mission Board, 10 June 1896.
8. W. C. White to W. W. Prescott, 25 October 1896; W. C. White to A. G. Daniells, 4 December 1896.
9. W. C. White to May White, 8 March 1897; W. C. White to A. G. Daniells, 8 March 1897.
10. Minutes, Australasian Union Conference, 26 October 1897.

Daniells expressed the wish that Haskell be dispatched from Cooranbong too, which he was. Daniells reported that the two men were preaching perfection, the corruptions among Adventists in Melbourne and Cooranbong, and inveighing against health and temperance, Mrs. White, and the Third Angel's Message. No doubt Daniells had in mind Mrs. White's criticisms of his handling of some previous cases because he wrote reassuringly, "I am fully resolved to manifest a tender Christian spirit." Mrs. White had little advice for Daniells in this case, apparently trust-

Davis confessed that for 10 years he had been under the control of a lying spirit who had a white beard, wore a turban, and claimed to be an Oriental from Tibet. That evening, after dinner, Daniells prayed earnestly with Davis and his wife and the spirit left Davis.

ing Haskell's wisdom and experience to steer a proper course.⁴⁷

In retrospect we are left to wonder whether the embarrassment caused by McCullagh's defection was one reason why the miraculous healing he received at Avondale in May 1894 did not feature in the reminiscing about the choice of the site for the Avondale School.

One intriguing sidelight that emerged from the crisis was the relationship between McCullagh and W. C. White. Daniells wrote, "I am not altogether surprised that Brother McCullagh has taken this turn. He has been at war with Brother W. C. White for a long time."⁴⁸ Mrs. White picked up this point. Lest this unresolved antagonism be blamed on W. C. White and he be thought to have hastened McCullagh's apostasy, she replied that, in reality, Daniells himself might be to blame. She said, when the purchasing of the Brettville Estate was discussed at the 1894 Ashfield camp meeting, Daniells showed partiality for Rousseau. McCullagh had complained about it to W. C. White, who, in turn, tried to pacify McCullagh. McCullagh had then turned his frustration and

anger on W. C. White. Mrs. White made the point that if Daniells and Rousseau had not been such buddies to the exclusion of McCullagh and others, then the antagonism would not have arisen in the first place.⁴⁹

Once the Avondale school started functioning in 1897 there arose some strained relationships between the Haskells and other members of the staff. The Haskells were not trained teachers, and this apparently led to an air of nonacceptance by other teachers. Haskell was, of course, really appointed principally on the recommendation of Mrs. White who envisaged him as the ideal spiritual leader for the enterprise. But the school board, while they waited for the Hughes to arrive from America to take the principalship, had appointed Lacey as the principal. Mrs. White increasingly despaired of the way Lacey handled matters. She complained of him rushing in without forethought and showing "a manifest lack of good judgment." He was far too "free and easy-going," "a boy among boys," and even proposed to live off campus. Haskell, too, apparently despaired at times and spoke of leaving. Mrs. White finally complained to Daniells and E. R. Palmer.

From the time Brother Lacey came the Board made their decision for him to be principal of the school. Not one of these Board thought to counsel with me. . . . Brother Haskell, with his grey hairs and his long connection with the work, was not once referred to. . . . No more attention or reference was made to Brother Haskell or Sister Haskell as matron than if they were blocks of wood; not one reference made to me or my judgment or my opinion. . . . I have not wanted you to know these things, but as sure as Elder Haskell leaves I shall leave also.⁵⁰

This matter was not resolved readily. Finally, in 1899, Daniells, and then Palmer, were asked to be principals at the school to smooth the situation.

Another matter arose in 1897 that occupied Daniells in an incident for which he relied heavily on Mrs. White's advice. She wrote to him about a canvasser, N. A. Davis (the letter is not extant), asking Daniells to deal kindly with him. Daniells promised to help him, knowing something of his activities since the 1894 Ashfield camp meeting. He explained to Mrs. White that recent reports about Davis borrowing money forced him to believe he was a swindler, but, wrote Daniells, "I

feel I must have more counsel from you before I can take another step in his case.”⁵¹ She wrote a letter to Davis, sent it to Daniells and asked him to read it to Davis. On his return from Adelaide Daniells broke his journey at Ballarat and read the letter to Davis while they took a walk together. Davis confessed that for 10 years he had been under the control of a lying spirit who had a white beard, wore a turban, and claimed to be an Oriental from Tibet. The spirit, he said, would often terrorize him at night and threaten to kill him. That evening, after dinner, Daniells prayed earnestly with Davis and his wife and the spirit left Davis. Later, in his letter of explanation and thanks to Mrs. White, Daniells said:

I am very glad for the instruction you gave me to deal very kindly and patiently with him. I am glad you referred me to the statements of Jude 21-25. . . . The experience was of great value to me. I have always shrunk from meeting the devil in that form, and have dreaded the idea of having to rebuke Satan. But when I saw how the mention of the name of Christ in living faith broke the power of the enemy. . . . I received new impressions in regard to meeting the power of the enemy. . . . How glad I am that we have a Saviour, who has met Satan and conquered him. In Christ we need not fear.⁵³

One more issue troubled Daniells in 1897. It concerned his public advertising for the Victorian camp meeting in Balaclava in November. Earlier he had received some advice regarding follow-up work at camp meetings, and he had read Mrs. White’s advice to those who were advertising the Stanmore camp meeting to be held a month previously. She had advised no advertising until the tents were erected and the meetings were virtually underway.⁵⁴ To Daniells this seemed a strange manner of operation. He explained at length how the Melbourne public were favorable to Adventists because of the positions they took concerning the Australian constitution and the teaching of religion in public schools. He thought it would be advantageous to advertise widely well before the meetings started. Three times he wrote asking whether her advice regarding Stanmore applied also to Balaclava,⁵⁵ but she did not clarify it for him in the two letters she sent in reply.⁵⁶ She tired at the Stanmore camp meetings, so, in her Novem-

ber letter she seemed depressed, writing at length of troubles at headquarters in Battle Creek and using Daniells as a sounding board for her distress of mind.⁵⁷

There are no 1898 letters of Daniells to White that are extant. However, he had asked her (whether by letter, face to face, or via W. C. White perhaps, it is not known) a question regarding a 100£ donation. “Should it be given to the school enterprise, health food business, or medical institutions?” he asked. She replied, “It should help to defray the school debt.” The health food and medical work were to be self-supporting.⁵⁸

With W. C. White back in Australia, direct interchange of letters became less frequent be-

He reported that the Ballarat mission was spoiled by rain but there was a good interest. “I urged the workers to hold fewer public meetings, and to do more house to house work,” he wrote, reminiscent of the same advice Mrs. White had earlier given him.

tween Daniells and Mrs. White. Those that were written were largely composed of news snippets about their mutual friends. Daniells reported Davis was working as the evangelist for their Helping Hand Mission in Melbourne, Mrs. Collins was in Adelaide with her three children while Mr. Collins was living with another woman in Broken Hill, and McCullagh was in Ballarat, repentant, and wishing to rejoin the church. McCullagh’s daughter, Crystobel, was attending Avondale. Daniells said the parents were anxious about their daughter and did not approve of her bad attitude toward Mrs. White. (Crystobel was dismissed from Avondale a week later.) He also reported that the Ballarat mission was spoiled by rain but there was a good interest. “I urged the workers to hold fewer public meetings, and to do more house to house work,” he wrote. This was similar to earlier advice from Mrs. White.⁵⁹

Mrs. White’s letters contained similar news snippets. She spoke of seeing the Hickox family

at church services in Parramatta, said that Elder Irwin was urging her to return to America, and she felt it was a pity Daniells had to leave for America just as the plans for the Wahroonga Sanitarium were coming to fruition.⁶⁰

Mrs. White returned to America in August 1900. Daniells had left earlier that same year. He traveled via South Africa with John Wessels who was in a quandary about whether he should enter into his own family's business enterprises or return to Australia and take a leading role in the Wahroonga Sanitarium as Mrs. White urged him to do. Daniells wrote to Mrs. White from South Africa saying:

I reviewed my experience in Australia during the last nine years. I told him [John Wessels] where I had promptly responded to the light and been blessed. I also told him when and where I had swerved, and how it had hurt me and the cause. I could honestly state that in all that time—nine years—the Spirit of Prophecy had never once led me into trouble, but that I had got myself in trouble by failing to obey promptly.⁶¹

Conclusions

When researching collections of personal letters one naturally tends to learn more about the writers—their interests, attitudes, opinions, tendencies, and manner of relating to problems and other people. The writers are often seen in times of frustration, jubilation, or despondency; unguarded moments; or when taking others into confidence. For this reason there exists a proportion of sensitive material—sensitive because it deals with the emotions and reputations of people with foibles as plentiful as our own. Nevertheless, in the interest of achieving some degree of objectivity a researcher is obliged to present an unvarnished account if the exercise is to be worthwhile. The letters of Ellen G. White and A. G. Daniells are no exception. They are a tableau of news interspersed with keyhole views into the emotions, attitudes, foibles, and strengths of themselves and others.

At times Daniells craved and pleaded for Mrs.

White's advice, for example, with reference to the Davis case and also the proper manner of conducting camp meetings. On other occasions Daniells apparently set aside her advice, for instance, her suggestion regarding financial assistance for Avondale students. There were times when their relationship was cordial and he thought of her as his adopted mother. But in the wake of reprimands to his wife and himself he seemed to reel, the relationship languished and became fragile. Time, however, strengthened what had been strained. In retrospect Daniells could only sing her praises.

Did Daniells influence Mrs. White in any way? There does not appear to be any significant influence. Nowhere in these letters does she ask for Daniells' advice. She does agree to a few suggestions that Daniells brings forward, such as the city branch office for the Echo Publishing Company, but she makes no requests of him for advice. Occasionally she uses him as a listening post for her concerns, but this simply suggests a confidence in him or an appreciation of his friendship. She always adopts the position of giving advice rather than seeking it. Daniells, for his part, provides information and appeals to her experience and spiritual gifts to give him direction.

Despite Mrs. White's frankness and her forthright rebukes, Daniells repeatedly expresses appreciation for her counsel. On occasion he is slow to accept it, but at other times he acts swiftly and dutifully. There is, however, no indication that he regarded her words as infallible. This is noticeable particularly in the Hickox affair. He did not cower and grovel as a lapdog, but came to his own defense on this and other occasions. It is also noticeable that Daniells' appreciation of her counsel developed with time. His early letters are newsy and friendly, but in time Daniells turns more and more to Mrs. White for counsel. Often, he is apologetic for seeking her out so much, taking her time and energies in communicating with him, and so he resorts to W. C. White as a conduit. But in the absence of W. C. White there is a heavy dependence on her counsel directly.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. A. G. Daniells to Ellen G. White, 1 November 1892.
2. Ibid.
3. The introduction is based on Percy T. Magan, "Life Sketch of Arthur Grosvenor Daniells," *AUCR*, 3 June 1935; and John J. Robertson, *A. G. Daniells: The Making of a General Conference President, 1901* (Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1977) pp. 13-23, 99.
4. A. G. Daniells to Ellen G. White, 7 November 1892.
5. A. G. Daniells to Ellen G. White, 22 November 1892.
6. A. G. Daniells to Ellen G. White, 30 December 1892.
7. Ellen G. White to A. G. Daniells, 30 January 1893.
8. A. G. Daniells to Ellen G. White, 2 February 1893.
9. A. G. Daniells to Ellen G. White, 4 March 1893.
10. A. G. Daniells to Ellen G. White, 26 April 1893.
11. Ellen G. White to A. G. Daniells, 11 May 1893.
12. A. G. Daniells to Ellen G. White, 26 June 1893.
13. Ibid.
14. A. G. Daniells to Ellen G. White, 10 October 1893.
15. Ellen G. White to A. G. Daniells and Mary Daniells, 6 March 1894; Ellen G. White to Mary Daniells and Emma Rousseau, 7 March 1894; Ellen G. White to A. G. Daniells, 11 March 1894; Ellen G. White to A. G. Daniells, 4 April 1894.
16. Ellen G. White to C. H. Jones, 9 May 1894.
17. Ellen G. White Diary, Manuscript 77, 1894.
18. W. C. White to E. H. Gates, 2 September 1894.
19. A. G. Daniells to Ellen G. White, 19 September 1894.
20. "Report of the Thirty-third Meeting of the Australasian Union Conference," 20 November 1894; Ellen G. White to S. N. Haskell, 21 November 1894.
21. Ellen G. White, Manuscript 69, 1894; Ellen G. White to J. E. and E. L. White, 13 December 1894; W. C. White to A. G. Daniells, 9 December 1894; W. C. White to A. G. Daniells, 14 December 1894.
22. A. G. Daniells to Ellen G. White, 3 March 1895.
23. A. G. Daniells to Ellen G. White, 8 March 1896.
24. A. G. Daniells to Ellen G. White, 15 April 1897.
25. A. G. Daniells to Ellen G. White, 2 June 1896.
26. Ellen G. White to A. G. Daniells and W. A. Colcord, 1 June 1896.
27. A. G. Daniells to Ellen G. White, 2 June 1896.
28. Ellen G. White to A. G. Daniells, W. A. Colcord, N. D. Faulkhead, and W. D. Salisbury, 20 September 1896. Note: This letter was not sent until 13 January 1897.
29. A. G. Daniells to Ellen G. White, 5 January 1897.
30. A. G. Daniells to Ellen G. White, 11 January 1897.
31. A. G. Daniells to Ellen G. White, 8 February 1897.
32. A. G. Daniells to Ellen G. White, 19 January 1897; Ellen G. White to A. G. Daniells and W. D. Salisbury, 21 January 1897.
33. A. G. Daniells to Ellen G. White, 8 March 1896; A. G. Daniells to Ellen G. White, 15 July 1896; A. G. Daniells to Ellen G. White, 13 November 1896.
34. A. G. Daniells to Ellen G. White, 15 July 1896.
35. Ellen G. White to A. G. Daniells, 25 August 1896.
36. Ellen G. White to W. C. White, 14 January 1897; Ellen G. White, Manuscripts 2, 3, and 12, 1897.
37. Ellen G. White to A. G. Daniells, 1 January 1897.
38. A. G. Daniells to Ellen G. White, 5 January 1897.
39. S. N. Haskell to Ellen G. White, 18 December 1897; A. G. Daniells to S. N. Haskell and Ellen G. White, 24 February 1897.
40. A. G. Daniells to A. S. Hickox, 15 January 1897; A. G. Daniells to Ellen G. White, 18 April 1897.
41. Ellen G. White to A. G. Daniells, E. R. Palmer and W. A. Colcord, 12 March 1897.
42. A. G. Daniells to Ellen G. White, 18 April 1897.
43. Ellen G. White to A. G. Daniells, 16 March 1897.
44. A. G. Daniells to Ellen G. White, 12 March 1897; Ellen G. White to A. G. Daniells, 16 March 1897; A. G. Daniells to W. C. White, 6 May 1897.
45. A. G. Daniells to Ellen G. White, 12 March 1897; Ellen G. White to A. G. Daniells, 28 June 1897.
46. A. G. Daniells to Ellen G. White, 24 March 1897.
47. A. G. Daniells to Ellen G. White, 25 March 1897; A. G. Daniells to Ellen G. White, 29 March 1897; A. G. Daniells to Ellen G. White, 15 April 1897.
48. A. G. Daniells to Ellen G. White, 24 March 1897.
49. Ellen G. White to A. G. Daniells, 30 June 1897.
50. Ellen G. White to A. G. Daniells and E. R. Palmer, 27 June 1897.
51. A. G. Daniells to Ellen G. White, 30 August 1897.
52. Ellen G. White to A. G. Daniells, 31 August 1897.
53. A. G. Daniells to Ellen G. White, 12 September 1897.
54. Ellen G. White to A. G. Daniells, 31 August 1897.
55. A. G. Daniells to Ellen G. White, 14 September 1897; A. G. Daniells to Ellen G. White, 25 September 1897; A. G. Daniells to Ellen G. White, 30 September 1897.
56. Ellen G. White to A. G. Daniells, 24 September 1897; Ellen G. White to A. G. Daniells, 28 September 1897.
57. Ellen G. White to A. G. Daniells, 3 June 1898; Ellen G. White to A. G. Daniells, 13 June 1898.
58. Ibid.
59. A. G. Daniells to Ellen G. White, 23 April 1899.
60. Ellen G. White to A. G. Daniells, 17 May 1900.
61. A. G. Daniells to Ellen G. White, 17 May 1900.

Early Adventists Plunged Into New Zealand Politics

by Peter H. Ballis

Adventists were drawn to the forefront of New Zealand's political arena during the first 30 years of Seventh-day Adventist presence in the country. Between 1886 and 1918 Adventists found themselves taking definite political stances and lobbying for community support.

Seventh-day Adventism's radical social reformism during its first 30 years in New Zealand illustrates the dynamic interplay of social forces and religious ideology. This movement's campaign for temperance reform and enthusiastic defence of New Zealand's secular education demonstrates how this minority was stirred into effective action. As Seventh-day Adventists attempted to influence society they were at the same time influenced by it.¹

During those first three decades of Seventh-day Adventist presence, New Zealand was experiencing a major social, political, and economic transformation—stepping out of colonial adolescence into national adulthood. This period of rapid social change was characterized by industrialization and modernization.² During these years, New Zealand's politics were coming of age, polarizing the country into government and opposition, working class and property owners.³ This was also a period of economic prosperity. New

Peter H. Ballis, an Adventist pastor in Melbourne and doctoral student at Latrobe University, received a B.A. in theology from Avondale College and a B.A. (Honors) in Religious Studies from Victoria University in Wellington, New Zealand. This selection is a chapter in a book Ballis edited when he was a pastor and student in New Zealand, *In and Out of the World: Seventh-day Adventists in New Zealand* (Palmerston North, New Zealand: The Dunmore Press, Limited, 1985).

Zealand's economy slowly edged its way out of the trade depression of the 1880s.⁴ This setting of social, political, and economic unrest had the effect of enticing, if not forcing, Seventh-day Adventists out of their relative socio-religious introspection.

Beneath the surface of the church's participation in the prohibition movement, the Bible-in-schools debate, and later, the issue of military conscription, Adventists can be seen entering the political arena, sometimes in search of a New Zealand identity and social respectability, at other times being compelled to speak politically for fear of their religious liberty, and still other times dragged into conflict with government authorities when they would very much have preferred to have been left to their own devices.

The various forces at work mobilizing this minority into effective action also helped shape its political conscience during the formative decades of Adventist history in New Zealand. The examination of Seventh-day Adventist activities in prohibition politics, Bible-in-schools polemics, and the issue of conscription, presents a certain vantage point from which to examine the inner logic of religious minority groups.

Prohibition

Seventh-day Adventists in the United States developed early a concern for temperance reform.⁵ By June 1863, the date of Ellen White's memorable health vision, Sabbath-keeping Adventists were already in pos-

session of the main outlines of their future health message. The prophetess' vision served to legitimize this emphasis and systematized the loosely held teachings of early Adventists into an ordered whole. Three decades later, when the church commenced sending missionaries to other countries,⁶ the principle that it was a religious duty for God's people to care for their health and not violate the laws of life, was woven into the fabric of Adventist belief.⁷

Early Adventist evangelists in New Zealand quickly discovered their health message was an excellent means of establishing contact with potential converts. S. N. Haskell's first contacts in Auckland, in October 1885, were for the most part vegetarians, and, upon visiting the Hare household at Kaeo, Haskell was not slow to observe "only one of their number uses tobacco in any form, and all of them are temperate people."^{8,9}

A. G. Daniells, Haskell's successor, likewise used the subject of health to capture and maintain the interest of his large audiences during his evangelistic meetings. His tent meetings at Ponsonby's Surrey Hills Estate were from their commencement well attended, with as many as 300 people reported being present nightly to hear the visiting American lecture on the prophecies, the law of God, the seventh-day Sabbath, and the nearness of the Second Advent.¹⁰ On 8 February 1887, after lecturing in his tent three or four times a week during the previous two months, Daniells announced he was to present a lecture on temperance. His choice of subject catapulted him to the forefront of political discussions of his day.

One reason for Daniells' choice of subject was to keep a hold on his audience during the crucial stage of his evangelistic campaign. A more important reason was that he wanted to say something of community relevance during the weeks immediately prior to the 1887 elections.¹¹ Public feeling in favour of prohibition had rapidly taken hold among New Zealanders since the foundation of the New Zealand Alliance in February 1886.¹² To his surprise, the 28-year-old Adventist evangelist found himself addressing audiences three or four times the numbers present at his tent meetings. For the next few weeks, his peculiarly

Adventist doctrines were temporarily put to one side, as hundreds of Aucklanders clamoured to hear him repeat his presentation.¹³ Daniells was also requested to address small private gatherings, local temperance meetings, and a large audience in the Auckland Town Hall, organized by the Auckland branch of the New Zealand Alliance. The young Adventist had touched a sensitive political nerve, and for a short time became an active participant in New Zealand's prohibition politics.

Midway through 1888, Daniells turned his attention to Hawke's Bay. What is noteworthy of

The experience of William Cage, an Adventist minister elected mayor of Battle Creek and censured by Ellen White for political activities as "wholly unfit to engage in the work of God," may have influenced Daniells' decision to avoid public statements on this subject.

his Napier programme is the conspicuous absence of the subject of temperance from his lectures. Only three of the 92 sermons and lectures Daniells presented in Napier between 28 October 1888 and 4 April 1889, were devoted to the subject of health.¹⁴ Although his lecture on "Health: Cause and Cure of Indigestion" was "packed. . . to capacity," he does not seem to have stirred the imagination of the masses as he had done the year before in Auckland.¹⁵ This is even more evident in his Wellington campaign between 4 May 1890 and 15 March 1891, where the subjects of health and temperance did not feature at all.¹⁶ It seems Daniells was making a conscious and deliberate attempt to avoid being drawn into the prohibition debate. One suspects the experience of William Cage, an ordained Seventh-day Adventist minister who was elected mayor of Battle Creek in 1882 and who was subsequently censured by Ellen White for his political activities as "wholly unfit to engage in the work of God," had something to do with Daniells' decision to avoid public statements on this subject.¹⁷

However, Daniells was not against lay partici-

pation in the temperance cause. Shortly before he left Auckland for Napier in 1888, Daniells announced that he had “organized a Health and Temperance and Social Purity Society, with a membership of about 50 to 60 persons.”¹⁸

During the 1890s, prohibition became an issue of national importance to New Zealand. The Alcohol Liquor Sale Control Act of 1893 was seen by many prohibitionists as a partial victory for the cause. The introduction of licensing districts was also interpreted as a preliminary step

Early Adventists had other reasons for entering the debate. Involvement in prohibition was a means of gaining acceptance in the community with an emphasis which was also popular among the established churches.

toward the abolition of the liquor trade. In 1893, Ellen White came to New Zealand.¹⁹ Together with G. B. Starr, a former associate of D. L. Moody, Ellen White conducted an evangelistic campaign in Wellington. Her decision to open the campaign with a lecture on “Jesus Christ and Temperance Reform” was calculated to establish the Adventist presence among prohibitionists.²⁰ The *New Zealand Mail* presented her as standing midstream on the subject of temperance. Before an audience of “more than 250 people,” she was quoted denouncing

strong drink ... [as] the principal agent in the devil’s work, the purpose of which was to deprive man of his reason, to brutalize his character, and to extinguish his conscience. The man who fell under the thralldom of strong drink virtually sold his soul to the arch-enemy of mankind. . . .²¹

What Ellen White had to say on temperance was neither new nor profound. For a decade or more the same thing was being said by other New Zealand Christian groups. The one fundamental difference between her message and that of other New Zealand churches, who were campaigning for prohibition, was that of motive.

A. R. Grigg has argued that the New Zealand

church’s involvement in prohibition was very much an attempt to “assert the church’s authority in society at a time when it was only too well aware that its influence was waning among a steadily increasing population.”²² By the 1880s, New Zealand’s churchmen were realizing the country was progressively becoming de-Christianized as a growing portion of the population was either nominally attached to the institution of the church, or did not profess any belief at all.²³ The church’s involvement in prohibition was an attempt to legislate New Zealanders into goodness by forcing the masses *out of the tavern* and *into the church*.

Early Adventists had other reasons for entering the debate. Involvement in prohibition was a means of gaining acceptance in the community by becoming associated with an emphasis which was also popular among the established churches. In 1902, Ellen White declared temperance reform was “the right arm of the gospel.” She saw this subject as a successful means of “removing prejudice,” “softening the heart,” “gaining confidence,” and as an “entering wedge” for the Adventist message.²⁴ Before the turn of the century, Adventists were sympathetic to the growing temperance debate and, from a politically “neutral” position, sought to promote their own teaching.

By 1900 the Adventist presence had spread to most of the main centres with a total of 35 organized churches and companies.²⁵ The 1901 census numbered Seventh-day Adventists at 864. At this time, Adventists in New Zealand were entering a period of self-awareness, characterized by the desire to erect “respectable” church buildings, and the commencing of church schools and hospitals. Changes in the church’s self-awareness were accompanied by a corresponding change in social emphasis.

An early sign of a shift in Adventist attitude toward prohibition was evidenced at the 1901 conference session.²⁶ One of the resolutions passed during this session stated:

that as a Conference we express our interest and sympathy in every Christian effort to abolish the liquor traffic; and that we co-operate, as far as we consistently can, with all temperance organizations, in obtaining laws

laws prohibiting the importation, manufacture, and sale of intoxicating liquors.²⁷

When it came to implementing this recommendation at the local church level, the matter as to whether Seventh-day Adventists should involve themselves with politics was passionately debated. In a business meeting, Ponsonby Church members were divided as to the extent of Adventist involvement in the prohibition cause, but were unanimous in recognizing prohibition as a political matter.²⁸ From this time on, with each succeeding conference session, the “political” implications for the church’s statements on temperance become increasingly pronounced.

The 1903 conference session voted to establish a fund for the distribution of literature on “special issues,” and undoubtedly prohibition was one of these.²⁹ The following year, conference delegates discussed the possibility of introducing medically trained persons to labour alongside ministers.³⁰ They were hoping to establish the “right arm of the message” as a bridge for the introduction of Adventist doctrinal views. Although no resolutions were passed at the Island Bay Camp meeting on January 1906 specifically dealing with temperance, several lectures were delivered by Dr. D. H. Kress on “Health as Related To Temperance.”³¹

During these years, prohibition had gained much popular support. By 1908, 12 licensing districts elected to go “dry.” Until now the law required a three-fifths majority of votes to ban licensing liquor outlets. Had the principle of simple majority been operative, no less than 50 no-licence districts would have resulted from the 1908 elections. Realizing this, the alliance commenced lobbying for the replacement of the licensing district scheme with the principle of simple majority.³²

With increased temperance agitation came a corresponding proliferation of Adventist statements. The 1908 session authorized the conference executive committee to make vigorous efforts to distribute nationally Ellen White’s *The Ministry of Healing*, which dealt with health reform.³³ The following year Prime Minister Joseph Ward introduced the Licensing Amendment Bill, advocating that local option polls were to be decided by a 55 percent majority vote, with a

resolution demanding colonial option by the same majority. The introduction of the bill caused “unprecedented political melee,”³⁴ and with this Seventh-day Adventists entered the political arena with vigour.

At the 1910 camp meeting, the conference committee on plans and recommendations presented two recommendations which were carried unanimously. The first called upon Adventist

ministers, teachers, physicians, nurses, and people generally [to] engage in a vigorous campaign on behalf of total abstinence, by means of lectures, demonstrations, and the distribution of health and temperance literature, and that whenever consistent, our people by voice and vote, place themselves on record as favourable to its restriction and entire prohibition.

The second recommendation urged church members to study the principles as given in the Word of God and the Spirit of Prophecy, and seek, with the Lord’s help, to carry them into effect; and that our labourers throughout the conference be urged to carry on an active campaign on behalf of health reform principles.³⁵

The subject of temperance was featured also at the Petone camp meeting, and daily newspapers were not slow to detect the enthusiasm with which

Daily newspapers were not slow to detect the enthusiasm with which Adventists involved themselves in the temperance issue.

Adventists involved themselves in this issue.³⁶ Any apprehension Adventists might have had toward becoming politically involved was by this time totally overcome. At the Petone Camp, conference delegates once again stated they were “unalterably opposed to the liquor traffic, and in favour of municipal, national and world-wide prohibition.”³⁷

R. Newman rightly observed that the contribution of smaller Protestant bodies to the alliance was in providing the latter “with a body of devoted workers and lay propagandists whose efforts accelerated the spread of temperance ideals in some electorates.”³⁸ Seventh-day Adventists canvassed the community for support. Mrs. I.

M. Sharp reported in the *Australasian Record* that she “found the majority of the people in favour of no-licence and prohibition” and was sure the prohibitionists would have “no difficulty” in forcing the country “dry.”³⁹ J. Pallant, the conference president, announced that a special temperance edition of *Signs of the Times* was being produced in time for distribution before the elections. This was to be “the best temperance *Signs*” ever produced by the denomination, and the New Zealand Conference ordered 100,000 copies.⁴⁰

In an attempt to resolve the deadlock between prohibitionists and the liquor trade, the government introduced an amendment to the Licensing Amendment Bill returning to the previous three-fifths majority with local and national option. At the 1911 polls, prohibition won 55.83 percent of the votes, and along with other New Zealanders who had taken to the road in favour of no-licence, Seventh-day Adventists experienced disappointment. For a time church members continued their activities as if little had changed with elections. In 1914 the union conference collected £845 16s 4d for the dissemination of temperance literature.⁴¹ However, the church’s reformist impulse was short lived, being distracted by the more urgent matter of Bible-in-schools. Moreover, the out-

Contrary to expectation, preoccupation with prophecy and apocalyptic eschatology does not exclude a resurgence of reformist activity.

break of World War I and the crisis brought about by military conscription accelerated the church’s shift of emphasis from social reform to social withdrawal. In the following years the Adventist temperance emphasis became preoccupied with educating its own constituency.

Adventist participation in the temperance movement highlights one anomaly of this minority. Contrary to expectation, preoccupation with prophecy and apocalyptic eschatology does not exclude a resurgence of reformist activity. This suggests that a movement’s social and political attitudes are conditioned more by the social and political milieu than its theological tenets. This

had led G. Schwartz to conclude “the eschatological doctrines of Seventh-day Adventism obscured the fundamental optimism of their ideology.”⁴²

Bible-in-Schools

Adventist involvement in the campaign to counter attempts to introduce religion into the state school curriculum grew at the same time as its developing interest in New Zealand temperance reform. Thus it presents an interesting comparison to perceive Adventism’s social and political ideology during these years. Seventh-day Adventist response to this issue fits the typical sectarian mould. Adventists preferred *no religion* to *wrong religion*, because they assumed their cause would better succeed among those who were religiously neutral than among the churched.⁴³

With the passing of the Education Act of 1877, the state took on itself the responsibility of educating New Zealand’s young. The act stated that New Zealand education was to be free, compulsory, and secular, with religious instruction being left to individual preference.⁴⁴ Official denominational reaction to the settlement varied, but by the 1890s churchmen were beginning to express doubts concerning the wisdom of New Zealand’s secular education. It was becoming apparent that church ministers did not have the necessary skills to retain the interest and attention of their Sunday school pupils. Also churches were poorly equipped and lacked suitable educational facilities to do justice to their cause.

In no time the movement seeking to amend the Education Act grew from local and regional protest groups to national proportions. Anglican, Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregationalist churches formed the backbone of the Bible-in-schools campaign.⁴⁵ Along with Roman Catholics,⁴⁶ and Baptists,⁴⁷ Seventh-day Adventists played an important part in defending New Zealand’s secular education.

The *Auckland Star* of 19 February 1895 described Seventh-day Adventists as a people who “hold to the rightfulness and necessity of civil government, believe in paying taxes, and in pa-

tronizing and supporting the State Schools.”

But this attitude was conditioned upon the state’s noninterference in matters of religion. From its earliest years, the Adventist church in New Zealand looked with disfavour upon those groups seeking to introduce religion in state schools. They feared that the kind of religion taught in schools would leave no room for denominational preference.⁴⁸ In a lecture on “Church, State, and the Bible in Public Schools” presented to a mixed audience in Napier, A. G. Daniells was quoted as being:

strongly opposed to the State interfering with moral or religious matters. Civil matters had only to do with man’s relation to man, and when the Government went so far as to deal with moral questions it was intruding upon the sacred rights of the individual. A true Civil Government would not make distinctions in its subjects because of their opinions. The infidel, the Jew, and the Christian were equally entitled to all the rights of the Civil Government. Concerning the Bible in public schools he said that would be impossible without wronging some of the citizens for it would be making them pay for having their children taught something they did not believe. The Government should teach civility.⁴⁹

Daniells’ position was typical of early New Zealand Adventists.

Along with the subjects of home missions, foreign missions and temperance reform, separation of church and state was a theme frequently raised at the Auckland Tract Society. The meetings of the tract society were designed to keep the “prophetic” and evangelistic emphasis of early Adventists in focus by studying local issues against the backdrop of Adventist prophetic interpretation.⁵⁰ Similarly, the 1896 Sabbath school lesson quarterly on “The Reformation” emphasized separation of church and state. The Edendale Church Sabbath School Minutes record that during one Sabbath School lesson, church members stressed “God had separated the Church and the State” and the “true Protestants will protest when any church urges the State to enact religious laws.”⁵¹ The notion that politics and religion should be kept separate was deeply etched in the Adventist mind. The growing number of voices calling for change to the Education Act accentuated Adventist fears of a church-state alliance. In response, Seventh-day Adventists launched their

vigorous and enthusiastic campaign in favour of maintaining New Zealand’s present secular education.

The earliest evidence of Adventist involvement in Bible-in-schools polemics dates to 1903. The secretary to the New Zealand Tract Society reported to the conference delegation that one of its most important activities during the previous 12 months involved distributing the tract *Religion and the State Schools* “to every minister in the colony, to every member of Parliament, and to many of the State School teachers.”⁵² Mrs. Caro, a member of the Napier Adventist Church, reported that three Napier members posted 1,250 copies of the same tract to influential persons all over the country.⁵³ At the following year’s camp meeting, the Bible-in-schools issue was debated at length. Delegates at this camp meeting pledged their support to combat the introduction of religion in public schools, and sufficient funds were donated to obtain 12,000 copies of Ellen White’s *Education* for distribution.⁵⁴ It was also an-

From earliest times Adventists maintained that the issue they were combating involved more than a threat to Adventist belief. In their thinking, the Bible-in-schools movement threatened the religious liberties of all New Zealand minorities.

nounced that the March issue of *Signs of the Times* was to feature the subject of religion in schools. Sufficient copies were ordered to send one to every teacher in the country.⁵⁵

During these years Adventist Bible-in-schools polemics consisted primarily of literature distribution. In 1905 the Tract Society secretary informed the church that a letter had been sent to judges, barristers, magistrates, and members of education boards, warning them of the dangers threatening the religious freedoms of New Zealanders by the Bible-in-schools movement and called for more definitive action. The necessary impetus for greater Adventist involvement in the debate came quite by surprise.⁵⁶

From earliest times Adventists maintained that the issue they were combating involved more than a threat to Adventist belief. In their thinking, the Bible-in-schools movement threatened the religious liberties of all New Zealand minorities. This emerged into the open in 1906. At the Island Bay camp meeting, Conference President W. A. Henning informed his constituents:

New Zealand had been taking backward steps during the past year. The New Zealand Methodists had adopted the resolution posed by their brethren in Victoria re Sunday desecration. He quoted for his reports of their meeting as to their plans from the enforcement of Sunday legislation. In New Zealand the Presbyterians had united with the Methodists in bringing about Sunday legislation. The Presbyterian Conference just closing in Dunedin had also endorsed this work.⁵⁷

In the minds of Seventh-day Adventists, a connection was made between this resurgence of Sabbatarianism and the Bible-in-schools emphasis, and the latter was seen as a forerunner of a more insidious plan to enforce a Sunday-keeping Christianity by the union of church and state.

The experience of Seventh-day Adventists in the United States just a decade earlier loomed large in Adventist thinking. More than 100 Seventh-day Adventists were imprisoned as a result of Sunday blue laws.⁵⁸ The possibility of New Zealand Adventists also being persecuted for

Seventh-day Adventists were driven to defend New Zealand's secular education because of fears arising from their eschatology.

their faith was not out of the question. After all, at least two Sabbath keepers in New Zealand were known to have been summoned to court on charges of Sunday desecration.⁵⁹

From its beginning in the 1840s the Seventh-day Adventist movement had developed an elaborate and complex picture of end-times using the books of Daniel and the Revelation. They maintained that a period of intense trial would engulf the world just prior to the second advent of Christ during which time Seventh-day Adventists would be persecuted for their faithful obedience to God's

law.⁶⁰ In *The Great Controversy*, Ellen White outlined in graphic detail the steps leading to this eschatological crisis.⁶¹ Cooperation between church and state was the pivot in this apocalyptic drama, and to Bible-instructed Adventists, the subject of the Bible-in-schools was like "a red rag to a bull."

Current interest in Sunday legislation by New Zealand Presbyterians and Methodists, and the Bible-in-schools emphasis appeared so close to Adventists, and sounded so much like what Ellen White had described that they felt they had no option but to protest. Seventh-day Adventists were driven to defend New Zealand's secular education because of fears arising from their eschatology.⁶²

The first move toward mobilizing Adventist forces to counter the Bible-in-schools campaign was the organization of a religious liberty department. Delegates at the 1906 Island Bay Camp voted to establish:

a Religious Liberty Department...in the New Zealand Conference, consisting at present of a committee of three persons, one of whom shall be a secretary who is alive to the question and through whom there may be the free-est [sic] co-operation with the Union Conference.

They also stressed that in planning for this work "such appropriations be made from the ordinary income of the Conference or by special collections as may be deemed necessary to meet the demands of educating the public in the principles of Religious Liberty."⁶³ At the Masterton Camp the conference president highlighted the dangers of legislation affecting religion, and called upon church members to become thoroughly instructed in the principles of religious liberty.⁶⁴

The next three years saw a fine tuning of the religious liberty department, finally replacing it with a state religious liberty secretary. To assist him the 1909 conference session called on each church to appoint "one of its most wide awake members" to report on developments in other parts of the country.⁶⁵

The formation of the Bible-in-schools League in 1912 precipitated the most trenchant phase of Adventist protest. Adventist ministers became militant on the issue.⁶⁶ At this time the *Ne Temere*

decree was passed ruling as invalid, as well as illicit, marriages contracted by Catholics otherwise than before priests. Adventists interpreted this as a marshaling of Catholic forces against God's people, and read this action into present issues. Church members seriously and sincerely believed

the success of this (Bible-in-Schools) movement means the welding together of the first link of the chain that will bind Church and State together, and that after the first link is formed the chain will rapidly be completed, and then freedom of conscience is lost.⁶⁷

Adventists all over the country became busy circulating the tracts *Religion in the State Schools, Principles Too Little Understood, and Shall the State Teach Religion?*⁶⁸

Midway through 1913, W. H. Pascoe, New Zealand Conference president, announced the unprecedented action that one of the church's full-time ministers was to be given leave on full pay to campaign against the Bible-in-schools League. C. K. Meyers was told to disconnect from his Wellington evangelistic programme and appointed to "throw all his energies into the conflict of opposing the union of Church and State by the introduction of religious teaching in the State schools."⁶⁹ When it is considered that the total Adventist ministerial workforce at this time consisted of no more than 10 full-time ministers, this action displayed considerable commitment to the issue.

Soon Meyers was elected president of the Auckland branch of the National Schools Defence league and a member of this league's central executive. The league was composed of representatives from a wide range of ideologies opposing the introduction of the Bible into public schools. Meyers found himself working alongside representatives of the Anglican, Presbyterian, Roman Catholic, Congregational, Baptist, and Church of Christ churches, as well as many nonbelievers.⁷⁰ Adventists feared papal influences were at work in the Bible-in-schools movement, engineering the union of church and state. Ironically, in the National Schools Defence League, Adventists found themselves siding with Catholics against a *common foe!*

Meyers launched an aggressive campaign to

undermine the "iniquitous proposals" of the Bible-in-Schools League.⁷¹ He travelled to Auckland, Hamilton, Napier, Hastings, Wanganui, Palmerston North, Wellington, and as far south as Christchurch holding public meetings and soliciting signatures for his petition in defence of New Zealand's present education system. Meyers reported his work was proving successful—Auckland alone yielded 6,000 signatures⁷² with

The opportunity of an Adventist minister lecturing to such a wide cross section of the population no doubt kept alive proselytizing hopes.

corresponding successes in other centres.⁷³

The experience of working alongside clergy of other denominations raised a number of Adventist eyebrows. In a report to the *Australasian Record*, Meyers assured his readers his association with these men had evangelistic potential: "there are some outside of us who feel the need for vigilance, and sometimes their alliance with us may be closer."⁷⁴

To what extent had Meyers allowed his Adventist apocalyptic eschatology influence his public presentations as president of the Auckland branch of the National Schools Defence League? If his address at Napier as reported in the *Hawke's Bay Herald* is typical of his campaign speeches, the league provided him with a convenient platform from which to promote his Adventist cause.⁷⁵ As well, the opportunity of an Adventist minister lecturing to such a wide cross section of the population no doubt kept alive Meyers' proselytizing hopes.

The Adventist campaign against the Bible-in-schools movement climaxed in 1914 at the Palmerston North camp meeting. The New Zealand members voted:

Inasmuch as it is advisable, in the interest of true liberty, that we resist every approach of Union of Church and State, we recommend to members of our Churches and isolated Sabbath-keepers to enlist in a vigorous national campaign against an effort of the Bible-in-Schools League to introduce Bible teaching into the State Schools during School hours, and to this end we

pledge ourselves to endeavour to obtain at least 2000 signatures for a petition to Parliament against submitting this or any other religious matter to the referendum, because in religion majorities have no right over minorities.⁷⁶

At the same camp the decision was made to strengthen the New Zealand Adventist education system. The Bible-in-schools movement, therefore had the effect of adding impetus to the Seventh-day Adventist private-school system.⁷⁷ On this point New Zealand Adventists were caught between wanting to be a “church” and maintaining their own separateness as a sect. They desired New Zealand education to remain secular for the general population, but for their own children they sought an education system that incorporated and enhanced the church’s unique theological emphasis.

Seventh-day Adventists, like other bodies, refused by overwhelming majorities to have anything to do with the introduction of religion in public schools. Their participation belied their small numbers.

On 26 June 1914, the minister of education presented to Parliament the “Religious Instruction in Schools Referendum Bill,” but this lapsed. The outbreak of war in that year brought an end to the activities of the Bible-in-schools League and the conclusion of Adventist Bible-in-schools polemics.

Seventh-day Adventists were just one of a number of bodies who refused by overwhelming majorities to have anything to do with the introduction of religion in public schools. Their participation in this campaign belied their small numbers. It is difficult to estimate with any exactness their contribution and influence in this debate. Adventists presented a total of eight petitions to Parliament opposing the “Religious Instruction in Schools Referendum Bill” —among them one by C. K. Meyers with 1,835 signatures.⁷⁸ Their enthusiastic and extensive literature distribution helped keep the issues before the New Zealand public.

Military Conscription

The outbreak of war in 1914 forced on Adventists a third political conflict. Unlike their participation in prohibition, which was motivated by a desire to ground the Adventist message in New Zealand soil by associating with an emphasis that was popular with many New Zealanders, and their Bible-in-schools polemic, which was generated by a potential threat to the movement’s religious freedom, the problem of conscription came uninvited. Adventists were drawn with reluctance into this conflict. However, they did not enter the “storm” of 1917, described as “one of the most bitterest and violent controversies,” without some prior warning.⁷⁹

The first encounter between Adventists and government authorities over the military question dates back to 1901 when a Seventh-day Adventist teacher (possibly W. J. Smith) employed by the education department, refused to cooperate with the authorities over the requirement to teach military drill in school. He objected first because he was required to perform duties on the Sabbath, and secondly on the grounds that military drill was so full of the military spirit, “it was training the young how best to kill, and therefore was a violation of the sixth commandment.”⁸⁰

Seventh-day Adventists at this time numbered no more than 1,000, and the fact that no reference is made again to this issue until 1908 indicates few of them were in positions to be affected directly by the military question. The problem of the status of Seventh-day Adventists in relation to military drill was first discussed by the church in session on January 1908, during the camp held on the Pukekura Training School ground, near Cambridge. At that time the Bible-in-schools movement was demanding Adventists to take a greater interest in community affairs and to monitor the various political developments. In the context of emphasizing the need for a vigorous and positive campaign to undermine moves to introduce religious instruction in public schools, conference delegates voted that:

the Religious Liberty Department encourage suitable

persons in the Conference to correspond with, or visit, resident members of the legislature upon the question of compulsory military training, also that suitable articles be prepared upon this subject for insertion in our leading papers.⁸¹

However no licence and the Bible-in-schools issues prevented Adventists from anticipating the full force of what lay ahead.

On 22 December 1909 the government passed into law the Defence Act, calling all males between 12 and 30 to register for conscription. The bill contained provisions for magistrates to impose penalties ranging from fines to disenfranchisement upon non-compliers. While the bill was being debated in Parliament, Adventists were busily occupied with their 14th annual camp meeting and conference session at Linwood, Christchurch. At this session, Adventists endorsed the Australasian Union Conference's action stating that Adventists were against military training.⁸² Session minutes give the impression the bill did not cause undue anxiety among Adventists.

The 1910 Amendment to the Defence Act announced 3 April 1911 as the commencement date for registration. With their decision, New Zealand's army, previously composed of volunteers, was transposed into a compulsory military force. The formation of the Anti-Militarist League, the National Peace Council, and the Passive Resister's Union indicated that not all sections of the community accepted the announcement fully and without complaint. Up to this point Adventist discussion on the military issue was quite general, but the growing community reaction against compulsory military training finally pulled within as well the relatively young Adventist church. The minutes of the Petone camp meeting of February 1911 indicate Adventists had finally realized they too were indelibly implicated in present lively discussions. Action was taken to inform government authorities of Seventh-day Adventist attitudes to military drill. Dr. F. Caro, the church's religious liberty secretary, reported that as a result of his correspondence with the authorities, students at the Pukekura School were granted exemption for compulsory military training.⁸³ Dr. Caro added

that "if our young people wished to be exempt from Compulsory Military Training, they must become students of the Pukekura School."⁸⁴ Although heartened by this news, church members knew well this arrangement was but a partial reprieve, and that action had to be taken to discover ways of making provision for the majority of Adventist youth.

In May 1911, conference presidents from Australia and New Zealand met at the church's administrative headquarters at Wahroonga, Australia, to study the question of compulsory military training with a view to arriving at a consensus statement. The question of the denomination's official standing was causing growing confusion

Some Australian Adventists had already been imprisoned for refusing military drill on the Sabbath.

among church members in Australia. Some Australian Adventists had already been imprisoned for refusing military drill on the Sabbath.⁸⁵ Others were acting irresponsibly by not cooperating with government authorities, and some going so far "as to refuse to have their youth register according to Government requirement." Such actions aggravated an already serious situation. The meeting of the presidents condemned as "evil" and "deplorable" such behaviour, and called upon the church to "be loyal to the Government, and go as far as possible in obeying all civil requirements for Government is of God."⁸⁶ The presidents concluded:

The members of the Australasian Union Conference Committee present, regard the action of the Defence Act which provides for Compulsory Military training for the young men, to be an infringement of the civil rights of the inhabitants of this country; and in that the Act makes no provision for exemptions from military training on the Sabbath—the seventh day of the week—it infringes the religious rights of Seventh-day Adventists. And while we may yield under protest to compulsory drill because it violates our civil liberties only, yet we cannot consent to military drill of any kind on the sabbath, because that would be a violation of the fourth commandment.⁸⁷

This position outlined the direction New Zealand Adventists were to take throughout the crisis

years.

Adventist attitudes to war were fashioned early in the church's history.⁸⁸ During the American Civil War, after much soul searching and spirited debate, Adventists adopted a noncombatant stand. Although the present situation was of a different nature to that faced by Adventists during the Civil War, conclusions reached at that time moulded Adventist attitude and policy on the war question.

National registration had closed on 17 July 1911, and immediately government launched into proceedings against persons alleged to have failed to register. Nearly 25 percent of those eligible as senior cadets and territorials did not register.⁸⁹ By February the following year, 98 resisters had been prosecuted. The Defence Act did make pro-

Seventh-day Adventists faced the double burden of unwillingness to desecrate the Sabbath as well as objecting to bearing arms.

vision for objections to military service. However, before a religious objector could qualify to train as a non-combatant, the law required him to register, be enrolled, take the Oath of Allegiance, be ordered to parade, and only then apply for exemption.⁹⁰

How Seventh-day Adventists fared during these years before the war is open to conjecture. The Pukekura School property was sold in March 1912, and the Oroua Missionary College in Palmerston North was not in operation until April the following year, so the previous exemption granted to Pukekura School students was no longer operative.⁹¹ Still, there is no evidence in denominational literature from prewar years that suggests Adventists experienced hardship as a result of the Defence Act.

During 1913 and 1914, government stepped up its activities against antimilitarists, and community disfavour of the Defence Act grew proportionately. For a time it looked as if the Act might have to be amended to accommodate extreme and militant objectors, but the declaration of war in August 1914 gave the whole matter a new twist.

The patriotic atmosphere awakened by the outbreak of World War I overcame many of those who were less-than-staunch pacifists. The National Registration Act of 1915 was designed to survey the country's manpower, and as expected, was the prelude to military conscription introduced by the Military Service Act of 1916.⁹² This act also made no provision for the religious and conscientious objector. J. A. Allen, the minister of defence, had hoped objectors could appeal for exemption before an appeal board but this suggestion was rejected by the cabinet as too open-ended.⁹³ In its place was introduced an amendment to the Military Service Act making the ground of appeal that on 4 August 1914 and continuously since, a man had been a member of a religious organization that prohibited military service and which made allowance for noncombatant service.⁹⁴ This amendment made no provision for conscientious objectors professing no religion. Many individuals suffered as a result. For Seventh-day Adventists, the amendment contained both good as well as bad news.

Once government had decided exemption to military service applied to members of churches with a *written* constitution forbidding bearing arms, Seventh-day Adventists had to admit they had "no man-made written constitution or creed."⁹⁴ The Adventist position was further complicated by its Sabbatarianism. In *A Call for Loyalty in the Present Crisis*, C. H. Watson noted that "the ordinary Christian conscientious objectors to bearing of arms had his difficulty settled when he is exempted from combatant duties and given non-combatant service."⁹⁵ Seventh-day Adventists, however, were faced with a double burden—unwillingness to desecrate their Saturday Sabbath as a result of military duties on this day, as well as objecting to bearing arms. In response, the second session of the North New Zealand Conference (January 1917) sought to improve the plight of Adventist young men with a resolution stating that the church endorses:

what is and has ever been our denominational attitude towards military service. That as loyal citizens we will conform to all the requirements of the government so long as they do not conflict with the law of God: that is, we will perform at any time, except on the Sabbath of the

Lord (from sunset Friday till sunset Saturday) non-combatant service which may be imposed on us by law.⁹⁶

On February 15 of that year, a deputation of Seventh-day Adventists, headed by J. B. Donald, met with Sir James Allen to establish a non-combatant status for Adventists.⁹⁷ On 10 April 1917, the minister of defence wrote to W. H. Pascoe, North New Zealand conference president, informing him that "exhaustive inquiries have been made, but it cannot be found that your body claims, as a tenet of its Faith, that the bearing of arms is contrary to Divine Revelation."⁹⁸

Adjutant-General R. W. Tate also pointed out that no accommodation was made for British Adventists who were reportedly performing military activities on the Sabbath. Several telegrams back and forth to British military officials and the front lines in Europe finally clarified this matter and Adventists in the New Zealand Army were granted leave "from Friday nights to Saturday nights and that their services be invariably utilized for Sunday fatigues and duties and so relieve other men of Sunday work."⁹⁹

Tate was hoping once Adventists settled into military routine, they would discover that "fighting goes on irrespective of Sabbath" and thus view their Sabbatarian stand differently.¹⁰⁰ Fearing "that a very large proportion of the new men [at Trentham Camp] would claim to be of this religion in order to be set free on Saturdays," Seventh-day Adventist servicemen were informed privately as to Sabbath leave arrangements!¹⁰¹

The situation of Seventh-day Adventists had improved midway through 1917 with the arrival of documentation from the church's world headquarters clarifying the denomination's stance as non-combatant ever since the American Civil War.¹⁰² Soon military service boards directed appellants to serve on the state farm.¹⁰³ Subsequent correspondence between Adventist leaders and the defence department got bogged down over the issue of accommodating Adventist Sabbatarianism to conditions of active service.

The war experiences taught New Zealand Adventists some important lessons. A. W. Anderson reported in the *Australasian Record*:

Never in the history of Australia (and New Zealand)

has it been necessary (for Adventists) to keep in touch with public affairs as during the period of war, and never before has it been necessary for us to study first principles and to keep absolutely sure of our ground before making requests of the governments under whose protection we live.¹⁰⁴

For the next three decades the religious liberty secretary became the political watch dog of the denomination.

As with Bible-in-schools polemics, the deteriorating international situation of World War I precipitated wild speculation among Adventists. For many, the ominous war clouds signalled the fulfillment of Adventist millennial dreams.¹⁰⁵ From its inception in 1844, Adventism had shown a keen sensitivity to the day-by-day flow of world

The church's involvement in New Zealand's social issues may have doubled its membership.

events. Wars and rumours of wars, famines and pestilences, earthquakes and persecutions, heralded the eschatological end-time. As early as 1911 Adventists began studying the Scriptures for explanations of the present world crisis, and at times indulged in fantastic interpretations based on prophecy.¹⁰⁶ World War I provided a new impetus to both Adventist journalism and evangelism.¹⁰⁷ A new Adventist literary genre came into being with the proliferation of books, tracts, and articles interpreting world events as the fulfillment of prophecy.

Adventist evangelists assumed the role of forecasters of international events. With the prophecies of Daniel and the Revelation in one hand, and the daily newspapers in the other, they travelled the country lecturing on the changing political map of Europe.¹⁰⁸ Seventh-day Adventists saw in the present world crisis a literal fulfillment of those passages that depicted the events of "the last days" and acknowledged themselves as God's remnant people whose task was to inform the world of unseen realities, promising redemption to the faithful and pronouncing warnings to the godless.¹⁰⁹ Throughout the war years, both in New Zealand and abroad, the church had an evangelistic success unprecedented in its history.

Summary and Conclusions

The first three decades of Seventh-day Adventists were truly the crisis years in the church's 100-year history in New Zealand. Yet these were also the most progressive years.

At the same time as Adventism in America was fraught with conflict and clashes over organizational ideas and theological emphasis, the Seventh-day Adventist millennial experiment was taking root in New Zealand.¹¹⁰ The seed first planted by Haskell and Daniells quickly spread from centre to centre and by the end of the third decade, New Zealand Adventists boasted of a membership in excess of 2,000. Having survived the peril of beginnings, the movement entered its period of adolescence.¹¹¹ As an American millennial movement transplanted to a different world, the Seventh-day Adventist church embarked on a search for relevance by looking at ways of affirming its values and theology to an environment radically different from its motherland. Adventists found in prohibition politics and Bible-in-schools polemics an ideal platform from which to expound their theology and values to New Zealanders.

Beward has argued that in the areas of education and temperance agitation there is evidence of significant cooperation between the various denominations.¹¹² Surface study of church activities in these areas can be interpreted as examples of ecumenicity. At a deeper level, when motives are sought, such generalizations are anything but clear. Newman rightly observed that several groups were campaigning for prohibition, each for different reasons, and states that "support for temperance was largely symbolic."¹¹³ For the larger church groups involvement in prohibition was an attempt to revitalize the institution and thus affirm its relevance at a time when traditional religious forms were increasingly being questioned. Whereas Seventh-day Adventist temperance agitation was calculated at winning friends by cashing in on an emphasis that was popular among large groups of New Zealanders.

Adventist involvement in the Bible-in-schools

debate was also symbolic. Adventists saw in this movement a prelude to a church-state union and sought to counter its influence in a bid to maintain its religious freedom.¹¹⁴ Weber's observation that in order to maintain its true religious identity and effectiveness, "the genuine sect must demand the non-intervention of the political power and freedom of conscience for *specifically religious reasons*" is well exemplified in the Adventist experience.¹¹⁵

The campaign to combat the introduction of religion in state schools also proved to be for Seventh-day Adventists a public-relations exercise. Adventists found themselves joining committees, speaking before audiences that under different circumstances would have been inaccessible to them, and, at times, cooperating with clergy of other denominations. All this had the effect of creating a favourable image for the church.

The Adventist church also benefited from its social reformism in other ways. Prohibition, religion in schools, and military conscription provided church members with numerous opportunities to mix with a wide spectrum of the community. It is recorded, for example, that eight of the 50 members of the Edendale Adventist Church attended the Prohibition Convention held on 3 January 1915, as delegates.¹¹⁶ Such interaction with the public served to acquaint Adventists with large numbers of people in the community.

The message being preached by Adventists, particularly during the first two decades of the present century, was also influenced by the political climate of the day. Public evangelists and pastors found themselves addressing issues and answering questions relevant to New Zealand. During this period the church's health emphasis as well as its eschatology became both relevant and significant.

This situation brought to the relatively small Adventist congregations a brief period of community prominence. Sinclair has pointed out that "some of the odder American religions made a great many converts during these years of New Zealand's insecurity."¹¹⁷ Along with other religious minority groups, New Zealand Adventists benefited numerically by the times. The New

Zealand census revealed that between 1911 and 1921 the Seventh-day Adventist church experienced membership increases of 37.83 percent and 44.79 percent.¹¹⁸ In the decade between 1911 and 1921 the church doubled its membership. It is tempting to conclude that it was the church's involvement in New Zealand's social issues that brought about this unprecedented growth rate.

Following these years of rapid membership increase and intense social involvement, New Zealand Adventists gradually withdrew from their worldly engagement. For a time, Adventists came into conflict with authorities over compulsory unionism during the 1930s and again during World War II over military conscription; but gone were the days of social campaigning and political protest so characteristic of earlier decades.¹¹⁹ Rapid membership gains forced the church to transfer its resources from converting the multitudes to consolidating and indoctrinating its more

recent gains. Temperance programmes and their emphasis on religious liberty became more tailored to the internal needs of the rapidly growing church, in contrast to earlier years when emphasis was primarily on educating the community.

By becoming involved in this country's social issues, Adventism in New Zealand during its first 30 years, 1886-1918, forged itself a place in the country's denominational landscape. Involvement in those same issues also affected the church's preaching agenda. In addition, by becoming concerned with current social events and interpreting and integrating these into their own prophetic framework, Seventh-day Adventists established institutions that would perpetuate their theology to the next generation. Hence the proliferation of Adventist Schools during this period. Involvement in New Zealand's social issues had lasting consequences for Seventh-day Adventists.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. 'In seeking the Christian consequences upon New Zealand Society, we will look, not for nothing and not for everything, but for something.' W. H. Oliver goes on to say that to discover that 'something', the 'researcher... would need to look for occasions which stirred a minority of Christians into considerable and sometimes effective action. And he will note occasions upon which the minority was stirred into a mistaken manner, or in a highly sectarian manner. Oliver, W. H., 'Christianity Among New Zealanders,' *Landfall*, vol. 70, no. 1, March 1966, pp. 12, 13.

2. Olsen, E., 'Towards a New Society,' *The Oxford History of New Zealand* (ed.) W. H. Oliver, Wellington, Oxford University Press, 1951, p. 250.

3. Richardson, L., 'Parties and Political Change,' *ibid*, p. 197.

4. Brooking, L. T., 'Economic Transformation,' *ibid*, p. 226.

5. For a history of Seventh-day Adventist philosophy of health, see F. K. Vande Vere, *Windows: Selected Readings in Seventh-day Adventist History, 1844-1922*, Southern Publishing Association, 1975, pp. 124-151. G. E. Reid, *A Sound of Trumpets—Americans, Adventists and Health Reform*, Review and Herald Publishing, 1982; *The Vision Bold: An Illustrated History of Seventh-day Philosophy of*

Health, W. L. Johns & R. H. Utt, (eds), Review and Herald, 1977; R. L. Numbers, *Prophetess of Health: A Study of Ellen White*, Harper and Row, 1976.

6. Oosterwal, G., 'A History of Seventh-day Adventist Mission,' unpublished paper, p. 22f; P. G. Damsteegt, *Foundations of the Seventh-day Adventist Message and Mission*, Eerdmans Publishing, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1977, pp. 271-293.

7. Damsteegt, P. G. 'Health Reform and the Bible in Early Sabbatarian Adventism,' *AH*, vol. 5, no. 2, 1978, pp. 13-21; R. Numbers, *Prophetess of Health*, ch. 4.

8. Hare, E. B., *An Irish Boy and God: The Biography of Robert Hare*, Washington, D. C., Review and Herald, 1965, p. 39ff.

9. Haskell, S. N., 'Planting the Third Angel's Message in New Zealand,' *BE*, 9 Dec. 1886.

10. *The New Zealand Herald*, 8 Jan. 1887; 21 Jan. 1887.

11. Daniells, A. G., 'New Zealand,' *BE*, April 1887, p. 64.

12. 'Prohibition,' *An Encyclopedia of New Zealand* (ed.) A. H. McLintock, Wellington, Government Printer, 1966, pp. 872-877.

13. Daniells, A. G., 'New Zealand,' *BE*, December 1887, p. 64; *The New Zealand Herald*, 12, 15, 16 Feb., 11 April 1887.

14. For a list of Daniells' Napier sermons, see S.R. Goldstone, *Veneered Infidelity: The Story of the Seventh-day Adventist Church in Hawke's Bay*, Napier, The Daily press, 1979, Appendix A, pp. 129-131.
15. *The Daily Telegraph*, 21 Nov. 1888; *The Hawke's Bay Herald*, 15 Nov. 1888.
16. See *The Evening Post*, 4 May 1890-15 March 1891.
17. Anderson, Y.D., 'The Bible, the Bottle and the Ballot: Seventh-day Adventists Political Activism, 1850-1900,' *AH*, vol. 7, no. 2, 1982, p. 44, J. Kearns, 'Ethical Politics: Adventism and the Case of William Cage,' *AH*, vol. 5, no. 1, 1978, pp. 3-15.
18. Daniells, A.G., 'Auckland, New Zealand,' *BE*, 29 May 1888. In 1890, this society was renamed 'Health and Temperance Society,' *BE*, May 1890, p. 140.
19. See S. R. Goldstone, *The Angel Said Australia*, Signs Publishing, 1980, chapters 12-14; A.L. White, *The Australian Years: A Biography of E.G. White*, Review and Herald, 1983.
20. *The Evening Post*, 29 April 1893.
21. *The New Zealand Mail*, 5 May 1893.
22. Grigg, A.R., *The Attack on the Citadels of Liquor: A Study of the Prohibition Movement in New Zealand, 1894-1914*, unpublished PhD Thesis, Otago University, 1978, p. 72; cf. E. Olsen, 'Towards a New Society,' *The Oxford History of New Zealand*, p. 263; A. R. Grigg, 'Prohibition, the Church and Labour: A Programme for Social Reform, 1890-1914,' *New Zealand Journal of History*, vol. 15, 1981, pp. 135-154.
23. See figures on Church attendance during these years in H. Mol (ed.), *Western Religion: A Country by Country Sociological Inquiry*, Mouton Press, 1972, p. 371.
24. White, E.G., *Testimonies to the Church*, vol. 7, Pacific Press Publishing, 1948, p. 59; E. G. White, *Evangelism*, Review and Herald, 1946, pp. 513-524. The passages referred to were written in 1902.
25. 'Sabbath School Quarterly Reports,' *UCR*, 1 Sept. 1900, p. 6.
26. Goldstone, S. R., *Yesterday-Today in South New Zealand*, Max Printing for the South New Zealand Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1980, pp. 20-23.
27. Minutes, NZCS, 16 Jan. 1901, p. 72.
28. Ponsonby Church Minutes, 12 Oct. 1902.
29. Minutes, NZCS, 15-26 Jan. 1903, p. 110.
30. Minutes, NZCS, 17-31 Jan. 1904, p. 134.
31. *The Evening Post*, 15 Jan. 1906.
32. Newman, R., 'New Zealand's Vote for Prohibition in 1911,' *New Zealand Journal of History*, vol. 9, no. 1, 1975, pp. 52-71.
33. Cobb, S.M., 'The New Zealand Conference,' *UCR*, 17 Feb. 1908, p. 5.
34. 'Prohibition,' *An Encyclopedia of New Zealand*, p. 876.
35. Minutes, NZCS, 13-23 Feb. 1910, pp. 99-100.
36. *The Evening Post*, 24 Feb. 1911; *The New Zealand Times*, 11, 16 Feb. 1911.
37. Pallant, J., 'New Zealand Conference,' *AR*, 20 March 1911, p. 6.
38. Newman, R., 'New Zealand's Vote for Prohibition in 1911,' p. 63.
39. Sharp, I.M., 'Temperance Work in New Zealand,' *AR*, 27 Nov. 1911, p. 6.
40. Pallant, J., *ibid*, p. 4.
41. Butz, E.S., 'The No-License failure in New Zealand,' *AR*, 1 Aug. 1913, p. 7; E. S. Butz, 'No-License Lesson from Invercargill,' *AR*, 29 Sept. 1913, p. 8.
42. Schwartz, G., *Sect Ideologies and Social Status*, The University of Chicago Press, 1970, p. 137; cf. R. Theobald, 'Seventh-day Adventists and the Millennium,' in *A Sociological Yearbook of Religion in Britain*, vol. 7 (ed.) M. Hill, S.C. M., 1974, pp. 126-127.
43. Oosterwal, G., in 'A History of Seventh-day Adventist Mission,' p. 34, has observed that 'SDA missionaries, with very few exceptions, have been reaching out primarily to the Christian populations of the world. And until the late 1960s, some 95 percent of all the converts came from a Christian background...' One is surprised therefore, that New Zealand Adventists should have held so tenaciously to this position.
44. Breward, J., *Godless Schools? A Study of Protestant Reaction to Secular Education in New Zealand*, Christchurch, Presbyterian Bookroom, 1967, pp. 1-36.
45. Morrell, W.P., *The Anglican Church in New Zealand*, Dunedin, 1973, pp. 131-133.
46. O'Conner, P. S., 'Sectarian Conflict in New Zealand, 1911-1920,' *Political Science*, vol. 19, 1967, pp. 3-16.
47. Clifford, J. Ayson, *A Handful of Grain*, vol. 2, 1882-1914, N. Z. Baptists Historical Society, Wellington, 1982, pp. 106-107.
48. *BE*, vol. 12, no. 32, Aug. 1897, p. 256.
49. *The Hawke's Bay Herald*, 12 April 1892; 13 April 1892.
50. Auckland Tract and Missionary Society Minutes, 11 Oct. 1891, p. 48; 10 May, p. 72; 12 July, p. 77; 9 Aug. p. 82; 25 Oct. p. 96; 15 Nov. 1892, p. 99; 4 May, p. 118; 4 Sep. 1893, p. 132; 14 Jan. p. 139; 11 Feb. p. 143; 14 July, p. 160; 14 Oct. 1894, p. 173; 12 May 1895, p. 190; 11 Sept. 1895, p. 206.
51. Epsom Church Sabbath School Minutes, 21, 28 March 1896.
52. Minutes, NZCS, 15-26 Jan., 1903, pp. 98-99.
53. *ibid*. p. 100.
54. Minutes, NZCS, 14-31 Jan. 1904, p. 148.
55. Minutes, NZCS, 24 Jan. 1904, p. 215.
56. Minutes, NZCS, 20 Jan.-5 Feb. 1905, p. 159.
57. Minutes, NZCS, 12-28 Feb. 1906, p. 34. For a discussion of Presbyterian Sabbatarianism, see L. Barber, 'Building New Zealand to Presbyterian Specifications,' in *Religion in New Zealand*, C. Nichol & J. Veitch (eds). Revised edition, Victoria University, 1983, pp. 152-154.
58. Moon, A., 'Religious Liberty association Report,' *General Conference Bulletin*, vol. 1, no. 11, 26 Feb. 1897,

pp. 161-163; *Arguments of the Breckenbridge Sunday Bill; The Object and the price of Exemption Clauses*, The Sentinel Library, Pacific Press Publishing, 1890.

59. 'Kaeo, New Zealand,' *BE*, Oct. 1886, p. 155. Only one other mention of a Sunday labour persecution in New Zealand appears in Adventist literature dating from this time, but it seems that the person alleged was not a Seventh-day Adventist, see W.H. Pascoe, 'New Zealand,' *UCR*, 21 Dec. 1908, p. 3. W.H. Pascoe reported to the 1909 Conference Session that 'he conducted a series of meetings in the township of Cambridge, as it was thought that an interest had been awakened on account of a recent Sunday persecution...but the interest was not what had been expected and the attendance varied very much.' Minutes, NZCS, 1-10 Jan. 1909, p. 75.

60. Passages like *Revelation 12:17, 14:12* and especially *Revelation 13*, featured prominently in this apocalyptic schema.

61. White, E.G. *The Great Controversy*, Review and Herald, 1911 (first edition published in 1888); cf. J. Battistone, *The Great Controversy Theme in E. G. White Writings*; Andrews University Press.

62. S.R. Goldstone to P.H. Ballis, letter, 6 Feb. 1983.

63. Minutes, NZCS, 14-18 Jan. 1906, pp. 256-259, cf. 238-239,

64. Cobb, S.M. 'The New Zealand Conference,' *UCR*, 31 Dec. 1906, pp. 5-6; 'The New Zealand Camp Meeting,' *UCR*, 15 Feb. 1906, p. 5.

65. Minutes, NZCS, 1-10 Jan. 1909; J. Pallant, 'The New Zealand Conference,' *UCR*, 15 Feb. 1909, pp. 5-6; cf. Minutes, NZCS, 9-19 Jan. 1908, pp. 54, 59, 60; S.M. Cobb, 'The New Zealand Conference,' *UCR*, 17 Feb. 1908, pp. 4-5.

66. Goldstone, S.R. *Yesterday-Today in South New Zealand*, p. 67.

67. Caro, E., *AR*, 6 May 1912, p. 67. p. 8-9.

68. Westerman, W.J., 'Wellington, New Zealand,' *AR*, 6 May 1912, pp. 3-4.

69. Pascoe, W.H., 'Auckland, New Zealand,' *AR*, 16 June 1913. C.K. Meyers, 'An Interesting Work,' *AR*, 15 Dec. 1913, p. 3.

70. *Appendix to the Journal of the House of Representatives of New Zealand*, 1914, vol. 3, no. 1, 13B, pp. 32-33.

71. Meyers, C.K., 'An Interesting Work,' *AR*, 15 Dec. 1913, p. 3.

72. *ibid.*

73. *AR*, 15 Sept. 1913, p. 3.

74. See note 71.

75. 'Plea for Secular Education: Address by Mr C. K. Meyers,' *Hawke's Bay Herald*, 2 July 1913, p. 3; 'Bible in Schools Question: Lecture at Napier,' *The Hawke's Bay Tribune*, 2 July 1913, p. 6.

76. 'Bible in Schools: Seventh-day Adventist Against a Referendum,' *The Evening Post*, 17 Jan. 1914; Minutes, NZCS, 15 Jan. 1914, pp. 173-174; W.H. Pascoe, 'The New Zealand Conference,' *AR*, 23 Feb. 1914, pp. 3-5.

77. Seventh-day Adventist began contemplating the possibility of commencing their own schools soon after the Church became established in Australia and New Zealand. At the 1891 General Conference Meeting, S.N. Haskell, the first Adventist evangelist to visit New Zealand, presented his case for a school in Australia. He pointed out that between 15 and 20 New Zealand children were potential candidates for such a school: 'A Plea for An Australian School,' *Daily Bulletin of the General Conference*, March 1891, pp. 39-68. At this time members agreed that Australia was the best location for the school. The first Adventist School was opened in Melbourne in 1892 and soon gave way to the larger complex of Avondale College on the New South Wales coast. However, growing fears from potential dangers posed by the Bible-in-Schools movement encouraged Adventists in New Zealand to seriously consider commencing their own schools in this country. At the 1901 Camp meeting, one delegate candidly remarked that 'the call "come out of her My people"... includes the withdrawal of our children from public Schools' Minutes, NZCS, 21 Nov.-9 Dec. 1901, p. 85. The Bible-in-Schools movement was the circumstantial catalyst for New Zealand Adventists to launch into their parochial school system. Between 1901 and 1910, eight Schools were commenced in New Zealand, although most of these were short-lived.

78. *Appendix to the Journals of the House of Representatives of New Zealand*, vol. 3, I-13B 1914, pp. 32, 51.

79. O'Connor, P. S., 'Storm over the Clergy - New Zealand 1917,' in *Journal of Religious History*, vol. 4, no. 2, 1966, p. 129.

80. 'Military Drill in the Schools,' *UCR*, 1 Feb. 1901, p. 16.

81. Minutes, NZCS, 9-19 Jan. 1908, pp. 50-60; S.M. Cobb, 'The New Zealand Conference,' *UCR*, 17 Feb. 1908, pp. 4-5.

82. Pallant, J., 'The New Zealand Conference,' *UCR*, 15 Feb. 1909, p. 5-6; Minutes, NZCS, 1-10 Jan. 1909.

83. Minutes, NZCS, 7-20 Feb. 1911, p. 125.

84. *ibid.* pp. 125-126.

85. Muegge, J., 'Imprisoned for Conscience Sake,' *AR*, 7 Oct. 1912, p. 2.

86. Fulton, J. E., 'Military Training,' *AR*, 5 June 1911, pp. 6-7.

87. *ibid.* p. 6.

88. For detail on SDAs and the American Civil War, see P. Brock, *Pacifism in the United States: From Colonial Era to the First World War*, Princeton University Press, 1968, pp. 862-891; 'The Problem of the Civil War: When Seventh-day Adventists First Faced War,' *AH*, vol. 1, no. 1, 1974, pp. 23-27; R. Graybill, 'This Perplexing War: Why Adventists Avoided Military Service in the Civil War,' *Insight*, 10 Oct. 1978, pp. 3-8; W.C. White, D.E. Robinson and A.L. White, 'The Spirit of Prophecy and Military Service,' unpublished MS, E.G. White Estate, Cooranbong, Aust; N. Bulzis, 'The Challenge of Wartime Service,' *RH*, 17 Feb. 1983, pp. 6-7; N. Bulzis, 'Adventists and Non-

Combatancy,' *RH*, 24 Feb. 1983, pp. 6-8; F.M. Wilcox, *Seventh-day Adventists in Time of War*, Review and Herald Publishing, 1936, pp. 55-67; E. Syme, *A History of SDA Church-State Relations in the United States*, Pacific Press Publishing, 1973, pp. 69-78.

89. R.L. Weitzel, 'Pacifists and Anti-Militarists in New Zealand, 1900-1914,' *New Zealand Journal of History*, vol. 7, 1973, pp. 128-147.

90. *ibid.*, p. 136.

91. *AR*, 28 Sept. 1914; W.J. Wilson, *The History of Seventh-day Adventist Education in Australia and New Zealand*, unpublished MS, p. 217.

92. O'Connor, P. S., 'The Awkward Ones—Dealing With Conscience, 1916-1918,' *New Zealand Journal of History*, vol. 4, 1974, pp. 118-136; 'Storm Over the Clergy—New Zealand, 1917,' *Journal of Religious History*, vol. 4, 1966, pp. 129-148.

93. PD, CLXXV, 1916, p. 646.

94. W.H. Pascoe to J.A. Allen, 26 Feb. 1917, WArc, File AD Series 82, 4.5/5.

95. Watson, C.H., *A Call for Liberty in the Present Crisis*, nd, Signs Publishing Company, p. 12.

96. *The Dominion*, 16 Feb. 1917; Minutes, NZCS, 18 Jan. 1917, p. 238; Edendale Church Minutes, 2 Dec. 1916; 17, 21 Feb. 1917.

97. Anderson, A.W. *Religious Liberty in Australasia*; Warbuton, Signs Publishing Company, 1917, p. 40 ff; *Seventh-day Adventists' Attitude to Warfare...*, Auckland, Wilkinson Printer, 1917; *Seventh-day Adventists and War: An Official Declaration*, Auckland, Morton and Turner Printers, 1918.

98. J. A. Allen to W.H. Pascoe, 10 April 1917, WArc, File AD Series 1, 10/407.1, part 2; Memorandum for the Minister of Defence, 2 April 1917, WArc, File AD series 82, 4.5/5.

99. R.W. Tate to the Major General, 2 April 1917, WArc, File AD Series 82, 4.5/5.

100. *ibid.*

101. G.M. Gibbon, Memorandum for the Minister of Defence, 3 May 1917. At least one soldier named 'Robinson' was being court martialled at Trentham, for refusing ambulance duties on a Saturday because he claimed he was a Seventh-day Adventist. It was later discovered that Robinson belonged to a movement known as 'The Lord Jesus Christ,' see Memorandum, 15 Feb. 1917, AD Series 1, 10/407, box 784.

102. *The Evening Post*, 13 June 1917.

103. Memorandum for the Adjunct-General, 11 May 1918, WArc, AD series 1, 10/407.

104. Anderson, A.W., 'Religious Liberty department,' *AR*, 21 Oct. 1918, p. 12.

105. For a detailed discussion on Seventh-day Adventist interpretations of World War I, see G. Land, 'The Perils of Prophecy: Seventh-day Adventists Interpret World War One,' *AH*, vol. 1, no. 1, 1974, pp. 28-33, 55-56; J. Butler,

'The Morning Newspaper and the Book of Daniel,' *AH*, vol. 1, no. 1, 1974, pp. 45-48; H.B. Weeks, *Adventist Evangelism in the Twentieth Century*, Review and Herald, 1969, pp. 74-83; E.K. Vande Vere, *Windows—Selected Readings in Seventh-day Adventist Church History, 1844-1922*, pp. 285-294.

106. Brock, P., 'The Problem of the Civil War,' p. 27.

107. Schwarz, R.W. *Light Bearers to the Remnant*, Mountain View, Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1979, p. 424.

108. Weeks, H.B., *Adventist Evangelism in the Twentieth Century*, p. 81; 'Adventist writers and evangelists alike were sure that, guided by inspiration, they knew the meaning of world events and were ready to inform the public.' J. Butler, 'The Morning Newspaper and the Book of Daniel,' p. 46.

109. See summaries of C.K. Meyers' talks in the Edendale Church Minutes, 17, 31 Feb. 1917.

110. Olson, A.V., *Thirteen Crisis Years, 1888-1901*, revised edition, Review and Herald, 1981.

111. Potok, C., *In the Beginning*, Heinemann, 1975, p. 3: 'All beginnings are hard...especially a beginning that you make by yourself. That's the hardest beginning of all.'

112. Breward, J., *Religion in New Zealand*, Presbyterian Historical Society, 1979, p. 2.

113. Newman, R., 'New Zealand's Vote for Prohibition in 1911,' p. 66.

114. Olsen, E., 'Toward a New Society,' in *The Oxford History of New Zealand*, p. 263, writes that the prohibition and Bible-in-Schools League were attempts by Churches to 'improve standards of worldly morality.' One must not misconstrue from this that groups like the Seventh-day Adventists who challenged the League were thereby affirming 'worldly morality'!

115. Weber, M., 'Sect, Church and Democracy,' in *Society and Economy*, Bedmister Press, 1968, pp. 1208-1209, emphasis supplied.

116. Edendale Church Minutes, 28, 30 March, 4 April 1914; cf. 25 May 1915.

117. Sinclair, K., *History of New Zealand*, revised edition, Penguin Books, 1980, p. 245.

118. Seventh-day Adventists as reported in the New Zealand Census:

	Total Membership	% Increase	% Population
1906	990	14.58	0.11
1911	1113	12.42	0.11
1916	1534	37.48	0.14
1921	2224	44.79	0.18
1926	2273	29.18	0.21

(Source: The New Zealand Census, 'Religions of the People.')

119. 'Seventh-day Adventists Protest,' *The Dominion*, 31 July 1936.

In the Wake of the *Pitcairn*— Establishing Adventism in the South Pacific Islands

by Alexander S. Currie

Adventist history in the South Pacific is “partly a lesson in oceanography.”¹

Oceania covers one-third of the earth’s surface but has less than 1 percent of its population. It is a “watery continent dotted with thousands of scattered bits of land,” the home of less than six million people.² Seventh-day Adventist concern for Pacific people is first observed when James White and John Loughborough “sent a friendly letter and a box of literature” to Pitcairn Island in 1876.³ John I. Tay, an American Adventist layman, read a book concerning the “Bounty mutineers,” worked his passage to Tahiti, and found a ship to take him to Pitcairn.⁴ On 18 October, 1886, Tay landed on Pitcairn, and spent five weeks instructing people in the beliefs of Adventists. When he left the island, most had been converted, and everyone was worshipping on Saturday.

Returning to California, Tay aroused Adventist interest in Pitcairn Island, and the General Conference voted to build a ship to facilitate missionary travel in the South Seas. A 100-foot schooner named *Pitcairn* was dedicated and set sail on 20 October, 1890.⁵ The ship arrived at Pitcairn on 25 November, and after three weeks of intensive instruction 82 adults were baptized and

the first Seventh-day Adventist church was organized in the Pacific.⁶ H. L. Shapiro comments that “the entire community was baptized, and a rich fare of theology was easily digested by the communicants.”⁷ When the mission ship sailed for Tahiti on 17 December three islanders, James R. McCoy, his sister Mary Anne, and Haywood Christian, were on board as the first indigenous Adventist missionaries in the South Pacific.⁸ Their presence enabled American Adventist missionaries to have a greater impact, particularly on Norfolk Island, where Jane Quintal, McCoy’s sister, opened her home for Gates to preach the first Adventist sermon. James McCoy’s missionary experience contributed in giving him a new sense of purpose, direction, and leadership.⁹ When the mission ship returned to Pitcairn in 1892, having visited the major Polynesian Islands, Norfolk Island, Australia, and New Zealand, the leader declared:

We need a training school on Pitcairn... These young people can do a great work in the South Pacific. They can go as missionaries to other islands, but they need training. And for that they need a teacher.¹⁰

Gates began a school on Pitcairn in 1892 with a curriculum that concentrated on Bible, history, and grammar. During the 1890s the *Pitcairn* made six voyages to the South Seas carrying successive waves of American and national missionaries to the Pacific Islands.¹¹

People movements in the South Pacific witnessed thousands accepting Christianity, and the need for indigenous Christian ministry high-

Alexander S. Currie, senior pastor of the Wahroonga church, near Sydney, Australian Adventism’s largest congregation, graduated from Andrews University with both an M. A. and Ed.D. Twelve of his 20 years as a minister and an educator, were devoted to theological education in Australia, New Guinea, and Fiji.

lighted the necessity for theological education. Such education evolved slowly. Missionaries, including Seventh-day Adventists, initially utilized the home as the centre for theological training. Eventually schools with an emphasis on theology were established in most Pacific countries. Early Adventist theological educational methods and approaches paralleled that of most Pacific Protestant churches.


Like many other mission organizations, Adventists developed Australia and New Zealand as home bases for Pacific operations.

The spread of Adventism across the Pacific in only 22 years is remarkable, particularly in view of the fact that the Australasian Union Conference took over the superintendency for mission advancement in 1901 with a membership of only

3,000.¹² We must recognize, however, that consolidation of Adventism in much of Melanesia and all of Micronesia did not occur until after the second world war.

It is not surprising therefore that Adventism in the Pacific, with limited financial and human resources, took time to establish itself in some Pacific cultures. The Adventist church in the United States possessed far greater resources than the Australasian church, and when the Pacific region was given to the Australasian church in 1901 it experienced this loss. The *Pitcairn* that had plied the Pacific for 10 years no longer serviced the small missionary force with literature, supplies, or human resources. This situation had its psychological impact on expatriate missionaries as well as new converts. The question was "Is

Advancement of Seventh-day Adventist Missions in the South Pacific Islands



Note: While the movement of 19th century Protestant missions tended to expand outward in all directions from centers such as Samoa and the Society Islands, Adventism in the late 19th century moved east to west, from Pitcairn Island toward Australia and New Zealand.

Adventism going to survive in the Pacific without its own transportation link?" Survive it did. However, there was obviously a period of adjustment and perhaps waning of influence experienced by those on the defunct *Pitcairn* route.

Due to the smallness of Oceania's islands, the vast distances separating them, and "their comparatively sparse populations, mission stations tend to be more isolated from the rest of the world than are those even in 'darkest Africa.'" ¹³ Therefore, most denominations, except the Anglican church, educated their converts for church work in their own cultural context. Like other denominations, Seventh-day Adventists prepared indigenous converts for church work in their own island context. Very few Seventh-day Adventists ventured outside their familiar cultural environment for education; those who did attended Healdsburg College in California or Avondale College in New South Wales.

Adventist theological education followed the east-west pattern established by the London Missionary Society and Methodists, except in the Western Pacific where Seventh-day Adventists advanced in the following order: Papua (1908), New Hebrides (1912), Solomon Islands (1914), Bougainville (1924), New Caledonia (1925), New Guinea (1929), Gilbert and Ellis (1947).

Pioneer Adventists invested heavily in personnel and financial resources to establish educational foundations during this period for what has become one of the largest independent school systems in Oceania. In 1918 missionaries had established a small chain of "missionary schools" for training indigenous gospel workers for the Pacific. This chain developed into a system that in 1984 operated 198 primary schools, 15 high schools, and three colleges. In 1984 a total of 14,468 students were attending these schools. ¹⁴ Bible remains the essential core of the curriculum for Pacific Adventist education, which has educated thousands of Pacific Islanders. Children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren of those educated have occupied and occupy important government, private, and church positions. Investment in theological education therefore has reaped beneficial dividends for families and the church.

By 1918 most island clusters from Pitcairn to Papua New Guinea boasted at least one Protestant training school. These schools provided a general education, often with an industrial and agricultural bias, but curricula emphasis was theological. ¹⁵ The purpose of the schools was not merely to provide general education but to produce students who could preach and teach in their own cultural environment and serve as missionaries abroad. Between 1892 and 1918 Adventists opened schools in all major island groups between Pitcairn Island and Fiji, as well as a home school in the Solomons, and a small one in Papua. Their curriculum of general education, practical industrial skills, and theology, was much like other Protestant schools except for doctrinal differences. With Adventist interest in healthful living, health education was emphasized, particularly on Pitcairn. Centralized theological education for most Protestant churches did not emerge until after the second world war. ¹⁶

By 1918 most Christian villages had their own pastor-teachers who were usually nonordained

Many early Pacific traders and the occasional missionary lived somewhat dissolute lives. Adventists sailed into the region proclaiming abstinence from alcohol and smoking, and advocating a healthy, balanced life-style.

congregational leaders. The pastor-teacher became a highly respected village leader. Exact statistics are elusive for 1918, but estimates would suggest that between five and six thousand indigenous spiritual leaders served their Pacific churches with less than half a percent of that number ordained. ¹⁷

Many early Pacific traders and the occasional missionary lived somewhat dissolute lives. ¹⁸ Adventists sailed into the region proclaiming abstinence from alcohol and smoking, and advocating a healthy, balanced life-style. This harmonious integration of the physical, mental, social, and spiritual became the hallmark of Adventist education and life-style. ¹⁹ Part of that life-style,

unfortunately, meant Westernization, evidenced by early photographs of male converts living in tropical conditions dressed in heavy woollen suits. Nevertheless, a result of early Adventist education throughout the Pacific is the clean living and healthy life-style practiced by most Pacific Adventists today.

Although Adventists were the first missionar-

ies to take Christianity to Pitcairn Island, Atchin,²⁰ and the first to enter portions of Papua New Guinea,²¹ they recognize with gratitude and respect all Christian missionaries for other denominations who pioneered the major portion of the Pacific for Christ. These men and women, expatriate and indigenous, achieved great success.

It appears Adventists institutionalized too

Adventists Lead South Pacific Governments

by Raymond L. Coombe

At least 20 Seventh-day Adventists in the South Pacific are politicians and members of the national parliament, with several holding important ministries in the cabinet. Scores are serving in local provincial governments, one as a Premier. Many more hold important responsibilities in high positions of the public civil service. While I know of no Adventists in federal or state politics in Australia or New Zealand, in the recently independent island nations of the South Pacific Adventists are participating in a sense of national pride and a growing consciousness of social and civic responsibility.

Why have so many Adventists entered public life? One reason is the high ratio of membership to population. For the island territories as a whole the ratio is down to 1 in 42, going as low as one in nine for the Western Solomon Islands Mission.

Another reason for the prominence of Adventists in government is the strong emphasis given to education in the 100 years since Adventists founded a training school on Pitcairn Island. Many of the brightest and most promising graduates from post-secondary tertiary institutions, such as Fulton and Sonoma Colleges, and from secondary schools, did not stay in denominational employment for long, but found employment and wider experience "outside the work," including standing for elective office.

Thirdly, Adventist involvement in health and temperance, education, women's affairs, Adventist Development and Relief and youth programs have meant that members have had the kind of experience that allows them to rise quickly to the top of service departments in the island governments.

In 1986, the president of the South Pacific Division, Walter Scragg, decided the church should sponsor seminars in the three Union Mission territories for Adventists in

government. Almost 70 Adventists in government and politics attended three seminars. The first was held in Suva, Fiji. The second seminar was conducted in Honiara, capital of the Solomon Islands, and the third in Port Moresby for Papua New Guinea. Another series of seminars is now planned for 1989. Adventists at these seminars indicated a keen sense of commitment and individual responsibility. They made it clear that they want the church to be more vocal on moral and ethical issues which face these developing countries. While the level of commitment to the church varies among Adventist politicians, many are involved in the church, and some are zealously evangelistic.

In the Cook Islands two Adventists are prominent members of Parliament, one being the Minister of Education and Public Service, and the other the leader of the House. Manuela Puna has been Clerk of Parliament in the Cook Islands since 1980, a position of considerable importance in the British parliamentary system inherited from New Zealand. Recently, Manuela gave advice on introducing a bill controlling the sale, advertising, and use of tobacco and helped to steer it successfully through the parliament.

Another faithful Adventist, Maine Brown, is the Executive Officer for the Cook Island Government. He frequently travels with the Prime Minister as an executive secretary. Sometimes there is a problem with Sabbath observance, but now the Prime Minister understands his situation and they usually locate the nearest Adventist church before Sabbath and he is allowed freedom from all engagements. The Prime Minister also tells hosts that Maine Brown does not take alcohol, tea, or coffee. "Unfortunately," says Maine, "it is embarrassing to come across other Adventists who compromise their principles."

Tonga as a kingdom with the feudal system of nobility, does not afford much opportunity for Adventist involvement as in the independent democracies. However, several church members now fill important public service positions, including Deputy Collector of Customs, a superintendent for planning and training in the Ministry of Police, and the aide-de-camp for the palace.

Although Seventh-day Adventists hold no political of-

Raymond L. Coombe is the director of the public affairs and religious liberty department of the South Pacific Division.

early in some countries, failing to establish a theologically educated indigenous following. Where Adventists depended on medical institutions such as those in the Cook Islands, Samoa, and medical activities in Tonga, this appears to have delayed church growth and theological education. Where Adventists translated and printed literature, learned the vernacular, and established schools,

theological education flourished. Countries where Adventist missionaries instructed theologically, equipping nationals for witnessing and missionary work, appear to have rooted in Adventism quickly. Examples include Pitcairn, Fiji, and the Solomons. Exceptions include Papua.

John Garrett observes that "diffusion of Christianity has been largely by the contacts of Island-

fice in Western Samoa, a few have responsibilities in public service, including an executive in the Prime Minister's office, and the director of finance for the Tokelau Islands.

As a French colonial dependency, Tahiti or French Polynesia has limited local participation in government, but three Adventists are councillors in the territorial assembly.

Until the military coup in 1987, the independent Commonwealth country of Fiji had Seventh-day Adventists in very prominent government positions. Perhaps the best-known were Lavinia and Jim Ah Koy from Suva. Lavinia Ah Koy served as secretary to the constitutional conventions even before Fiji became an independent country. Not coincidentally, the constitution provided that parliament not meet on the weekends. Later, she served as secretary to the nation's new parliament and then became secretary to the cabinet. Her husband, Jim, has been a member of parliament.

Other Adventists in high places in Fiji have included: Masi Latianara, private executive secretary to the former governor general, Ratu Sir Penaia Ganilau; David Pickering, the general manager of the Fiji Electricity Authority, Minister for Tourism and member for West (Lautoka) in the House of Representatives; Dr. Isireli Lasaga who was formerly registrar for the University of the South Pacific in Suva; Josateki Nailati, assistant director in the Ministry of Health; and Rusiati Vulii, registrar of the Supreme Court. After the military coup and during the time of the interim government, many of these folks continued to play very important roles during the critical period of political instability. Even in the new Republic of Fiji, Seventh-day Adventists are well respected and continue to serve in public positions.

The Tuvalu government includes an example of the young educated Adventists who have left denominational employment and now serve in Government. Afaese Manoa is a departmental head in the Ministry of Finance. He was involved in Tuvalu's Constitution Review Committee and contributed to the inclusion of the "Freedom of Belief" clause which is now embodied in Section 23 of the Constitution.

In Vanuatu, (formerly New Hebrides) political awareness among Adventists is possibly at its height. It was in the north on Espiritu Santo, that Jimmy Stevens, a former

Adventist from Tonga, led a rebellion in 1979. Although Adventists were not generally involved, many church members in the north were somewhat sympathetic and disenchanted with the government in the south, led by a former Anglican priest, Father Walter Lini. Subsequently, while in prison, Jimmy Stevens received Bible studies and has counselled all his former followers to accept the Seventh-day Adventist mission. Although the church continues to maintain strict neutrality, before the November 1987 election, a whole new political party called the New People's Party was formed, consisting primarily of young Seventh-day Adventists. Interestingly enough, in the outcome of the election, five Adventists who actually gained seats in the National Parliament represented three different political parties. Only one is in the governing Vanuaku Party, the other four are in the opposition. Many others are involved in local government authorities.

In the Solomon Islands Seventh-day Adventists are also assuming a greater profile in public life. Four Seventh-day Adventists are currently members of the national parliament, and all hold important ministries in the Cabinet, including Education, Telecommunication, Aviation and Transport, Agriculture and Land. Almost 20 others are members of provincial assemblies. In the Western Province 10 out of the 30 seats are held by Adventists. Jonathan Paia, a faithful Adventist in Honiara, is secretary to the Prime Minister. Recently, some brutal killings led the cabinet to consider reintroduction of the death penalty, and Adventist politicians urged the church to offer guidance on the issue.

The political scene in Papua New Guinea is constantly changing. Prior to last year's national elections no fewer than 14 members of the National Parliament were listed as Seventh-day Adventists, and some 20 others were members of provincial governments. At times, some have held cabinet ministries and it is well known in Papua New Guinea that just before his death, Deputy Prime Minister Mr. Iambaki Okuk, (a radical highlander) accepted the Adventist faith, the faith of his wife.

With so many Adventists leading their nations, the principles of religious freedom and tolerance, the need for justice and fairness in the exercise of power, and the importance of maintaining the separation of church and state are vital as never before.

ers with Islanders in everyday life."²² The chapel at Pacific Theological College is dedicated to Pacific Island missionaries who witnessed for God and their churches in foreign island territories.²³ More than 1,000 missionaries plus their wives and

families are recorded. Hundreds more left their own tribes to evangelize other tribes.

By 1987, 97 years after the first indigenous Pacific Island ministers were appointed, there were 146,125 adult baptized members.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. John Garrett, *To Live Among the Stars* (Suva, Fiji: W. C. C. Publications, 1982), p. xi. Garrett uses this phrase to refer to Pacific Christian history.
2. William L. Needham and Susan R. Seldomridge, *Status of Christianity Profile Oceania* (Lausanne: International Congress on World Evangelization, July 1974), p. 1.
3. Arthur Whitefield Spalding, *Origin and History of Seventh-day Adventists* (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1962), vol. 2, p. 316.
4. Arthur S. Maxwell, *Under the Southern Cross* (Nashville, Tenn.: Southern Publishing Association, 1966), p. 97; E. H. Gates, *In Coral Isles* (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1923), p. 14.
5. *Review and Herald* (14 October 1890), p. 636.
6. E. H. Gates, Pitcairn Log, pp. 54-62; *Review and Herald* (3 March 1891), pp. 139-141.
7. Harry L. Shapiro, *The Heritage of the Bounty* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1936), p. 129.
8. *Review and Herald* (3 March 1891), p. 141.
9. Robert B. Nicolson, *The Pitcairners* (Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1965), p. 171.
10. Alta H. Christensen, *Heirs of Exile...The Story of Pitcairn Island Paradise of the Pacific* (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1955), p. 240.
11. Spalding, *Origin and History*, vol. 2, pp. 316, 317; Christensen, *Heirs of Exile*, pp. 185-240; Norman A. Ferris, *The Story of Pitcairn Island* (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1957), pp. 99-107; Gates, *In Coral Isles*, pp. 14-59; A. G. Steward, *Trophies From Cannibal Isles* (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1956), pp. 23-36; Pitcairn Log, pp. 153-191.
12. *SDA Encyclopedia*, rev. ed., s.v. "Australasian Division."
13. Yorke Allen, *A Seminary Survey* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1960), p. 130.
14. Australasian Union Conference *Record* (13 July 1985), Supplement.
15. Forman, "Theological Education," p. 156.
16. *Ibid.*, pp. 156, 157.
17. Charles W. Forman, "The South Pacific Style in the Christian Ministry," *Missiology: An International Review*, 2(1974): 421-435.
18. John Garrett, *To Live Among the Stars*, pp. 16, 21, 36, 43, 108, 125, 141-143, 150-151, 208, 216-217, 231, 270-271, 281, 296.
19. E. M. Cadwallader, *Principles of Education in the Writings of Ellen G. White* (Payson, Ariz.: Leaves of Autumn Books, n.d.); Raymond S. Moore, *Adventist Education at the Crossroads* (Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press, 1976).
20. *SDA Encyclopedia*, rev. ed., s.v. "New Hebrides." Norman and Alma Wiles, graduates of Avondale College, pioneered Atchin.
21. *Ibid.*, s.v. "Papua New Guinea." Emira and Mussau Islands are examples. Chapman, "Seventh-day Adventist Education." Forman, *Island Church*, p. 53, cites Adventists as "the first mission to station workers in some areas" of the Solomons.
22. Garrett, *To Live Among the Stars*, p. xi.
23. Charles W. Forman "The Missionary Force of the Pacific Island Churches," *International Review of Missions*, 59 (1970): 215-226.

Colin Cook Responds

To the Editors: There are times when I have been utterly appalled and astonished at what has befallen me and my family over the last one-and-a-half years. I cannot deny that God called me in 1976 to speak of what happened to my homosexual condition as I learned to receive Jesus' wholeness by faith. Since then it has been a growing "from strength to strength" (Ps. 84).

All the sexual wrongs described in the *LA Times*, the *Reading Times*, *Spectrum*, and various gay and other media took place prior to more than three years ago. Two-and-a-half years ago I reentered counseling for myself at the urging of colleagues. That led to the final end of a remaining homosexual addictive pattern in September, 1986, over one-and-a-half years ago—one month before the Lawson report.

There has been no return to homosexual behavior or inappropriate physical intimacy in any form. All vestiges of male fantasy have gone and my marital intimacy with the bosom friend of my life has wonderfully deepened. I am experiencing the fulfillment of what I wrote about in *Insight* in 1976, as I was experiencing by faith its gentle beginnings.

That God found it necessary to bring this great trial upon me to complete my deliverance from homosexuality, has stunned me and left me bereaved. I have joined with Jeremiah in his lament: "The Lord brought grief upon me because of my many sins." "All my splendor has departed," because "filthiness clung to me and I did not consider my future." I have been in "torment within" and have "poured out my heart like water in the presence of the Lord." "I have been deprived of peace and forgotten what prosperity is. So I say, my splendor is gone and all that I had hoped for from the Lord."

(Jesus, now I know something of what it was for You to be utterly shamed before everyone in church and town, for You to be misunderstood and thought a criminal. Now, I know, Lord, what it is to enter into your sufferings, as you enter also into mine and I comfort You as You comfort me.)

But I believe we should all mark this: Quest did not fall because of the revelations of a mere human. "Who can speak and have it happen if the Lord has not decreed it? Is it not from the Lord that both calamities and good things come?" It is God that "hurled down the splendor of" Quest. Even those who oppose homosexual healing are instruments in God's hands to bring about its proclamation. It appears that I have become an omen. When I learned to walk in the way of Jesus as my righteousness I prospered. But when I took my eyes off Jesus, I was covered with shame. God shows no partiality. He will dishonor whatever he has set up if truth no longer possesses it. I believe all men

should be warned by my experience: the struggling homosexuals desiring to be free are the poor in spirit, and theirs is the kingdom of heaven. But those who are satisfied with their homosexuality and argue for its acceptance dishonor the image of Himself that God gave them and will ultimately be covered with shame, as I am, because they made a pact with the Lie. Kinship's time will come. May they be able to discern the events in order to escape.

Yet I am not disheartened. The bush burns, but it is not consumed. Beyond my window the forsythia bloom again; so, too, the daffodils, and the time for the greening of the trees. And "this I call to mind and therefore I have hope; Because of the Lord's great love I am not consumed." "The Lord is good to those whose hope is in Him, to the one who seeks Him." "It is good for a man to be near the yoke. Let Him sit alone in silence, for the Lord has laid it on Him. Let Him bury His face in the dust—there may yet be hope. Let Him offer his cheek to one who would strike Him and let Him be filled with disgrace."

For in all this living death, the gentle blade of resurrection springs forth. And when the storm of lawsuits and vitriol has settled, and the lust for anger turns in upon itself, and the air becomes fresh and quiet again, the question, forgotten in the cacophony will be heard once more: "What does Jesus do for the homosexual?" like the soft insistence of cow-bells on the Swiss mountains, but now with larger appeal comes the answer. "Jesus loves the homosexual; Jesus saves the homosexual; Jesus sets the homosexual free."

Colin D. Cook
Birdsboro, Pennsylvania

The General Conference Move

To the Editors: I was shocked when I read in *Spectrum* (Vol. 18, No. 2) that the cost of moving the General Conference headquarters will be \$25+ million (the architect has given estimates as high as \$32 million!). This means this move of the General Conference and Review and Herald will cost us \$25-32 million more than the \$14 million proceeds from the sale of the present General Conference and Review facilities (It cost us \$13.5 million to replace the publishing house with its new facility in Hagerstown, Maryland.).

This would have been a most appropriate time to consider other locations outside the Washington/Baltimore area, such as Houston/Dallas/Fort Worth, where developers are selling newly-built office buildings at "fire-sale" prices because of a downturn in the oil economy and over-building. Following so closely upon the Harris Pine pseudo-

'bankruptcy," this \$25-35 million dollar cost overrun on the new General Conference headquarters can only serve to raise serious questions about the competence of those who are making these decisions. Remember, these are the men who promised us that the proceeds from the "valuable" Takoma Park properties would provide adequate funds to build new facilities. No additional funding would be necessary!

I was further shocked to learn that plans for the new General Conference headquarters building include increasing the size of the headquarters from the 187,000 square feet in the present buildings to 300,000 square feet — a 60 percent increase in space!

We may be certain that principles which are well-known in the corporate world would apply at the General Conference as well. Robert Townsend, former chairman of Avis, says in his book, *Up The Organization*, that "too little is almost always better than too much (p. 187)." Townsend relates how he resisted efforts to increase space at Avis headquarters beyond 30,000 square feet (1/10 the size of the proposed General Conference building!), and only allowed "units with a profit center of their own" to move outside the headquarters building when space became a real problem. Such a careful use of space allows greater flexibility during periods of economic "contraction" (recessions and depressions), as well as during periods of economic expansion. We may be certain that increasing space by 60+ percent will lead to increases in staff at the General Conference.

I do not know how "the brethren" in Washington can justify such extravagant expansion plans during a time when there is a clear desire on the part of our membership around the world for a streamlined staff and more efficient operation at the General Conference headquarters. That was the whole purpose of the reorganization plan adopted at the 1985 General Conference Session at New Orleans. Have a few of "the brethren" at headquarters now decided that they possess greater wisdom in this matter than the 1,853 assembled representatives of the world church at New Orleans who adopted the plan for streamlining church structure?

It is clearly inexcusable for this denomination to spend more (25.3+ percent of the tithe dollar in 1980) for administrative and promotional personnel in local, union, division and General Conference offices than the amount we spend (24.8 percent in 1980) for pastors, evangelists, Bible workers or other personnel in the field. Denominational leaders will acknowledge, when pressed, that this denomination has become overloaded in administrative personnel, but I doubt they are even aware that we have developed the largest religious bureaucracy in the world on a per capita of membership basis! Now we see evidence which suggests that there may soon be an even larger bureaucracy at the world headquarters as staff will expand to fill available space.

Many members of the church are coming to the conclusion that the only way to counteract the present policies

which have resulted in a "bloated bureaucracy" is to find a way to "starve it down to size". Some have suggested that we need a constitutional provision at all levels of church organization limiting administrative budgets, using the tithe of a tithe principle. The local conference administrative budget would be limited to a tithe of the tithe of the churches. Each level of administration beyond the local conference would receive amounts equal to 1/10th of the administrative budgets of its supporting organizations. This would limit the size of each level of administration and would cut administrative cost by about 55 percent—from 25 percent of tithe to about 11 percent of tithe. Under such a policy, in 1986 my local conference would have been allocated an administrative budget of \$450,000, my union, Southern New England, the Atlantic Union would have received \$290,000, the North American Division would have received \$338,000, and the General Conference \$500,000. If the General Conference had only \$500,000 available in its administrative budget, it would certainly run more efficiently and there would be no need for a 300,000 square-foot headquarters building!

Unless the elected leadership of this denomination shows leadership in dealing with this problem, we may soon see our people taking matters into their own hands. It is no accident that sentiments for a more congregational form of church government are growing in direct proportion to the growth of the bureaucracy.

Wayne Willey
Pastor
Amesbury, Massachusetts

To the Editors: Pastor Neal Wilson (whom I respect) has been a power broker for at least 18 years and has been General Conference president almost 10. The system makes it too easy to focus power in the hands of too few people for too long a period. This stifles reinvigoration by both new leaders and perspectives. Without a valid checks and balances, the General Conference serves no more effectively than a Pope or a Politburo. Even the appointed-for-life U.S. Supreme Court has two counterbalances: the executive and legislative branches of the federal government.

In Adventism we see a religious bureaucracy bouncing from one financial/theological pinch to another, thanking God for getting them through by the skin of their teeth, when sound management forethought may have prevented crises in the first place. The move of the General Conference was an example of how the General Conference skates along the edge. Sadly, unions and conferences will see no need to act differently. There will always be inherent problems when the church is too centralized.

Michael Angelo Saucedo
Los Angeles, California

Spectrum Advisory Council

Delmar and Cheree Aitken
Floyd and Charlene Andersen
Ted Benedict
Charles and Julie Bensonhaver
Doug Bertleson
Viveca Black
Larry Botimer
Joseph and Cynthia Bozovich
Bernard and Neridah Brandstater
Bruce and Betty Branson
Roy Branson
Floyd and Mary Brauer
M.L.S. Brown
Morris Brusett
Robert and Marilyn Burman
Harold Campbell
B.H. Carson
Glenn and Judy Coe
Douglas Collins
Patricia Cople
Molleurus and Dos Couperus
William and Judy Cowling
John and Anna Mae Crowder
Eryl Cummings
Raymond Damazo
Merlyn C. Duerksen
James and Mary Dunn
Elwin Dunn
Thomas and Bonnie Dwyer
Richard and Juanita Engel
Rene and Mary Evard
Walt and Lois Fahlsing
James and Erika Fallbeck
Joy and Gerald Fuller
G. Elaine Giddings
Gary Gilbert
David and Joyce Grauman
Sanford Graves
Octavian Gregorescu
John Griffen
Paul Gruzensky
William Hafner, Jr.

Gordon and Nadine Hale
F.E.J. Harder
Jon Hardt
Milford and Cheryl Harrison
Robert and Sally Hasselbrack
John Hodgkin
Jerry and Ketty Holt
Wilfred and Margaret Huse
Fil Inocencio
John and Marjorie Jacobson
Bernard and Dorothy Johnson
Eugene and Liv Joergenson
Gail Kendall
Elton and Marga Kerr
William and Dorane King
Richard and Claire Knierim
Alice Koelsch
Edward and Ruth Komarniski
Albert and Elizabeth Koppel
Doreen and Irwin Kuhn
Alvin and Verla Kwiram
Melvin and Karen Lake
Robert and Anita Lang
Fred Lee
Andrew Leonie, III
Charles and Rae Lindsay
Bradley and Roberta Litchfield
Ewald Lonser
Felix Lorenz
Richard and Heidi Ludders
Edward and Marilyn Lugenbeal
Robert and Marguerite Marsh
Temple G. Matthews, III
Donald McAdams
Kenneth and Irene McGill
W.M. Meek
Mario and Viginia Mendoza
Ken and Mary Moe
Robert and Jacqueline Moncrieff
Barton Moore
Lyla Neumann
N.W. Northey

Daniel and Marilyn Patchin
Daniel Paulien
Thomas and Sharon Pellow
Ernest and Cecelia Plata
Zane Price
Winslow and Verna Randall
Alfredo and Martha Rasi
Alvin and Carol Ratzlaff
Robert Rausch
Walter Rea
Merlin and Arlene Reeder
Barbara Renschler
Gordon Rick
William and Anieta Rippey
E. Arthur Robertson
Wayne Rohming
Jan and Patricia Rushing
James and Thais Sadoyama
James Sands
Michael and Shelly Saucedo
Michael Scofield
Donald and Ursula Shasky
Gordon and Lovina Short
Walter and Lula Ann Stilson
Gerhard Svrcek-Seiler
Dennis and Jodi Swena
Leonard and Carlene Taylor
James Thomas
Dort and Nancy Tikker
Lorna Tobler
Darwin and Faye Tompkins
Thorvaldur and Lou Anne Torfason
Robin and Nancy Vandermolten
John and Nancy Vogt
Harold and Ella Mae Wallar
Kenneth and Karla Walters
Harry Wang
James Webster
Rodney and Barbara Willard
William Woods
Joe Zweig

The *Spectrum* Advisory Council is a group of committed *Spectrum* supporters who provide financial stability and business and editorial advice to ensure the continuation of the journal's open discussion of significant issues.

For more information, contact

Dr. Donald R. McAdams
4501 Holt Street
Bellaire, Texas 77401
(713) 644-9539

Or call the Association of Adventist Forums: (301) 270-0423