

Some History, Experience and Facts

by Alonzo T. Jones

SOME HISTORY, EXPERIENCE, AND FACTS

by A. T. JONES

A Statement by Elder A. T. Jones. The regular monthly meeting of the Sanitarium family, in the Sanitarium Chapel, Battle Creek, Mich., Sunday, March 4, 1906, 8:00 p.m.

I can safely appeal to the whole Sanitarium family to witness that since I came here two years ago last November, I have not at any time in any meeting, or in any class, discussed or dwelt upon the controversy that has been carried on from General Conference sources. My address in the tabernacle the night of January 2, is the first time that I have spoken on the subject. All who are here now, who were here when I came will remember that when I came I said to the whole family that we here should have nothing to do with that matter; that we have a work to do, and that we could not afford to abandon or neglect that work to engage in controversy of any kind; that we could spend our time far better in studying the Bible and sticking close to the work that God has given us to do, than we could in discussing differences or in defending ourselves against attack or even in trying to correct false reports.

All of that is true yet; except that now the time has come when we cannot be true to the truth and continue completely silent on these matters. Tonight I wish to state the case as it is so far; and why it is that I must speak. The great part of what I shall say to you has been already said to General Conference brethren, and to Brother Daniells and some others. Nowhere in it is there, or will there be any purpose to attack anybody; nor any attempt to discredit anyone; or to put anyone in the wrong. I have some facts of history to state and some facts of experience. I make no objections to anyone's doing or having done any of the things to which I do not agree. My sole purpose is to tell why I cannot do so. Also I should say that so far as I am concerned and as to anything that shall be said to-night, there is no question at all and no issue at all as to the Testimonies as such.

What I shall further say to-night will be introduced by a short statement that I read last Tuesday morning to such of the General Conference brethren as were then in town. When I learned last Friday that Brother Daniells was to be in town over Sabbath, I sent to him a note asking to meet him and the other General Conference brethren who might be here. When it came about, on Tuesday morning, there were only three present. If there had been only one, it would have been all the same, or if there had been the whole General Conference Committee, it would have been all the same; as all that I wished to do was to state a few facts, and to tell them what we now find ourselves obliged to do.

What I had to say, I wrote down and read to them, so as to avoid misunderstanding, and so misreport, of what I said. I read it now to you; because that in it there is something that very vitally concerns this family, and especially a few who have been in the family. Possibly there may be a few here yet to whom it especially applies. The great majority of the family it does not touch particularly, I am glad to say. I read:—

The Sanitarium management has not objected to anybody's going away. Before this late campaign began in Battle Creek in December last we told the whole family that every one of them was at perfect liberty to go whenever he should choose to go; that wherever the Lord wanted them, there they should be. Indeed, does not everybody know that the whole purpose and work of the Sanitarium has always been to educate and train people for the express purpose of their going away? The Sanitarium has had, therefore, no difficulty at all with respect to any of the workers going away. The only difficulty that there has been is with

the secret, underhanded, treacherous, and dishonorable course and conduct of those, who, while insisting that they “cannot stay”, that “the Lord has shown them that they should go”, and that they “must go”, yet do stay and will not go, and we cannot get them to go.

They insist that they “must go” and send in their resignation to take effect in a month or six weeks, or two months or more afterwards; or to take effect when their contract expires anyhow. We accept their resignation, to take effect earlier, or possibly immediately, then they insist that if they go earlier they must be paid full wages clear up to the expiration of the time of their contract, or they ask to stay “two weeks more”; and when we consent to their plea, then they spend their time just as far as they can, and make opportunity day and night to create dissatisfaction in others of the family, and even in the patients; to attend secret meetings off the premises, or to hold secret meetings on the premises; to show disrespect to their teachers, to those in responsibility, and in fact to everybody who does not fall in with their own spirit; to despise the Bible, prayer, and meetings, whether for religious services, or for the benefit and improvement of the Sanitarium and its work; to be careless, if not reckless of the property of the Sanitarium; to betray confidence; in short to do any unchristian thing, and no Christian thing if they can help it. And when at last their own time expires, or because of their perverse course we are compelled to discharge them, then they claim and report that they are turned out “because they believe the Testimonies”, and still hang around the place watching for chances to poison the minds of others, and to make great representations of how “the Testimonies tell everybody to get out of Battle Creek”.

In short and in perfect truth, the spirit manifested, and the course followed, is exactly such as that of the trade-unions in their arrogance, their boycott, their strikes, and their picketing. Through it all there has been no sign of James 3:17, 18, on the part of the ones most devoted to the cause. On the contrary, the spirit manifested has been the open manifestation of James 3:14-16.

And sorry as we all are that it is the plain, sober truth that you brethren have sanctioned, for you have promoted it, you have fired it and kept it alive. You have set the example of holding the secret meetings.

Now all this time we have kept silent on this subject. We have made no opposition to what you have been doing. We have let you and all these others go straight along, excepting only in the accepting the resignations and refusing longer to endure the imposition of those who simply “could not stay” and just must go, and simply would not go. But now when this mischievous working is persistently carried on in the very rooms of our buildings, even so late as nine o'clock at night; and since this working has reached the point where it is a constant and open violation of the civil law; we are now compelled, in the interests of everyday civility, to say nothing of common morality, and that we be not guilty of countenancing and becoming parties to open lawlessness—we are compelled to take an open stand against it, and to speak out plainly on it. We shall be unfaithful to both human and divine trust, no longer to be silent and inactive with this thing going on.

But please never think for a moment that we are going to meet it by any such working as that by which it has been promoted—secret meetings or secrecy of any kind. We are going to meet it openly only, with the plain statements of the truth as it is in the Bible, and with the quiet entreaty of Christians. Since you are especially interested in the Testimonies, I quote from a Testimony an excellent statement of the principle upon which we shall work in this sentence: “Whatsoever is not as open as the day, is of the methods of Satan.” Upon this principle we have begun our course of action, by coming thus first of all to you personally, and telling you plainly of it. We have not mentioned this to any others. We have now told you, and now we are perfectly free to say to any or all of the others, what may be considered proper, and to pursue the only course that is open to us, and to do the things which we must do, to be faithful to men and to God.

With our co-operation as before stated, and your liberal offer of money, you have got some to leave the Sanitarium—who might not otherwise have gone, I mean, in this way you may get some more to go. But my dear brethren, in the spirit of those who insist that they must go and yet will not go if they can avoid it, we pity you and many others who may be so unfortunate as to fall into their hands. We shall sincerely pray for them that they may be converted, and find and manifest the true Spirit of James 3:17, 18, so that you shall not have to endure the like wrong-doing that you have helped these to inflict upon us.

And now we take an active and positive course, instead of any longer the passive and negative, please do not think that there will be any new or strange position taken, or any new or strange thing taught. In this I have an advantage that can never be taken away from me. I mean in my books, tracts, and articles, that are all published by the denomination and with the denominational imprint and endorsement, even up-to-date. The Two Republics, The Empire Series, Great Nations of To-day, Place of the Bible in Education, The Consecrated Way, and the Federation of Churches, and articles in the Signs up to last week. In these books and articles there is every main feature of the Third Angel's Message, just as I am and shall be still, teaching it. You may repudiate me, you may repudiate my books and articles, but there is one thing certain, and that is that as certain as you and the denomination preach the Third Angel's Message, you will preach the things that are in those books and articles as they stand to-day. I do not mean that anyone will have to use those books and articles, or even to quote from them, but they will have to preach the truths that are in those books and articles. There is where I stand, and where I shall continue to stand, as to that. Therefore it is perfectly plain that there can never be any division, or what some call a split, in the denomination, so far as I and the Truth of the Third Angel's Message are concerned. And if a division is made over me, it will have to be solely because I am a friend of sinners.

The brethren demurred to the phrase, secret meetings, claiming that they had not held any secret meetings. But it all turns upon the technical meaning of the word secret, therefore I will state what I mean by the phrase: when the General Conference brethren came to this town first in December I myself personally invited Brother Daniells to come into this chapel and spend the time of the midday meeting in whatever way he pleased, every day while he was here, as long as he might stay. He came in one day, that was all. He said that he had Testimonies to read, and he could not read a Testimony in fifteen minutes. But I said, there are twenty-five minutes that you could have every day, and you could take possession and dispense with the singing and opening hymn service; and twenty-five minutes every day for all the time you stayed would have given you ample time to read all the Testimonies that you had. In addition to that we asked the brethren themselves — I and other brethren of the board and management — asked the General Conference brethren to come into the Sanitarium and go through every department of it; to go into the medical classes and see what the doctors were teaching; to go into the nurses classes and do the teaching themselves, and find out anything that they possibly could that was wrong and show it to us and help us to put it away. But they did not, and would not, do anything of the kind. Instead of that they held meetings with the medical students and with the helpers, outside of the institutions, without informing the faculty or the management, and with the understanding on one occasion at least that if I or Dr. Stewart came, the meeting could not be held; and at other times the presence of others was refused. Now that is what I refer to as secret meetings and a good many of such were held.

Now when they refused to come into the chapel and do openly every day as long as they choose, what they had to do, and say everything that they had to say; when they refused to come into the classes and teach, when they refused to go into the classes and hear what was taught; when they refused to come to the management and tell us what is wrong and try to help us to get rid of it, when they refused all that, and then met by appointment members of the Medical School and members of the family outside of the house, and not in public places, concerning things of vital interest, to the Sanitarium and Medical School, when the

management were not informed, and where the management were not welcome and were not wanted; then in the plain and proper sense of the word, and certainly so far as the Sanitarium management is concerned those were secret meetings. And that is what I mean by the phrase “secret meetings”. The General Conference brethren have set the example of holding such secret meetings. And when some of the helpers followed the example, even inside the house, they had a prominent example to follow.

I should say a further word with reference to that which has been done as being in violation of the civil law. Both the State and the United States governments have found it necessary to enact laws for the protection of people and their institutions in their rights of property and liberty of action. These laws are right and good, and are truly civil laws in every respect. And that which has been done in the connection in which I am speaking has been in open violation of these strictly civil laws. It is the duty of every person to be respectful to the civil law, and every Christian is so. Indeed no Christian can ever in the performance of any Christian duty, violate any truly civil law. For every Christian is commanded by Christ to “render to Caesar the things which are Caesar’s” as well as “to God the things that are God’s”. And Christ never contradicts Himself by leading any of His people to deny to Caesar that which is Caesar’s, while rendering to God the things that are God’s. And whenever those who profess to be Christians allow their zeal for what they suppose to be things of God to lead them to the point of violating the civil law and thus deny to Caesar the things that are Caesar’s they simply blunder, and do in fact deny to God that which is God’s. They put themselves outside of that which is God’s, and in violating the civil law they put themselves on the level with other criminals and are responsible to the civil jurisdiction without any ground of appeal to God. And to the point of open and constant violation of true and right civil law, this campaign against the Sanitarium and the Medical School has been carried. And in this it has been carried to the point where we can not any longer keep silent and be true to our obligations as Christians.

To those who are unacquainted with the actual experiences, what I have said in describing the course and conduct of those to whom I have referred may seem rather strong. But all who have been compelled to meet it in actual experience know that I have stated only the simple truth. I am glad to say that not by any means, the whole family, nor a majority, nor even a large minority of the family is involved in it. But of the few who are parties to it, what I have said is only the sober truth. Every item that I have cited as illustrative, is true. Not every item is true of every one; but each item is true of some case as it has actually been met in daily experience. And these do it as champions of the General Conference, and in a supposed loyalty to the Testimonies.

The foregoing are some of the reasons for my speaking on this subject to-night. But there are other reasons also. This will plainly appear in what I shall further read. And this that I shall further read has been said to the President of the General Conference. In a letter to me he stated that my “general attitude has greatly perplexed many of our people”, as well as himself. I then wrote to him a letter for the express purpose of taking away all grounds for his having any perplexity at all concerning my attitude. And as he said that many of our people have also in this connection been greatly perplexed, I desire to take away from everybody all ground for perplexity concerning me. And since the letter is a simple recital of facts, many of which concern all our people, I believe that what is said in this letter will be the best means that I could employ to relieve all persons of any perplexity that they may have had, or otherwise might have, concerning me or my attitude. Therefore, three-fourths of this letter I shall read to you to-night; the other fourth pertains to a matter that is not an issue, and is not necessarily in this issue, so far as I am concerned, or as the issue really is. It may yet be made an issue or a part of the present issue; for the campaign that is being made is a very wide sweeping thing. And if it shall be made an issue, or shall be made necessarily a part of the present issue, then, you shall be just as welcome to that part of the letter as you now are to the three-fourths of it that I shall read to-night. The letter was begun January 26, but because of regular work it was not finished

for about two weeks.

It runs as follows:—

Battle Creek, Mich., January 26, 1906.

A. G. Daniells,

Takoma Park Station, Washington, D. C.

Dear Brother:

Your letter of the 17th, in answer to mine of the 6th, goes so far afield from anything expected, or, as I think, called for by my letter, that I am disposed to follow you there, and do all that I can to take all grounds for your having any perplexity about me or my course. Indeed if you had remembered things that at the beginning I said to you, you need not to have been perplexed at all concerning me if you expected me to be consistent at all.

First as to the General Conference matters, and my relations to the Committee. Before the General Conference of 1897, at College View, the conditions were that in that Conference things came to a dead-lock. By the Committee and presidents in council, I, in my absence was appointed to read the Testimonies to find the way out. God did lead us out gloriously. A change was made; Brother Irwin being elected president. And I was made a member of the Committee.

It was not very long, however, before the same influence that had produced the situation at College View, was again at work. I saw it plain enough to satisfy me, and by the time of the General Conference of 1899 at South Lancaster, things were in a bad shape in some respects, though not near so far along as at College View. In the South Lancaster Conference one day, all unexpectedly, and unintentionally on the part of anybody in the Conference, the power of God came in, in a special manner, bringing the whole Conference to its knees at once, and working a great deliverance again. Brother Irwin stated openly in the Conference (1899) that he has been a coward. The whole matter can be read in the Bulletin of that Conference (1899) for that day. On another day in that Conference, the power of God came in specially and carried the deliverance further.

By action of that Conference, I was continued on the Committee. It was not long before the same old influence was at work; and in about a year they had got such a hold again, that, rather than to be compromised, I resigned from the Committee.

Then came the General Conference of 1901 at Battle Creek. According to the arrangements I was to report the proceedings of the Conference; and according to the arrangements, Brothers Prescott and Waggoner were not expected evidently to have even that much to do. But before the Conference actually assembled in session, there occurred that meeting in the Library room of the College Building, in which Sister White spoke on General Conference matters and organization, declaring that there must be “an entire new organization and to have a Committee that shall take in not merely half a dozen that is to be a ruling and controlling power, but it is to have representatives of those that are placed in responsibility in our educational interests in our Sanitariums, etc., that there should be a renovation without delay. To have this Conference pass on and close up as the Conferences have done, with the same manipulating, with the very same tone, and the same order—God forbid! God forbid brethren . . . And until this come we might just as well close up the Conference to-day as any other day... This thing has been continued for the last fifteen years or more, (1901 minus 15 takes us back to 1886), and God calls for a change.

“God wants a change, and it is high time — it is high time that there was ability that should connect with the Conference, with the General Conference right here in this city. Not wait until it is done and over with, and then gather up the forces and see what can be done. We want to know what can be done right now.

“From the light that I have, as it was presented to me in figures. There was a narrow compass here; there within that narrow compass is a king-like, a kingly ruling power. God means what He says and He says, ‘I want a change here.’ Will it be the same thing? Going over and over the same ideas, the same committees—and here is the little throne—the king is in there, and these others are all secondary. God wants those committees that have been handling things for so long should be relieved of their command and have a chance for their life and see if they cannot get out of this rut that they are in — which I have no hope of their getting out of, because the Spirit of God has been working and working, and yet the king is in there still. Now the Lord wants His Spirit to come in. He wants the Holy Ghost King.

“From the light that I have had for some time, and has been expressed over and over again, not to all that are here, but has been expressed to individuals—the plan, that God would have all to work from, that never should one mind or two minds or three minds, nor four minds, or a few minds I should say be considered of sufficient wisdom and power to control and mark out plans and let it rest upon the minds of one or two or three in regard to this broad field that we have.

“And the work all over our field demands an entirely different course of action than we have had; that there needs the laying of a foundation that is different from what we have had. . . In all these countries, far, and near, He wants to be an arousing, broadening, enlarging power. And a management which is getting confused in itself—not that anyone is wrong or means to be wrong, but the principle is wrong, and the principles have become so mixed and so fallen from what God’s principles are.

“These things have been told, and this standstill has got to come to an end. But yet every Conference has woven after the same pattern, it is the very same loom that carries it, and finally it will come to naught.”

She declared that God wants us to take hold of this work, every human agency. Each one is to act in their capacity in such a way that the confidence of the whole people will be established in them and that they will not be afraid, but see everything just as light as day until they are in connection with the work of God and the whole people. . . . All the provision was made in heaven, all the facilities, all the riches of the grace of God was imparted to every worker that was connected with the cause, and every one of these are wholly dependent upon God. And when we leave God out of the question, and allow hereditary and cultivated traits of character to come in; let me tell you; we are on very slippery ground.

God hath His servants—His Church, established in the earth, composed of many members, but of one body; that in every part of the work one part must work as connected with another part, and that with another part, and with another part, and these are joined together by the golden links of heaven and there is to be no kings in the midst of all. There is to be no man that has the right to put his hand out and say: No you can not go there. We won’t support you if you go there. Why, what have you to do with the supporting? Did you create the means? The means comes from the people. And those who are in destitute fields—the voice of God has told me to instruct them to go to the people and tell them their necessities, and to draw all the people to work just where they can find a place to work to build up the work in every place they

can.

Upon that instruction and much more to the same effect in that talk, you and Brother Prescott and others took hold of the matter pertaining to the then pending General Conference (1901), set aside entirely the old order of things, and started it new. At the opening of the General Conference, April 2, Sister White spoke briefly to the same effect as in the College Building the day before. Brother Irwin followed with a few words; and then you spoke a few words and introduced a motion that the usual rules and precedents for arranging and transacting the business of the Conference be suspended, and the General Committee be hereby appointed. . . to constitute a general or central committee, which shall do such work as necessarily must be done in providing the work of the Conference, and preparing the business to bring before the delegates. Thus the new order of things was started.

The night of that very first day of the conference, I was appointed to preach the sermon. Since I had been appointed to report the proceedings, I expected to have no preaching or other work to do. Therefore when I was called to preach, I supposed that it was designed to have me preach that one time during the conference, and have me do it at the beginning, so that I could go on afterwards unmolested with the reporting. I spoke on Church Organization. When that meeting was over, I supposed that my preaching during the Conference was done. Therefore, I was surprised when only two days afterwards—April 4, you came to me at the reporter's table and said, we want you to preach to-night! I said I supposed that my preaching was over, since I have the reporting to do. I cannot do this and preach often. You said to me, "You have light for the people, and we want them to have it." I consented and preached again on the subject of Church Organization, developing the subject further, and on the same principles precisely as on the night of April 2.

In that Conference (1901) the General Conference was started toward the called-for-reorganization. All understood that the call was away from a centralized order of things in which one man or two men or three or four men or a few men held the ruling and directing power, to an organization in which, all the people as individuals should have a part, with God, in Christ, by the Holy Spirit as the unifying, and directing power. Indeed, the day before my second sermon on organization, Sister White had said, April 3—we want to understand that there are no gods in our Conference. There are to be no kings here, and no kings in any Conference that is formed, "All ye are brethren".

"The Lord wants to bind those at this Conference heart to heart. No man is to say I am a god, and you must do as I say. From the beginning to the end this is wrong. There is to be an individual work. God says, 'let him take hold of My strength that he may make peace with Me and he shall make peace with Me.'"

"Remember that God can give wisdom to those who handle His work. It is not necessary to send thousands of miles to Battle Creek for advice, and then have to wait weeks before an answer can be received. Those who are right on the ground are to decide what shall be done. You know what you have to wrestle with, but those who are thousands of miles away do not know." Bulletin 1901, pp. 69, 70. And on the very day of my second sermon, April 4, she said in a talk at 9:00 a.m., this meeting will determine the character of our work in the future. How important that every step shall be taken under the supervision of God. This work must be carried in a very different manner to what it has been in the past years. —Bulletin 1901, p. 83.

In this understanding an entire new Constitution was adopted; and that such was the understanding in adopting this Constitution is plainly shown in the discussions. Under this Constitution the General Conference Committee was composed of a large number of men, with power to organize itself by choosing a chairman, etc. No president of the General Conference was chosen; nor was any provided for. The

presidency of the General Conference was eliminated to escape a centralized power, a one-man power, a king-ship. a monarchy. The Constitution was framed and adopted to that end in accordance with the whole guiding thought in the Conference from the beginning in that room in the College Building.

Shortly after the Conference ended, you suggested during the meeting at Indianapolis that my sermon on organization ought to be printed in a leaflet so that our people everywhere could have it for study in the work of reorganization. Your suggestion was agreed to and I was directed to prepare it for printing. I did so and it was printed at General Conference direction in Words of Truth Series No. 31, extra May 1901.

Now after all this, It was not long before the whole spirit and principle of General Conference Organization and affairs began to be reversed again. This spirit of reaction became so rife and so rank that some before the General Conference of 1903 at Oakland, Calif., two men, or three men, or four men, or a few men I should say, being together in Battle Creek or somewhere else, and without any kind of authority, but directly against the plain words of the Constitution, took it absolutely upon themselves to elect you president, and Brother Prescott vice-president of the General Conference. And than that there never was in this universe a clearer piece of usurpation of position, power, and authority. You two were then, of right, just as much president and vice-president of Timbuktu as you were of the Seventh-day Adventist General Conference.

But this spirit did not stop even there. The thing done was directly against the Constitution. This was too plain to be escaped. And it was just as plain that with that Constitution still perpetuated in the coming General Conference, this usurpation of position, power, and authority could not be perpetuated. What could be done to preserve the usurpation? – Oh, that was just as easy as the other. A new Constitution was framed to fit and to uphold the usurpation. This Constitution was carried to the General Conference of 1903 at Oakland, Calif., and in every unconstitutional way, because in every truly constitutional government the constitution comes in some way from the people, not from the monarch. Thus the people make and establish a Constitution. The monarch grants a Constitution. When the people make a Constitution the people govern. When a monarch grants a Constitution, he seeks to please the people with a toy and keeps the government himself. This difference is the sole difficulty in Russia today; and the difference is simply the difference between monarchy and government of the people; and between oppression and freedom. The people want to make a Constitution. The Czar wants to grant them a constitution, and have them endorse anew his autocracy and bureaucracy by adopting the Constitution that he grants.

And this is just the difference between the General Conference and its Constitution of 1901 and the General Conference and its Constitution of 1903. In 1901 the monarchy was swept aside completely, and the Conference itself as such and as a whole made a new Constitution. In the General Conference of 1903 the usurpers of monarchial position and authority came with the Constitution that fitted- and maintained their usurpation, and succeeded in getting it adopted. And how? – none of the people had asked for a new Constitution. The General Conference delegation had asked for it. Not even the Committee on Constitution asked for it. In behalf of the usurpation it was brought before that Committee and advocated there, because, in very words, “The Church must have a visible head”. It was not even then nor was it ever, favored by that Committee. It was put through the Committee, and reported to the Conference, only by permanently dividing the Committee, – a minority, of the Committee, opposing it all the time, and – a thing almost unheard of in Seventh-day Adventist Conferences, a minority report against it. And when at last it was adopted by the final vote, it was by a slim majority of just five. And it was only by the carelessness of some of the delegates that it got through even that way; for there were just then downstairs in the Oakland Church enough delegates who were opposed to it, to have defeated it if they had been present. They told this themselves afterwards. But they did not know that the vote was being taken, and by their not being in

their places, the usurpation was sanctioned; the reactionary spirit that had been so long working for absolute control had got it; the principles and intent of the General Conference of 1901 was reversed; and a Czardom was enthroned which has since gone steadily onward in the same way and has with perfect consistency built up a thorough bureaucratic government, by which it reaches and meddles with, and manipulates, the affairs of all, not only of union and local conferences, but of local churches, and of individual persons. So that some of the oldest men in active service today, and who by their life experiences are best qualified to know, have freely said that in the whole history of the denomination there has never been such a one-man power, such a centralized despotism, so much of Papacy, as there has been since the Oakland Conference (of 1903). And as a part of this bureaucracy there is, of all the incongruous things ever heard of, a Religious Liberty Bureau – a contradiction in terms.

Now when I was opposed to this thing before and in the General Conference of 1897, and before and in the General Conference of 1899, and before and in the General Conference of 1901, and before and in the General Conference of 1903, why should you be perplexed that I have not fallen in with it and helped to make it a success since 1903? why should I in 1903, abandon all the principles and teachings by which I was right in opposing it, until and including 1903, when I was in the right all these years in opposing it, and in doing all that I could to keep it from succeeding, why and upon what principles should I have swung in and favored it just because at last in a most arbitrary, unconstitutional and usurping way it did at last succeed?

Again in the General Conference of 1901 you yourself said that in the principles of organization that I preached I had “light for the people”. Those principles were the ones that prevailed in that Conference; and at your own suggestion these principles as preached in my first sermon, were published for the help of the denomination in the work of reorganization. But the principles and the form of organization of 1903 were directly the opposite of those that in 1901 you said were “light for the people”. If my second sermon in the General Conference of 1901 had been printed along with the first, the people would have been able to see more plainly how entirely the course of things in 1903 was the reverse of that in 1901. And anyone can see it now by reading The General Conference Bulletin of 1901, pp. 37-42 and 101-105.

Now brother, were those principles light in 1901? If so, then what did you do when you espoused the opposite of them in 1902, 1903? Or were those principles light in 1901, and darkness in 1903? Or were those principles really darkness in 1901 when you said that they were light. Or are they still light today as they were in 1901? And if in the General Conference of 1901 you were not able to distinguish between light and darkness, what surety has anybody that you were any more able to do it in 1902–1903? Or is it possible that in 1902–1903 you were not, and now are not, able to see that the principles and the course of action of 1902–1903 are not the same as those of the General Conference of 1901? In other words, is it possible that you can think that certain principles with their course of action, and the reverse of them are one and the same? I know that the principles that in 1901 you said were “light for the people” were then really light, and that they are now light and forever more will be light. They are only plain principles of the Word of God. I hold these principles to-day exactly as I did in 1901 and long before, and shall hold them forever. For this cause I was opposed to the usurpation and unconstitutional action of 1902–1903 that were the opposite of these principles; and shall always be opposed to them.

In view of all these facts again I ask, Why should you think that I should abandon all, just because you and some others did? I think that it was enough for me to keep still these three years. It is true that I have had no disposition to do anything but to keep still about it. For when the General Conference of 1903 made their choice that way, I have no obligation to their having what they have chosen. I have no disposition to oppose it in any other way than by preaching the gospel. Indeed the strongest possible opposition that can

be made to it is the plain, simple preaching of the plain gospel. There is this about it, however, that now the plain simple preaching of the plain gospel will be considered disloyal to the General Conference. disloyal to the organization, etc. Nevertheless, I am going to continue to preach the plain gospel, and that gospel is in the Word of God. For when the General Conference and the organized work put themselves in such a position that the plain preaching of the gospel as in the Word of God is disloyalty to the General Conference and the “organized work”, then the thing to do is to preach the gospel, as it is in the Word of God.

Second, as to the campaign against Dr. Kellogg: I told you in the very beginning of it, that I would never take any part in it. You can remember that in the month of November, 1902 in Battle Creek in the same room where you and Brother Irwin met the church board and others of us when you were here last month, – as you and I and several others of the General Conference Committee were sitting around a table, I told you all, that, admitting all to be the truth that was then being said about Dr. Kellogg, I would take no part in pursuing him, nor in making any kind of war upon him, not even with the Testimonies. I told you of the experience of a previous General Conference Committee when I was a member of it – that Testimonies had come reproving Brother A. R. Henry: that the Committee had used the Testimonies in a way, and had taken such a course toward him that he was offended: that then Testimonies came reproving the Committee for treating him so and telling the Committee to go and confess to Brother Henry. “Shall the soul of A. R. Henry be lost?” – And upon this I told you that I never would, never take any course toward Dr. Kellogg or any other man that would make it possible for any Testimony to tell me to go and confess to him even with the Testimonies; and, because of anything I had done, appeal to me “shall the soul of” that man be lost? I told you then that whatever Dr. Kellogg’s wrong-doing might be, I never would treat him, nor take any part with others in treating him in any other way than the way that I would choose to be treated, if I were in a like situation. All that, I told you then, and I tell it to you now. That is where I stood then, that is where I have stood ever since, and that is where I shall stand forever with respect to Dr. Kellogg and everybody else in the world. I was at that time ready to stand with you, and stand with you in working for him, to get him to see where mistakes had been made, and to correct them. On the eighteenth day of the same month of November, 1902, in the General Conference Committee room in Battle Creek, with Dr. Kellogg and a number of other brethren present, I, on the part of the General Conference Committee, and at your request read some Testimonies concerning kingship in the medical work and of species of bondage or slavery of minds in the matter of written contracts for the medical missionary workers. And even while I was reading it, Dr. Kellogg spoke out and said: “I see that, I see it now, I never saw it before, I could not see how that was; but I see it now. And I will stop it immediately. We will abolish all those contracts.” In the same meeting he also made other changes and concessions; so that the only thing that I expected to see, was that you would reach out your hand to him and say: All right brother, here is my hand. Let us go on together, working to find out whatever else may be wrong and to put it away.

But lo, instead of that or anything of that nature, I was surprised and humiliated and hurt, at your standing up, and planting yourself on your heels, and in a decisive tone saying: “I’m not satisfied. Dr. Kellogg has an imperious will, that’s got to be broken – with God.”

From that moment I have not had any sympathy with you nor any support for you in that campaign. The thing there said and the tone and manner of saying it, all showed that there was such an element of personal domination of personal triumph, of a man ruling man, that I would have no part in it. I know that you have since explained that you meant only what is always meant when it is said that a man’s will is to be surrendered to God, etc. Whatever you meant the words as given above are what you said. And said in a tone and a manner in which you said it and said openly in a company of men, in a time of tension; the only possible effect of the words was certain to be just what the words said. Surely the effect, or at least the danger of the effect, of such a statement would be bad enough if spoken only to a man in perfect privacy.

How much more when spoken about a man, openly to a company of other men with the man himself present. To this day I feel the Impression that the words made upon me. And I know that if in such circumstances such a thing were said about me, I have not the meekness to take it in any way near as quietly as Dr. Kellogg did at that moment. Surely, Brother Daniells, if you had thought only as far as A B C, you would have known that God never breaks any man's will, nor does He ask that any man's will shall be broken; and you would not have said what you did.

That day when you went direct from that meeting into the full swing of the General Conference Council in the north vestry of the Tabernacle, I wrote on the fiftieth leaf of my railroad permit the following:-

On this fiftieth leaf of this book on this Eighteenth day of November, 1902, after the meeting of the General Conference Committee from 8:00 o'clock a.m. to 1:15 p.m. I am obliged to say that it is impossible for me to see any basis for harmonious co-operation between the General Conference and Medical Missionary Association so far as Brethren Daniells and Prescott are concerned. And if the next General Conference finds no entanglements it will surely have to be because of Brethren Daniells and Prescott changing their attitudes in mind and spirit in meeting Dr. Kellogg's allowances and concessions.

And when the next General Conference did come even before the Conference was actually opened, the first great question was whether the first thing done in the Conference should not be to turn the whole Conference upon the issue with Dr. Kellogg, and get that out of the way, and then take up the regular business of the Conference? Brother Prescott knows that I was called to the house where Sister White was staying to meet with him and W. C. White and her, to counsel upon this very question, – at any rate, I was called there, possibly he was too, and that was the only matter considered. And Brother Prescott knows that I advised that instead of beginning Conference with the issue about Dr. Kellogg, we leave it out entirely, – and if it must come in, let it be the very last thing, and then only because it could not fairly be avoided; that the Conference was not assembled for any such business, but only for the consideration of the work of the Third Angel's Message in the world; and the time should be spent in studying the leading features of this great work.

Possibly Brother Prescott may remember that I was the only one present, who did thus advise, and when the Conference was formally opened, the expectation of certain ones was that the issue with or about Dr. Kellogg would be the first matter of importance taken up. For I was chairman of the General Committee; and either shortly before or at our very first meeting Brother Prescott asked me to delay the appointment of the committees, because if we should proceed, just then a certain man – Dr. Kellogg – might be nominated on some committee, and he would have to object to it, which without explanation might be considered only personal; whereas if there were delay of a day or two the whole matter would be exposed to the Conference, and then there would be no danger of anybody nominating Dr. Kellogg on any committee. I told him that the Committee itself would have to decide the question of delay, but that I would present his request. I did so in a general way without any particulars. The Committee conformed to the request, and did adjourn to the call of the chair. But that expected thing did not get into the open Conference. And after sufficient, – or rather too much delay, I called the Committee together and we went on with the business. You may remember that one day in the Conference I referred to this fact; when Brother Knox, sitting by you, arose and objected to the whole Committee being involved. However, I had not knowingly involved the whole Committee; I had only stated a fact. That was as far as I knew; and if the whole Committee was involved, it could only be by the whole Committee's knowing more of the matter than I did.

Before I left California – or rather at the depot just as I was leaving – to come to the Sanitarium to work, I told W. C. White that I was not coming here as a partisan of Dr. Kellogg's, nor as an opponent of you and

Brother Prescott. But that I was coming solely to help the medical students and others here by teaching the Bible to them. I told the same thing to you and the others in the Council at Washington before I came here in November, 1903. And that is true, yet, so far as I am concerned. But in this matter it seems that whoever does not make open and direct war on Dr. Kellogg, is held necessarily to be a partisan of his and an opponent to you; and there is no space between. But I know that if today I were to leave the Sanitarium, because of total disagreement with Dr. Kellogg there would still be a space wider than the world for me to stand in, without standing with you in the campaign against him, and without endorsing the course that you have pursued since 1902. And this space would be simply because of the plain A B C principles of the gospel, that I can, and therefore will, never abandon.

Thirdly the Testimonies:-

I know that you and others with you are making much of “loyalty to the Testimonies”; and are not slow to convey the impression that any who do not openly endorse your course in the use of some of the Testimonies is not loyal to the Testimonies, does not believe the Testimonies, etc., etc., but all of that proves nothing at all as to anybody’s loyalty or disloyalty to the Testimonies. Besides, facts within my personal knowledge demonstrate. that the loyalty to the Testimonies that is just now being made so conspicuous, is a very uncertain thing; it is merely “loyalty to some of the Testimonies” – that can be used to special advantage for a purpose.

For instance: During the General Conference Council in Washington in October, 1903, a Testimony came concerning the Battle Creek College debt, and the Acre Fund to pay that debt. That Testimony said: “How pleasing to God that would be for all our people – led and encouraged by the General Conference Committee – to share in lifting this obligation of the old Battle Creek College!”

“The creditors of Battle Creek College must be paid. The officers of the General Conference should lend a hand in this work.”

I was in a position to know full well that the General Conference Committee neither led nor encouraged the people in that thing at all. Indeed, their leading and encouraging was against it rather than for it. Also I personally know that the officers of the General Conference did not lend any hand in that work. Indeed they were not at all ready even to print that Testimony in the Review. They did by special request, if not persuasion, promise in the Review of October 29, to publish it next week; but in fact did not publish it till five weeks afterward, December 3; and then with changes, showing that it had either been sent to California for these changes and back again, or else another copy was received from California to be published in place of the one that they promised October 29, to publish next week. Any or all of which shows that loyalty to the Testimonies was not at all conspicuous on the part of the General Conference officers.

Again: At Berrien Springs in May, 1904, a written Testimony was given to you personally addressed: “Dear Brethren Daniells and Prescott” in which were the following words; —

“Last night I saw a hand stretched out to clasp his (Dr. Kellogg’s) hand, and the words were spoken: ‘Let him take hold of My strength, that he may make peace with Me, and he shall make peace with Me. Satan is striving for the victory. I will help Dr. Kellogg to stand on vantage ground and every soul who loves Me must work with Me as he sees Me do, so he must do’.”

You received that Testimony on Friday. Yet as late as Monday following, Dr. Kellogg knew nothing of it— at least so far as you were concerned—and he was there the most of the time. And when on Monday morning I read the Testimony openly in the morning meeting, you said that you had received it on Friday, but did not know what to do with it. It would seem that loyalty to the Testimonies would have given you plainly to know what to do yourself whether you knew what to do with it or not. It would seem that loyalty

to the Testimonies would have caused you to go straight to Dr. Kellogg and stretch out your hand to him as the Testimony told you to do. But you did not do it then: And when I asked you in Battle Creek last month whether you had ever done it, you were obliged to say “No”. Is that loyalty to the Testimonies, or is it merely loyalty to some of the Testimonies?

Again: Sister White says that in the time of the General Conference of 1905, at Takoma Park, Washington, she was shown in the night the needs of the South and that 5,000 dollars must be given immediately to the brethren – Butler and Haskell – for it. So plain was this and so urgent, that she said to Brother Haskell the next morning: “Have faith in God. You will carry 5,000 dollars from this meeting for the work in the South.” Then the Testimony proceeds. But Willie said that Brother Daniells was very much perplexed with the conditions in Battle Creek, and the money could not be sent just then. And I said no more about it. This Testimony you have there in Washington.

Now, did she see, that night, as she says that she did, the needs of the South, and so urgent that 5,000 dollars should be carried from that very meeting for it? If she did, then how much loyalty to the Testimonies was there in Willie, setting it all aside so effectually that for full two months nothing at all was done in that direction and when after full two months something was done, it was only because Testimonies were sent to the South as well as to Washington that would brook no more delay. And one of these said:

“This matter has been presented to me three times, and I was instructed that 5,000 dollars ought to have been placed in Elder Haskell’s hands before he left the Conference grounds.”

That is exactly the instruction that she says that she had on the Conference grounds, in the time of the Conference. She gave the instructions at least to Brother Haskell and to Willie, but Willie simply and promptly set it aside. Now was that instruction from the Lord, or was it not? If it was, how much did Willie care for it? Allowing what he had said about conditions in Battle Creek, is it not possible that the Lord knew of this, and knew as much of it as Willie did? Or is it true that Willie is the supreme source of knowledge and understanding in the work of the Lord, even above and against the instruction of the Lord? Or did Willie believe a particle in the instructions having come from the Lord? If it was from the Lord then how much loyalty to the Testimonies had Willie when he set it aside? If it was from the Lord and yet he did not believe that it was from the Lord, then how much loyalty to the Testimonies was there in what he did? Or shall it be said that it was not from the Lord, and was not Testimony till it came out in writing on July 19-20, fully two months afterwards? But if it was from the Lord when it was written out two months afterwards, then was it not equally from the Lord when it was spoken to Willie at the time? And in any case where in Willie’s course in that matter does there appear any faint suggestion of any real loyalty to the Testimonies. By the way, Brother, why haven’t you printed those two Testimonies of July 19, 20, 1905 in full, full names and all, in the R. & H. or in some series A, B, or Z? Number something? For all the people to have those Testimonies, just as they are, would do a lot of good to the work in the South; why not print them?

Now please, Brother Daniells, I am not involving you in Willie’s course in the foregoing matter. I am perfectly willing to believe that he did not allow that word to get to you, as to the 5,000 dollars going with Brother Haskell from that General Conference. The point I make upon it is this; that was the course which Willie took upon it. The Testimonies say so. Now since he can do such things as that, and at the same time is heartily and companionably fellowshiped by you as loyal to the Testimonies, how is it that you cannot just as heartily fellowship men who have far more respect for the Testimonies than that; but who possibly cannot near as loudly urge upon other people loyalty to the Testimonies?

Again: At the time of your late visit to Battle Creek, after urging upon the Battle Creek church for about

two weeks or more loyalty to the Testimonies, there was brought about the annual election in the church, two weeks before the regular time. In the proceedings there were read Testimonies that were strictly pertinent and applicable to the matter before the meeting; and were plainly against what was being put through. Yet these Testimonies were deliberately explained away, with a broad view and other like things; and you yourself took part in explaining them away. After what you had been for two weeks or more saying and doing as to loyalty to the Testimonies, this was rather a sweeping, but in truth, in view of the many facts of the matter, a very fitting anti-climax.

And in view of all these facts, and many others of the same sort, you seem actually to be perplexed that I have taken no part with you in your campaign with the Testimonies, and of the kind of loyalty to the Testimonies! Why brother, I never did, I never can, and I never will use the Testimonies that way; nor will I take part in it with those who use them that way. The long straightforward series of facts in the case make it so plain to me that this conspicuous loyalty to the Testimonies is for campaign purposes only, that I simply will not take part in it. I can afford to be suspected of heresy, and of other things that are now so trippingly told; but I will not run a false issue, nor will I make a false pretense.

You speak of a time when I took a strong position regarding the Testimonies, and used them with great force to wheel men and policies into time. Yes, that is so; but with it, every soul knows that I never was partial in them; that I never used some with pile-driver force, while utterly ignoring or explaining away others just as plain and definite. The brethren, and the people know well that whenever I was advocating a matter and some one produced a Testimony to the contrary, instead of explaining it away I stopped instantly and changed my course accordingly. And that was because of my loyalty to the Testimonies.

In the original address in the chapel, additional remarks and illustrations were interspersed as the foregoing matter was read. In printing it, it seems best to print the letter unbroken; and then insert here the additional remarks and illustrations.

In 1901 the General Conference was turned away from a centralized power; a one man or two men, or three men, or four men, or a few men power, a kingship, a monarchy; because the instruction was in very words, the principle is wrong. It will not do to say that in 1902-1903 circumstances had changed. For whatever change may even occur in circumstances, principles never change.

I stated that the present order of General Conference affairs is a thoroughly bureaucratic government. Not every section of it is called a bureau; but that is what in practice every section is, whatever it, may be called; and the title of the Religious Liberty Bureau is expressive of the whole.

I stated that the phrase "Religious Liberty Bureau" is a contradiction in terms, on every principle that is the truth. There are many words of our language that are the result and expression of invariable human experience through ages.

The result of human experience through ages has in certain things been so invariable that a word tells it, and tells it so truly, when that word is used, that a certain order of things is described; and when that word is espoused, then we have in certainty the situation and order of things which the word expresses. Bureaucracy – Government by bureaus – is one of these words: and the definition, which is but the expression of ages of invariable experience is as follows:–

"Bureaucracy: Government by bureaus: specifically, excessive multiplication of, and concentration of power in, administrative bureaus. The principle of bureaucracy tends to official interference in many of the properly private affairs of life, and to the inefficient and obtrusive performance of duty through minute subdivisions of functions, inflexible formality, and pride of place." – Century Dictionary.

“A bureaucracy is sure to think that its duty is to augment official power, official business, or official numbers, rather than to leave free the energies of mankind.” – Standard Dictionary.

“Republicanism and bureaucracy are incompatible existences.” – Century Dictionary.

All that is what bureaucracy has been found by ages of invariable experience to be. All that is what it is, and what it does: And when bureaucracy and republicanism are incompatible existences, how much more are bureaucracy and Christianity incompatible existences! Therefore, a Religious Liberty Bureau is a palpably impossible thing. Indeed, any true liberty is impossible in a bureau or a bureaucracy, and this is why it is that, as I said in the letter, the plain simple preaching of the plain gospel as it is in the Bible, will be considered disloyal to the General Conference, disloyal to the organized work, etc. The gospel and bureaucracy, Christianity and bureaucracy, are incompatible existences. I knew this at the time of the Oakland Conference in 1903. I knew then what would be at least some of the results of the action there taken, and spoke of it at the time; and when that action was finally taken by the Conference, I knew that it would stop my preaching under General Conference auspices, the truth that I had been preaching all these years. Before that action was taken in that Conference, even three months before the Conference met, I had decided to come to the Sanitarium to teach. And when that action was taken in and by that Conference, I was glad that there was thus a place where in comparative retirement, I could teach and preach the same truths that I have all these years been teaching, without interfering with, or embarrassing, in any way, any Conference or General Conference management or administration. I have no disposition to interfere with or to embarrass any Conference or General Conference management and administration. I have no objection to the General Conference, or any conference, or any persons, having a bureaucracy or whatever else they may choose. I only object to having it myself. I object also to being required to have it. I have no disposition to take away from anybody what he chooses to have, nor have I any disposition to break down anything. My commission is to build up Christianity and Christians, and Christianity in Christians in the world; and whatever is not Christian will fall of itself.

There is another thing that illustrates the truth of what I have said as to what I have always taught not being acceptable now to the General Conference administration; and which at the same time answers a question that is in the minds of many people. I have received letters from people in many parts of the land, asking why they cannot read anything from me any more in the Review and Herald. I will now tell you, and to all the others, why this is: It is only because the Review and Herald will not print anything from me. And for me that is sufficient reason why the people cannot read anything from me in that paper.

When I went to Washington a year ago, I went with good heart to help in the Religious Liberty work there. And I did help, with good heart. And yet all the people know that not a line of anything that I preached there, ever got into print in any Seventh-day Adventist publication issued from Washington. And the Religious Liberty truth that I preached there was the same that I have been preaching all these years; only intensified by study and by the fulfillment of prophecy in the development of the thing which all these years we have been expecting.

Afterward I sent to the Southern Watchman some of what I had preached in Washington at that time. The Watchman published it; and both the editors and readers said that it was the best that I had ever given on the subject. One sermon which I preached in Washington at that time was so plain, so straight, and so clear on the subject that Brother Colcord, Brother George B. Thompson, and Brother Kit Russell, who all heard it, all three asked that I write it out for the Review, so that all our people might have it. I had had some experience before, so I said to them, I can write it out; brethren, but its getting into the Review will be another thing. Of course they could not think that; and still asked that I should write it out, so that it could be published in the Review. Accordingly, I wrote it out. Brother Colcord, I believe, handed it in. It got as

far as the type, and then in the middle of last summer it was returned to me without any of the people ever having a chance to get it. When it was returned, the reason stated for not printing it was, having been so crowded with special matter of the General Conference, and the special issue which called it out, is now so far in the past. But the fact is that the matter was handed in nearly, if not quite a full month before the General Conference began; and the truth is that the issue which called out that sermon will never be to any degree or in any sense in the past, until probation itself shall be in the past.

To-day the issue that called out that sermon is even more urgent than it was the day the sermon was preached. In one way or another the issue is being urged everywhere throughout the land. But in one special way it is being so urged, and in such words, that if that sermon had been published in the Review and Herald a year ago, when it was handed in, our people everywhere would be far better prepared than they are to meet that which is being more and more urged upon the people in our very presence. I have the manuscript yet. It ought indeed to be published so that all our people could have it. I may have to publish it myself. But in that case, I may be charged with “starting a new work”, with “creating divisions”, etc. But how long shall it be right to let the people go without matter that they greatly need, that they ought to have just now, and that the cause of the Third Angel’s Message needs just now, simply because the denominational paper will not print it? How much longer shall things go on thus before it will be right for the people to have what is now urgently needed, and what the cause of the Third Angel’s Message itself greatly needs, even if I must print it myself?

I said that it was some experience that caused me to say when the brethren asked me to write out that sermon for the Review, that I could write it out, but its getting into the Review would be another thing. That experience was this: In the summer of 1903, I was regularly a member of the educational convention that was held at College View in the month of June. By the program I was appointed to preach on Christian Education. On Sabbath I preached the sermon. The editor of the Review said that he would print it. I prepared it and sent it in about the first of July, 1903. It is there yet, if it has not been destroyed. I have been told that that matter also got so far as to be set up in type. And I know that it never got into print. These facts tell why it is that nothing has been read from me in the Review and Herald for the past three years. Those who have had a chance to read the Signs of the Times or the Southern Watchman have- been able to read considerably from me.

However, please bear in mind that I am not in any sense laying any complaint against the Review and Herald or its editor. Every editor has always the unquestionable right to exclude anything. I am stating these things as illustration of the truth that the very same truths which I have been teaching all these years, and which are vital truths to the people and to our message as the issues of that message now are, are not acceptable to the General Conference administration; and secondly, in order that the many inquiring people may know truly and exactly why they do not read anything from me in the Review and Herald.

C.L. Taylor: Brother Jones, may I say just a word. I received a letter from one of our leading editors stating that he had received orders not to publish anything from you and some others whose names were given.

Voice: Louder! We didn’t hear that.

C.L. Taylor: I say that I received a letter from one of our leading editors stating that he had received orders not to publish any articles received from Dr. Paulson, Dr. Kellogg, or A. T. Jones.

A.T. Jones: Possibly these orders have now been given to all of the denominational papers.

Also now as in 1901, “The conferences are weaving after the same pattern”. Here is an instance that actually occurred not a great while ago: A certain individual in every respect. He has his private individual business, strictly legitimate and honorable, that he has built up wholly by his own efforts. And yet the

president of the conference in which he is, gave that brother to understand that if he does not quit that business in the place where he is and leave the place where he is, the denomination will withdraw its support from him. But not in any sense is the denomination supporting him. Some individual Seventh-day Adventists have patronized his business; there may be some who are doing so now; but that is as near as the denomination has anything to do with supporting him. Therefore, the kernel of this procedure is that the conference president proposes to dominate that private individual in his private business, or else work a denominational boycott against him. And when denominational management has reached that point, it is time that somebody was speaking in behalf of the common liberty as well as the religious liberty of the individual. And that is why I am speaking openly to-night. I owe it to this brother, and every other Seventh-day Adventist in the world to stand in behalf of his right to be himself, and to conduct his own private and honorable business in his own way wherever he pleases, without any reference to conference, General Conference, or any other thing under heaven.

the Sabbath-school lesson for March 17, 1906, presents D' Aubigne's excellent statement of the vital principle of the protect of Spires as follows:-

“This protest opposes two abuses of man in matters of faith: the first is the intrusion of the civil magistrate; and the second, the arbitrary authority of the church. Instead of these abuses Protestantism sets the power of conscience above the magistrate; and the authority, of the word of God above the visible church.”

This denomination has most rightly and nobly spent a great deal of time the past fifteen or more years in opposing the intrusion of the civil magistrate in the realm of religion. It is high time that at least somebody in this denomination should be Protestant enough to oppose the arbitrary authority of the church. For please bear in mind, that the arbitrary authority of the church has always been the arbitrary authority of a few in place of authority in the church. And if some of the things that are today being done in the name of this denomination are not the exercise of arbitrary authority then both the dictionary and history may well be revised.

For more than twenty years I have been preaching the same truths that I am now preaching. I preached them all over the United States and Europe, and in Canada. They were everywhere accepted by the denomination as the truth; and were published by the denomination as the truth. And when I have not changed in a single item of principle or of the truth, and yet I cannot now preach these same things without being counted “disloyal to the General Conference”, and disloyal to the organized work”, then is it not perfectly plain that the change has been somewhere else than in me or my preaching?

But I am not the only one. There are other men, who are just as good Christians and just as true Seventh-day Adventists as they know how to be, men whom God has plainly called to the work in which they are engaged; but who have been driven out, and today cannot do inside the organized work or under the General Conference administration, the work that God has given them to do. When certain ones of these were compelled to go, when I was present, I publicly protested, and asked this question: When men are just as true Seventh-day Adventists as anybody can be, and yet they can not do in the denomination the work that God has given them to do; but must do it outside the organized work, then is it not plain enough that there is something wrong with the administration and the so-called organized work? And is there not enough that is wrong to justify some study and inquiry as to why men who are called of God to the work, cannot do it inside, but are forced to do it outside the ranks of that, which stands as the work of God in the world? I ask that question yet. And if things must go on in this way till all who are called of God to the work that they are doing, shall be forced to do it outside of the organized work, then how much of the real vital work of God will be found inside the organized work?

Is it possible that anybody is expecting me to abandon all these principles, and change or modify all my teaching, just to be loyal to the General Conference, and loyal to the organized work? If so, all such expectation might as well be abandoned at once and forever; for I simply will never do it. Those principles and truths I shall hold forever, and will preach forever. They are the principles and the truths of the Bible. And I will never be loyal to any person or any thing but God, in Christ by the Holy Spirit through the Bible.

I will never believe that the church must have a visible head. I will never conform to any system of things that makes it possible for the church to have anything that corresponds to a visible head.

Excepting only those professed Protestant churches that are actually united with the State and so have the head of the State the visible head of the church, excepting only these, it is today the sober but startling truth, that the Seventh-day Adventist denomination is the only Protestant church in the world that has one man at the head and center of its organization. And in this one thing the Seventh-day Adventist denomination is more like the Catholic Church than is any other Protestant church in the world.

And this, too, is in spite of the Testimony that has been published and quoted over and over ever since the month of March, 1897, saying, "It is not wise to have one man president of the General Conference. . . ." However, as often as it has been quoted it has been explained instead of obeyed; and it will doubtless be so till the end. But Christ did not leave one man at the head and center of His organized work, when He ascended on high. He occupied and was allowed to occupy that place Himself as Head of His Church, and Head over all things to the church.

Christ, Christ alone, is the only Head of the Church; and He is the Head of each individual in the Church; as it is written, "I would have you know that the Head of every man is Christ." 1 Corinthians 11:3. And instead of going back to 1844 and a creed "let us go on unto perfection" in Christ Jesus by the glorious truth that He has given us in 1844 and since, that we may be prepared to meet Him in His soon-coming glory. Instead of either defining or defending the faith of men, let us preach the faith of Christ.

Another thing: In connection with the campaign against Dr. Kellogg, there is an item that occurred in 1901, that to me at the time and since, has had much meaning. This should now be stated.

From Sister White's address in the College Library just before the General Conference of 1901 I have, in the letter, quoted considerable of what was said concerning the wrong principles of General Conference workings and the necessity of "a change" and "an entire new organization". But that same address was just as remarkable, and to the then General Conference administration was just as revolutionary, concerning General Conference attitude toward Dr. Kellogg, as it was concerning affairs of General Conference itself. For it must be borne in mind that in 1901 there was expected, if not planned, by General Conference administration just such a move against Dr. Kellogg as has since been made; and it was then expected that the Testimony should bear as large a part in the movement as since they have been made to bear; and I believe that there was valid ground for the expectation.

But this expectation and all that was connected with it, was simply annihilated by what was said on that subject by Sister White in her address that day in the College Library. On this subject that day she said: –

"God has told me that my Testimony must be borne straight to this Conference, and that I am not to try to make a soul believe that my work is to leave the truth with human minds, and these having found the truth in the Word of God will appreciate it, and will appreciate every ray of light that God has given for poor lame souls that they should not be turned out of the way. And I want you to make straight paths for your feet lest the lame be turned out of the way.

"Now we want that in the Conference we shall have the ability that God has given unto Dr. Kellogg – I

don't suppose he is here; I don't know that he is – at any rate I want to say that the Lord wants you to make the most of the capabilities that he is using in every part of the work. He does not mean the Medical Missionary work separated from the Gospel work nor the Gospel work separated from the Medical Missionary work. He wants them to blend together. And He wants that this educating power of the Medical Missionary work shall be considered as the pioneer work, the breaking-up plow, for the breaking down of the prejudices that have existed, and that nothing will break down like it, and God wants every soul to stand shoulder to shoulder with Dr. Kellogg. He has become all but desperate, and came near losing his life because of the positions that have been taken, and every one throwing a stone right before the car so that it should not advance. Now God wants the Health and Missionary work to advance. He wants God's work to be carried on."

Sister White delivered an address, in which she said –

"What we want now is a reorganization. We want to begin at the foundation and to build upon a different principle."

"The institution under the management of Dr. Kellogg has done a great work for the education of the youth. It has sent forth more workers in the cause in medical missionary gospel lines than any other agency I know of among our people throughout the world. And I ask, how have you treated the matter? Have you felt that you were to honor God by respecting and honoring the work that has been done in His name for the upbuilding of His cause? The principles of health reform have been proclaimed by us as a people for thirty years. And yet there are among us ministers of the gospel and members of the church who have no respect for the light that God has given upon health reform.

"The Word of God is to be our guide. Have you given heed to the word? The Testimonies are not by any means to take the place of the Word. They are to bring you to that neglected Word, that you may eat the words of Christ, that you may feed upon them, that by living faith you may be built up from that which upon you feed."—General Conference Bulletin of 1901, p. 25.

Thus it is demonstrated, not only that in every respect I stand to-day exactly as I did before in 1897, and in 1899, and in 1901, but also that the principles and the attitude that I then held were in every respect confirmed in that address in the College Library, April 1, 1901, and in the one at the opening of the General Conference, April 12, 1901. I do not say that even then, either Dr. Kellogg or the Medical Missionary and Sanitarium work was without fault or flaw. I do not say so now. I simply say that a person of whom, and a work of which God could so speak as was then spoken, is worth earnest effort to save. And the word given to me of God was and is, "Destroy it not for a blessing is in it."