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Problem

Edward Alexander Sutherland, 1865-1955, was one of the most notable and successful educational reformers of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. He served the church for sixty years, fifty-three of them as president of four Adventist colleges. This study has been delimited to his years of denominational employment, 1890 through 1904, but does not include his forty-one years as president of Madison College—a self-supporting Adventist institution that received no direct financial assistance from the denomination.

Method

This study, investigating Sutherland's life from the perspective of his work as an educational reformer, employed the historical
method of research. Major sources included extensive correspondence housed in the archives of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Loma Linda University, Andrews University, and the Ellen G. White Estate. Official minutes of organizations and institutions, denominational periodicals, and miscellaneous archival materials were also valuable sources of information.

Conclusions

Sutherland led in the campaign to eradicate the classics from Seventh-day Adventist colleges and to place the Bible at the center of the curriculum. His philosophy of holistic education permanently altered the thrust of Adventist education from the elementary through the college levels. He was instrumental in the creation of the Adventist elementary and secondary-school system and a distinctive teacher-training program. Placing major emphasis on manual labor, Sutherland developed a viable work-study curriculum and sought to instill in Adventist youth a deep commitment to being missionaries regardless of their chosen career.

Attuned to the reforms of his era, Sutherland's work was reflective of the educational innovations attempted both in the Adventist church and in society at large around the turn of the century. His aggressive actions brought to fruition many of the reforms that his Adventist predecessors in the United States had not been able to consummate, as well as reforms not previously attempted by them. Sutherland's efforts to integrate faith and learning illuminate the most significant reform period in the early years of Adventist education. This study should be helpful in providing perspective
for the educational challenges presently confronting the Seventh-day Adventist Church.
Dedicated to
my dear wife Carolyn
and our children: Linda,
Brent, Mark, Eric, and Timothy
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Edward Alexander Sutherland was quite possibly the most notable and successful educational reformer in the Seventh-day Adventist Church during the formative years of its educational system. He played a key role in the growth and development of both the elementary and secondary levels of Adventist schooling, and a major, though controversial, role in the curricular reform of three Adventist colleges. His reforming work has affected all of Adventist education.

Throughout a lifetime as an educator, Sutherland tried conscientiously to follow biblical principles and the counsels of Ellen White regarding Christian education. He was an earnest student of the Bible. Until her death in 1915, he maintained a frequent correspondence with Ellen White.

Sutherland's great concern was to educate every child of Adventist parents to become a missionary for the church. As one means of achieving that goal, he promoted free education in church schools. In addition, he stressed a practical integration of faith and learning, not only in word but in every aspect of student life. He came to perceive the curriculum as encompassing virtually every activity of a student's life. Thus he espoused a holistic view of education. In order to educate the whole person, Sutherland concerned himself not only with effective classroom instruction and active missionary work but also with promoting manual labor as an integral and required
part of the curriculum, with particular emphasis on agriculture.

Still quite young when he accepted his first post as an administrator, Sutherland soon revealed a willingness, indeed a zeal, for educational reform. From an early beginning he spent fifty-three years of dedicated service as president of four different Adventist colleges (three denominational and one self-supporting)—a record not likely ever to be broken. During those years he touched thousands of young lives with his zeal for God and his church. He was concerned to instill in the youth the calling of a missionary, regardless of the career they might choose to pursue.

Sutherland pursued the scientific course at Battle Creek College from 1886 to 1890. Immediately following his graduation and wedding, he and his new bride travelled to Minneapolis, where he worked for a year as principal of the Minnesota Conference School.

It was during the summer of 1891 that he made a number of weighty decisions that gave direction to his life and an orientation to his lifelong work for the church. Following a year of teaching at Battle Creek College, he accepted the position of principal of Walla Walla College—a school yet to be built. In charge of erecting and guiding that institution from its inception in 1892, he served as its principal-president from 1892 through 1897. While still at Walla Walla, Sutherland began to experiment with curricular reform—a work he would pursue most of his lifetime.

Called to Battle Creek College in 1897, Sutherland set about initiating the reforms he had attempted at Walla Walla as well as experimenting with new ones. It was during Sutherland's tenure at
Battle Creek that he was instrumental in fostering the proliferation of Seventh-day Adventist industrial and elementary schools. He also played a vital role in the development of an organized teacher-training program for the church. As editor of the Advocate, the educational journal for the Adventist denomination, he helped to convince the members of the church that they should send their children to church-operated schools to receive a "Christian" education. Of critical importance was Sutherland's successful campaign at Battle Creek College to replace the classics with the Bible as the central focus of collegiate education. He also fostered the transformation of the college into a training school for Christian workers.

In 1901 Battle Creek College was moved to Berrien Springs and renamed Emmanuel Missionary College. There, in a rural location, Sutherland transplanted his earlier reforms, added new ones, and gave the curriculum a practical and missionary orientation unprecedented in Adventist educational institutions in the United States up to that time. He managed to build the new college exclusively with student/faculty labor. While serving as president in Berrien Springs, Sutherland strengthened the ministerial and teacher-training programs and innovated other special academic programs as well.

During his years at Battle Creek and Berrien Springs, Sutherland generated considerable suspicion and criticism. While most of it was unfounded, it made life frustrating and progress difficult. He consequently resigned the presidency of Emmanuel Missionary College in 1904 and went to the South.

At Madison, near Nashville, Tennessee, Sutherland established
a self-supporting college known as the Nashville Agricultural and
Normal Institute (later renamed Madison College), a school so dis­
tinctive that it was featured in Reader's Digest in 1938 as a "self-
supporting college" where "education and real life meet," and "where
students earn their own way to learning." Eleanor Roosevelt also
visited the school, at the urging of Secretary of State Hull, to pre­
pare an article for her daily column "My Day."¹ Sutherland served
as president of the college for forty-one years and, in addition,
became involved in the direction of the medical work of the campus
sanitarium upon completion of his M.D. degree in 1914.

In spite of his long and distinctive life of service for the
Adventist church in the field of Christian education, no major
biographical study has been written about Sutherland. The few
articles or chapters that mention him deal primarily with the institu­
tions of which he was president.

An unsigned article in the Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia
contains a brief chronological sketch of Sutherland's life; however,
it draws no inferences or conclusions and even fails to mention that
he was a pioneering educational reformer.² A considerable amount of
material may be found on him in the history of Battle Creek College
and Emmanuel Missionary College, The Wisdom Seekers, written by Emmett
K. Vande Vere. Four chapters are dedicated to the years of Sutherland's

¹Weldon Melick, "Self-Supporting College," Reader's Digest
32 (May 1938):105-9. Eleanor Roosevelt, quoted in Golden Anniversary
Album: Fifty Years of Progress at Madison (n.p. [1954], p. 61).
²"Edward Alexander Sutherland," Seventh-day Adventist Encyclo­
presidency at those institutions. The major intent of the material is to present a history of the institutions, consequently it does not include a detailed study of Sutherland and his work there. Richard W. Schwarz, in his denominational history textbook, *Light Bearers to the Remnant*, includes material on Walla Walla, Battle Creek, Emmanuel Missionary, and Madison colleges. Treatment of Sutherland, however, is necessarily general.

The four-volume *Origin and History of Seventh-day Adventists*, by Arthur W. Spalding, contains two chapters directly relating to Sutherland's work at Emmanuel Missionary College and Madison College. As in the aforementioned books, however, treatment of Sutherland is secondary to the central purpose of the work. In his *History of Seventh-day Adventist Education*, E. M. Cadwallader includes a scant three pages on the Sutherland years at Battle Creek and Emmanuel Missionary colleges and one brief chapter covering the Madison years. The work of the institutions is the primary focus.

In 1979, two of Sutherland's former students--Ira Gish and Harry Christman--co-authored *Madison: God's Beautiful Farm*, a brief but pleasant little book that gives an overview of Sutherland's life.

---

with special emphasis on his years at Madison College. It is based principally on personal recollections and makes no pretense of being a documented study.\(^1\) W. C. Sandborn, a teacher at Madison, wrote a dissertation titled "The History of Madison College." Being a history of the institution, however, information on Sutherland is limited.\(^2\)

Two biographical sketches have been written about Sutherland. Floyd A. Rittenhouse wrote a fifteen-page article on Sutherland for *Adventist Heritage*.\(^3\) A chapter written by Warren S. Ashworth for *Early Adventist Educators* also contains an overview of Sutherland's life.\(^4\) Neither of these sketches claims to be comprehensive treatments.

The primary purpose of this study is to trace the contributions of Sutherland to Adventist education from 1890 through 1904. In order to accomplish this task with as much insight as possible, this study provides a biographical sketch of his development from 1865 up to 1890 and introduces the educational context in which he lived and worked.

Due to the length of Sutherland's career and to the importance and controversial nature of his contribution to Seventh-day Adventist

---


education, this study has been delimited to his years of denominational service, 1890 through 1904. The study does include, however, a sketch of his heritage and life up to 1890.

A chronological approach has been followed in this study of Sutherland's life. His denominational career divides neatly into three periods--his college presidencies at Walla Walla College, Battle Creek College, and Emmanuel Missionary College. A topical approach has been used within these periods while maintaining a generally chronological scheme within each topic. Brief synthesis and evaluation have been added where appropriate, but the major evaluation is to be found in the final chapter.

Because Sutherland was so intensely and intimately involved with the institutions he directed, a quite detailed history of certain aspects of the colleges evolved in the process of writing this biography. That is as it should be, since an understanding of the history of the schools is indispensable to a correct understanding of Sutherland and his work.

It would be folly to claim complete objectivity in this study. The present researcher was initially intrigued regarding Sutherland through reading about him in The Wisdom Seekers some years ago. A careful study of the primary documents has tended to create a positive bias toward him and his work. In spite of his impressive accomplishments, however, Sutherland was very human, capable of errors of judgment, decision, and speech. This dissertation is a sincere effort to present a balanced and frank portrait of the man and his work.

The major sources for this study have been the document collections housed in the Archives of the General Conference of...
Seventh-day Adventists, the Ellen G. White Estate offices in Washington, D.C., and at Andrews University, the Loma Linda University Heritage Room, the Madison Alumni Office in Tennessee, and the Heritage Room of the James White Library at Andrews University. A fuller discussion of the sources is given in the bibliography.

The portrayal of Sutherland has been governed by the sources available to the writer. In the future, hopefully, additional documents will be found that will shed helpful light on aspects that still remain somewhat unclear. That, after all, is the nature of historical research. Sutherland did not keep a diary, nor was he prone to express himself with total frankness in most of his correspondence. He had, however, a loquacious friend in Percy T. Magan—his colleague, friend, and confidant. Since they enjoyed an unusually intimate closeness of viewpoints, desires, and goals, much of Sutherland and his work can be perceived through Magan's disclosures. Admittedly, the filter of Magan is colored. Fortunately, however, Sutherland and Magan lived in an era when a great deal of communication was by written correspondence. Thus, correspondence from a broad spectrum of other people was available to cross check Magan's perceptions. The picture, therefore, should prove to be a reasonably accurate one.

★ * * ★

Just as the portrait of Sutherland has involved many sources, so the completion of this study has involved many helpers. I gladly declare my deepest indebtedness to the Almighty for His sustaining power and daily blessings. I also feel especially grateful to my wife, Carolyn, for her willingness to bear with me patiently during
the years of research and the eight months of separation during the writing. She has managed the home, a job, and caring for our five children. They too deserve my thanks for being patient with me. I could not have accomplished this without the support and prayers of my family.

Regarding the preparation of the study, I am especially indebted to George Knight, chairman of my committee, whose encouragement, broad knowledge of Adventist history and educational history, editorial skills, and incisive perceptions have made this project move on to completion. I am also grateful to Richard Schwarz and George Akers for serving as members of my committee in spite of their heavy administrative obligations. Their insights, criticisms, and suggestions have contributed greatly to the study's accuracy and clarity.

Without the generous offer of time and financial support from the administrators of Pacific Union College this task could not have been accomplished. I am indebted to them for their assistance and encouragement as well.

Archivists are the indispensable friends of historical researchers, and I am indebted to several. Mable Towery graciously assisted me in my earliest documentary searches at Madison, Tennessee, and has donated much valuable material. Roger Goodge and Norman Peek of the Layman Foundation in Tennessee also generously shared materials and insights. At Loma Linda, Jim Nix did all he could to assist me in combing through its extensive collections. Don Yost and Bert Haloviak at the General Conference Archives; and Robert Olson, Don Mansell, Alta Robinson, Tim Poirier, and others at the Ellen G. White
Estate office in Washington, D.C., gave me invaluable assistance and support.

The archivists at Andrews University have been special friends. Hedwig Jemison was always ready to assist in any search for additional information, and Bill Fagal, her replacement, has been unfailingly helpful as well. Pauline Maxwell, Lucille Haagenrud, Merlin Burt, and Einar Rom have all given ready assistance, too. I am particularly indebted to Louise Dederen for her gracious kindness in allowing me the use of a corner of the Heritage Room for the last eight months, and for her expert assistance in finding the hard-to-find materials as well as those more readily available. A thank you is due her cheerful assistant Charlotte Erickson as well.
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I trust that the pages of this study will contribute not only to the understanding of Edward Alexander Sutherland, but will deepen the
reader's appreciation for the way in which God has blessed and guided the Seventh-day Adventist Church and its system of Christian education in the past and promises to sustain them in the future.
CHAPTER I

THE EARLY YEARS: 1865-1897

Contextual Overview

Edward Alexander Sutherland was born into a social order undergoing rapid change that would permanently alter the world and the kind of education needed to live and work effectively in that world. Four major factors contributed to the educational metamorphosis he witnessed during his lifetime. First, industrialization had begun to replace agriculture as the economic foundation of the Western World in general and the United States in particular. Increasing mechanization on farms and in the cities freed growing numbers of people to pursue an education. Meanwhile, the constant growth in technology created a demand for more and better educated workers—men and women with expertise in the practical side of life.

Second, an unprecedented democratization process had begun. For over two thousand years education had remained the privilege of the elite and had emphasized languages, words, and the ideas of brilliant minds as recorded in the classic writings throughout history. Education belonged largely to those who did not need to work with their hands. Consequently, it was predominantly intellectual rather than manual. Industrialization and democratization inexorably altered that emphasis and thrust education into a prolonged period of flux,
a period referred to by Frederick Rudolf, a leading historian of
American higher education, as one of curricular "disarray."^1

Third, the latter half of the nineteenth century witnessed
a strong reaction against theological modernism. Earlier in the cen-
tury, new denominations and sects had flourished in the United States.
Bible societies had been founded to afford universal access to the
scriptures. Theological modernism, however, had strengthened as
industrialization and technology advanced. Then came Charles Darwin's
theory of evolution, propounded in mid-century. Scientific advances,
both theoretical and mechanical, caused shock and reaction as some
Christians perceived an inexorable deemphasis on scripture, and on
religion in general, in the well-established educational institutions
of America. This led to a movement to create a new generation of
Christian schools founded on the Bible.

Fourth, coupled with the evangelical reaction to modernism
was the missionary goal of evangelicals to evangelize "the world in
this generation."^2 This mandate added fuel to the drive by fundamen-
talist denominations to establish "Bible Colleges" in the United
States. An awareness of this mission is indispensable in understanding
the context of the evolution of evangelical Protestant education in
the nineteenth century. Frank E. Gaebelein has written that

---

1Frederick Rudolph, *Curriculum: A History of the American
Undergraduate Course of Study Since 1636* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

2John R. Mott, "Report of the Executive Committee," in *Student
Mission Power: Report of the First International Convention of the
Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions, Held at Cleveland,
Ohio, U.S.A., February 26, 27, 28 and March 1, 1891* (Pasadena, CA:
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the evangelical revivals in the nineteenth century created both a thirst for knowledge and a demand for trained laymen. The awakening of the Church to the world-wide mission called for many more missionary recruits than seminaries were producing. American freedom from tradition and the absence of rigid state controls opened the way to nonconventional schools and provided the conditions for their development. . . . It is not a coincidence that the Bible-institute movement grew up during the very period when the philosophy of naturalism became prevalent in American education. Even in evangelical seminaries first place was usually given to language and critical studies at the expense of direct study of the Word as an experience of divine reality.

In 1883 the first Bible institute, now called Nyack Missionary College, was founded in New York as the Missionary Training College for Home and Foreign Missionaries and Evangelists. Three years later, Dwight L. Moody founded the Moody Bible Institute in Chicago. Both schools were established to prepare people effectively, but hurriedly, for missionary service.²

Seventh-day Adventist education grew and developed in this world of educational ferment, inevitably influenced by all four factors. Edward Alexander Sutherland stood in the vanguard of the early Seventh-day Adventist educational reformers.³

---


Family Background

Edward Alexander Sutherland's paternal grandfather was born and raised in Scotland in the late eighteenth century, and was educated for the Presbyterian ministry in Glasgow.¹ Not long after his marriage in Scotland, the Sutherlands emigrated to North America, first establishing residence near Montreal in Quebec, Canada.² Later, about 1860, they moved to Lodi, Wisconsin, with the financial assistance of Sutherland's cousin, a Mr. Cook, of New York.³ There on the frontier the properly-educated Scotsman, who had taught Greek and Latin in his homeland, found very little demand for his academic skills. Consequently, his wife, in addition to mothering their ten children, bore much of the financial responsibility for the family.

As events would later reveal, the Civil War years of the 1860s proved to be a very important time, not only for the nation but for the Sutherlands. With patriotic zeal for his new country, one of the Sutherland sons, Joseph, volunteered to fight but was rejected because his arms were too short. Resigned to staying at home and working on the farm, he became acquainted with a neighbor girl named Mary Rankin.

Mary was the eldest of the eight sisters and two brothers

¹ Joseph Sutherland obituary, RH 88 (October 26, 1911):23. The grandfather's name is not known.
² Ibid.
³ Anna Yeoman (Sutherland's sister), interview with Felix Lorenz, pp. 20-21. Lorenz's interviews are recorded in an unpublished manuscript, n.d., Madison Alumni Office. (The paging was done by Warren S. Ashworth). Lorenz conducted interviews with Sutherland's family and contemporaries over a period of about fifteen years. The last appears to have been conducted about 1970.
living with their parents on the large well-established Rankin farm.¹
All twelve members of the family had become Seventh-day Adventists
as a result of attending the tent meetings held by Elder Isaac
Sanborn. Thus when Joseph Sutherland—a non-Seventh-day Adventist--
came courting, Mary gave him a cool reception. Despite her initial
reserve, he finally persuaded her to be his wife. They were wed in
1864.

One year later, in the early winter of 1865, they struck out
on their own to make an independent future for themselves. In spite
of Mary's advanced state of pregnancy, they joined a caravan of
covered wagons and left their home territory. They had journeyed
about one hundred miles from home, family, and friends; passed the town
of Prairie du Chien; and started across the bridge that spanned the
border between Wisconsin and Iowa, when they had to stop because Mary
was in labor. Moments later Edward Alexander Sutherland was born.
It was March 3, 1865. Since his parents had not yet reached the half
way mark on the bridge he was born in Wisconsin, not Iowa. After a
brief delay the Sutherlands continued their journey for another hun­
dred miles, finally reaching their destination--a farm near Otranto
Station, Iowa, just five miles from the Minnesota state line.²

Apparently Mary lived her religion faithfully in their home
in Iowa, for by the time Edward was eight years old, his father had
joined her as a member of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. Together

¹Ibid. The ten children from oldest to youngest were Mary
Sutherland, Helen Druillard, Melissa Clement, Ida Rankin, Jimina Hill,
Effie Yale, Grace Conser, Belle Conser, Alexander, and Frank.

²Edward Alexander Sutherland obituary, RH 132 (July 28, 1955):
the Sutherlands raised all their children to honor God and do their 
honest share of work on the farm. Edward shared his chores with his 
sister Lydia, two years his junior, and the younger siblings, Anna 
and Walter, born nearly ten years after Lydia. The parents were 
active in sharing their Adventist beliefs and were instrumental in 
organizing the Otranto Seventh-day Adventist Church.¹

It is evident from Sutherland's life and work as an adult that 
he was taught to know and practice the principles of the Bible as a 
youth. He also learned valuable lessons in the school of experience. 
While still very small, Edward and his sister herded the family cows 
for a penny a day. He saved a total of thirty-five cents by the end 
of the summer. The following spring he invested it all in onions. 
That summer Edward sold his onion crop at quite a profit. In the 
meantime he heard that skunks had become so numerous and destructive 
that the county was offering a bounty. He saw another opportunity 
to make some money and took it. On cornering his first skunk, unfortu-
nately, he tried to kill it with a club—the only weapon he had. 
His attempt was not successful. Years later he would often tell the 
story because he saw it as having a moral in one's dealings with 
others. He would say: "When you encounter a skunk leave it alone. 
If you don't you will soon smell just like the skunk."²

Edward's father and mother were not the only relatives active 
in church work. He had four aunts who became well known for their 

¹Mary Rankin Sutherland obituary, RH 94 (October 25, 1917):22. 
This church is now known as the Austin Seventh-day Adventist Church 
of Austin, Minnesota.

²Sarah Peck, interview with Lorenz, p. 3.
contributions to the Adventist denomination. Ida Rankin was the first
dean of women at Battle Creek College and a life-long teacher. Her
sister, Effie Rankin Yale, served as matron at both Battle Creek and
Union colleges for many years. Melissa Rankin Clement's daughter
became the editor of the Youth's Instructor. The fourth sister,
Nellie Helen Rankin Druillard, came to be known and loved as "Aunt
Nell" or "Mother D" by all as she spent a lifetime serving the
Seventh-day Adventist Church in a number of important positions. She
became a teacher, county superintendent, secretary treasurer of the
Nebraska Conference, and in later years held other financial and
administrative positions.1

**Education in Otranto and Battle Creek**

Little is known of Edward's early formal education. It is
not known where he attended elementary school or even if he did. It
is possible, however, to confirm that he completed his secondary edu­
cation at Otranto High School. After graduation he accepted a teach­
ing position in a local country school and travelled back and forth
to his new job on his Indian pony, Mouse.2

On completion of his first year of teaching, Sutherland went
to Minnesota for the summer of 1883 to sell books as a canvasser.3
In Minneapolis, he stayed in the home of a wealthy widow by the name

---


2Yeoman, interview with Lorenz, p. 20.

3Yeoman, interview with Lorenz, p. 21. E. A. Sutherland to H. O. Olsen, July 5, 1949, Sutherland Coll, AUHR.
of Josephine Gotzian who had spent some time the year before at the Battle Creek Sanitarium. While there, she had become a Seventh-day Adventist. Sutherland found that though the woman was quite wealthy she was also very frugal. Mrs. Gotzian had found that she could buy milk more reasonably at a place further from her home, so Sutherland would get up very early every morning and fetch it for her. He would also take her riding evenings and Sundays in her carriage. The woman thought a great deal of him for his kindness. Little did Sutherland know how richly he would be repaid many years later.¹

While in Minnesota, Sutherland went to the town of Mankato to attend the Minnesota Conference campmeeting. There he heard George-I. Butler, president of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, give an invitation to the youth to go to Battle Creek. Butler explained that Dr. John Harvey Kellogg was offering a year's premedical course to prepare Seventh-day Adventist young men to go to Ann Arbor to complete their medical training. Kellogg strongly desired to secure physicians who would have an understanding of the principles of health as he understood them.² Returning to Iowa, Sutherland informed his family of his plan to study medicine, made the difficult decision to sell Mouse for the needed funds, and left for Battle Creek.³

Young Edward's father was strongly opposed to his pursuing any further education. He was determined that his son should follow

¹Yeoman, interview with Lorenz, pp. 21-22. During his years at Madison, Gotzian proved to be one of the college's staunchest financial supporters.

²E. A. Sutherland to H. O. Olson, July 5, 1949, Sutherland Coll., AUHR.

³Yeoman, interview with Lorenz, p. 20.
in his footsteps and become a farmer. Joseph felt a lasting resentment toward his own father, who was an "educated gentleman" but had obligated his mother to be the principal breadwinner for their family of twelve. Having endured hard times, the resentment he felt toward his father strongly colored his perception of education in general. Joseph's daughter, Anna Sutherland Yeoman, in later years, remembered her grandfather as an "educated loafer." Since it is highly unlikely that she ever knew him personally, it is not unreasonable to assume that Anna had heard that term used more than once at home in reference to her grandfather.¹

Sutherland arrived at the Battle Creek Sanitarium sometime between 1883 and 1886 to begin the premedical course. To his chagrin he found that there was only one other student enrolled, George Hare.² It is unclear whether the two received any classes, but Sutherland lamented that Dr. Kellogg and his associates "after several months decided they were not warranted in giving the course for only two, so it was cancelled."³ Confronted with a very frustrating situation, 

¹Yeoman, interview with Lorenz, p. 21.

²Sutherland stated twice in his letter to Olson that he entered the premedical course in the fall of 1884. On the other hand, Yeoman claimed it was the winter of 1885-86. Sutherland, however, claimed that the first time he went to Battle Creek was the first year of the presidency of W. H. Littlejohn. That was 1883-84. Thus it may be deduced that either Sutherland was mistaken regarding it being Littlejohn's first year, or he was mistaken regarding the date of his first visit to Battle Creek. The details are further confused by the fact that Sutherland recalled having returned to Iowa to teach for three years. The Battle Creek College documents show that he became a student there in the fall of 1886. Even if he canvassed the summer of 1883, which seems the most probable, he can only have taught school two years or, at most, parts of three years.

³E. A. Sutherland to H. O. Olson, July 5, 1949, Sutherland Coll., AUHR.
Sutherland decided he would take advantage of being in Battle Creek to gain the proficiency in English that he knew he lacked, so he sought someone to teach him. He had the good fortune of being able to study as a private student under the tutelage of Professor Goodloe Harper Bell.¹

Bell had been the principal of the Seventh-day Adventist Select School in Battle Creek and had headed the English department at Battle Creek College from 1874 through 1882. During the time that Sutherland studied with Bell, he learned much about English and a "great many things about the beginnings of Battle Creek College and its operation" during its first decade as the denomination's only school of higher education at that time.²

Sutherland's father had not been at all pleased with Edward's plan to study medicine, but when word reached him that his son was spending all his time and money on "grammar," he was even more disgusted—as were the other members of the family. In the spring of 1884 Edward returned home. For two years he taught again in a country school. Edward had not, however, given up his determination to get a college education. In September 1886 he enrolled as a full-time student at Battle Creek College.³

Joseph Sutherland's attitude toward education, even Christian education, was typical of that of the majority of Seventh-day

¹Yecman, interview with Lorenz, p. 20. For a definitive study on Bell, see Allan G. Lindsay, "Goodloe Harper Bell, Pioneer Seventh-day Adventist Christian Educator" (Ed.D. dissertation, Andrews University, 1982).
²E. A. Sutherland to H. O. Olson, July 5, 1949, Sutherland Coll, AUHR.
³Battle Creek College Records, 1876-1904, vol. 1, p. 302.
Adventist parents in the 1880s. Their enthusiasm, however, slowly increased. Edward's determination and success no doubt influenced his father's changing opinion on the value of education. On one occasion when Edward returned to the family farm at threshing time, his father purposely gave him the hardest job—that of pitching the straw. Though his mother was distraught over it, both the father and son stuck it out, and though Edward's hands blistered badly, he did not complain but kept at it all through the harvest. When it was over his father commented: "Well, I guess you've got the right stuff in you, you can go to college," and Edward returned to school.¹

In 1889 Edward's father moved the whole family to Battle Creek where they lived until 1891 when Union College was organized, and Joseph accepted a call as business manager of the new institution.² While living at Battle Creek, Edward's youngest sister—Anna—was not allowed by her father to attend school because she was sickly. She had poor eyesight, and her father did not want her to wear glasses. He did, however, permit her to take lessons from Professor Barnes. By the time the Sutherlands moved to College Place, Nebraska, however, Anna was permitted to be one of the original seventy-three students in the new college.³ Father Sutherland had clearly changed his attitude toward education in the years since Edward had first gone to Battle Creek.

¹Yeoman, interview with Lorenz, p. 20.
²Joseph Sutherland obituary, RH 88 (October 26, 1911):23.
³Yeoman, interview with Lorenz, pp. 20-21. David D. Rees and Everett Dick, Union College (Lincoln, Nebraska: Union College Press, 1941), p. 39. The authors state that there is no extant list of the original seventy-three students but an approximate list has been compiled. Anna is included in it.
One of Edward's classmates was a lovely young lady named Sallie Viola Bralliar. She was born six years after Edward, on March 28, 1871, in Richmond, Iowa. Thus they had grown up in the same state, just one hundred and fifty miles from each other. There is no evidence that they had known each other before attending Battle Creek College, but their friendship at the college eventually deepened into love. Her special interests were art and modern languages, especially German; his was science. She was a youthful nineteen to Edward's twenty-five when they graduated along with twenty-eight others on June 16, 1890—he from the scientific course, she from the academic. They were married in August of that year.\(^1\)

Sally proved to be a loyal wife and strong support for Edward. She was a capable educator, and the year after graduation served as matron of the Minnesota Conference School. She worked as head of the art department and teacher of German at Battle Creek College in 1891-92. During their years at Walla Walla College she served both as matron and superintendent of the domestic department, 1892-94, and as art and German teacher, 1894-96. On their return to Battle Creek College in 1897, she taught physical culture, and painting and drawing. Later she would serve as principal of the academy, dean of women, home economics and dietetics teacher at Madison College, and as manager of the Madison-sponsored vegetarian cafeteria in Nashville. During her retirement years she traveled extensively with her husband,

\(^1\)"The Class of '90," RH 67 (June 24, 1890):400. (Sally Viola Bralliar Sutherland obituary, RR 130 (July 16, 1953):28. BCC Cal, 1894, p. 40).
helping to give seminars in connection with the General Conference Commission on Rural Living. When she died on March 18, 1953, ten days short of her eighty-second birthday, they had been married for almost sixty-three years.  

The Sutherlands were given their initial work assignment in Minnesota. Since the first missionary endeavors in the early 1860s, the Seventh-day Adventist message had met with bitter opposition from the popular urban ministers in Minnesota. The Adventist work, therefore, had been established in predominantly rural areas and small communities. A church was finally established in Minneapolis by H. P. Holser at the corner of Lake Street and Fourth Avenue South, in February 1882. There were twenty charter members.  

In 1888 the conference established its first "Conference School" in the basement of the Minneapolis church. It continued there for many years. The principal for the first two years was C. C. Lewis. He had been teaching at Battle Creek College as chairman of the English language and literature department for three years when he was asked to take this new position. In 1890 he desired to further his education, as did his coworker--Sarah Peck. So they, with a small number of other coworkers, left Minneapolis. During Edward and Sally's freshman and sophomore years at Battle Creek College, Lewis was still teaching at the college. Thus he probably knew them both.

---

1Sally Sutherland obituary, RH 130 (July 16, 1953):28.
3Peck, interview with Lorenz, p. 2.
and may have been instrumental in acquiring the newlyweds as replacements for him and his staff.

Edward and Sally had graduated in June 1890 and had married two months later. Thus their trip to Minneapolis may have been their honeymoon. From the moment they arrived, however, they must have worked very hard to have everything in readiness for opening day on October 1, only two months after their wedding. During that school year, 1890–1891, they had approximately one hundred students. Their students tended to be older than average college students. Many of them, perhaps the majority, were older than Sally and some were possibly even older than Edward. Nevertheless, the young couple had a successful year—she as matron and he as principal.

At the Minnesota Conference committee meeting the following June, Sutherland must have felt understandable pride as he reported that by the end of the 1891-92 school term all but three of the students had made a profession of Christianity. Thirty were planning to go to Union College. Of the remaining students, a large number had chosen to enter the canvassing work or some other branch of labor for the church.

Following one year as principal of the Minnesota Conference School, Sutherland accepted the position as head of the history department at the newly opened Union College near Lincoln, Nebraska. Rapid moves, however, were being made by the General Conference to

---

1"Minnesota Conference School," RH 67 (September 2, 1890):542.
adequately staff both Union and Battle Creek, and as a result, Sutherland returned to his alma mater to teach general history and Bible, and to serve as dean of men.¹

The Significant Summer of 1891

The summer of 1891 was an unforgettable one for Sutherland. It proved to be one of the most important formative periods of his life. He was challenged to serious thinking and lasting decisions in five major areas: (1) his understanding of the doctrine and experience of righteousness by faith; (2) his position regarding vegetarianism; (3) his attitude toward the writings of Ellen White; (4) the real meaning of Christian education and how best to teach it; and (5) his choice of a lifework.²

In June 1891, Sutherland met Percy T. Magan, his former college roommate, at Union College. Magan was an irrepressible Irishman and a recent convert to the Seventh-day Adventist faith. During Sutherland's last year in college, Magan had been travelling on a round-the-world trip with S. N. Haskell, a highly esteemed student and teacher of the Bible who had been sent by the General Conference to survey strategic areas for mission stations. Ellen White had recommended young Magan as Haskell's travelling companion and secretary. Magan's close association with such a man of God, who had a

¹BCC Cal, 1891, p. 3. E. A. Sutherland, "Chapel Talk before the Medical Students at Los Angeles," December 14, 1949, pp. 3-4, Sutherland Coll, AUHR.

clear understanding of scripture and a firm faith in the writings of Ellen G. White, had greatly deepened and intensified his own experience in spiritual things.¹

Reminiscing at Union College in 1891, Magan and Sutherland recalled the momentous events that had transpired three years earlier. The year 1888 had been a year of great theological significance for the Seventh-day Adventist Church. Until that time, the majority of the church members and even the leaders had not had a clear understanding of the fundamental doctrine of righteousness by faith, especially experientially. At the Minneapolis General Conference held in October 1888, Ellen White, A. T. Jones, and E. J. Waggoner had stood in the minority in their eloquent support of the message of Christ's saving righteousness. Magan had attended those meetings, Sutherland had not. Now in 1891 Magan was convinced of the doctrine, Sutherland had not yet thought it through carefully. Magan had had an enviable association with Elder Haskell, Sutherland had not.

In June 1891 Magan began to read to Sutherland from the writings of Ellen G. White. Sutherland later recalled: "As he read, there came to me the acid test: 'Do you believe in righteousness by faith? Are your sins forgiven because Christ's offer has been accepted, or do you strive to attain righteousness by your own works?''² While Sutherland was searching his soul and making a
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personal commitment to the experience of righteousness by faith, both he and Magan were given the opportunity to attend an educational institute in northern Michigan.

As General Conference educational secretary, W. W. Prescott had organized the first Seventh-day Adventist teacher's institute at Battle Creek in 1888 with thirty teachers in attendance. They had selected seventeen principal topics for consideration, some of which were of particular significance, namely:

1. The relation of our educational work to the third angel's message. . . .
2. (5) How shall manual training be best carried on in connection with our schools? (6) To what extent should students be encouraged to take long courses of study? (7) What position shall we take with reference to the granting of degrees? (8) To what extent can religious instruction be given consistently and profitably in connection with the school work? . . .
9. (14) What is the best plan for teaching the English Bible?

Numerous recommendations had been proposed and accepted as a result of that institute—recommendations that would bring the Adventist practice of Christian education into closer harmony with the ideals expressed in the writings of Ellen G. White. Implementation, however, had been much less successful than Prescott had hoped for.

Following the institute, in the fall of 1888, Prescott attended the General Conference session in Minneapolis. There he was profoundly impressed by the sermons on the experience of righteousness by faith. Since he was also concerned about the counsels of Ellen White regarding the essence of Christian education, he eventually laid plans for a nationwide teacher's institute to study the topics of

---

righteousness by faith and Christian education. It was to be held during the summer of 1891, and not only teachers, but ministers and church leaders were invited."

Approximately eighty participants attended, though there may have been as many as one hundred present counting the speakers and staff. They stayed in tents which were pitched in a wooded area on Little Traverse Bay, near Harbor Springs, Michigan. It was a strategic choice of location in that it was very near Petoskey, where Ellen G. White was spending her summer. It seems very likely this was the predominant motivation for the choice of location, for while the counsels of Mrs. White could be read at any location, having her personally address the gathered workers would maximize the desired effect.

The meetings began July 15 and ended August 17. The speakers included Ellen G. White, W. W. Prescott, J. H. Kellogg, and A. T. Jones. There was a relaxed pace—three classes each day from 9:00


3}{GCC Min, August 4, 1891, p. 3. For the most complete description of the Harbor Springs meetings see Craig Willis, "Harbor Springs Institute of 1891: A Turning Point in Our Educational Concepts," March 1979, DF 60-a, EGWRC-AU. For the development of Adventist educational theory, see George R. Knight, "Ellen G. White: Prophet" in Knight, Early Adventist Educators, pp. 32-37.}
a.m. to 12:30 p.m.; the rest of each day was for study, meditation, and prayer. It is evident that at least some took advantage of the free time to go fishing. Sutherland recalled: "I enjoyed fishing and eating the results of my catch." But he also remarked that Magan would neither fish nor eat any, and that "he was diligent in calling my attention to the instruction in the Bible and in the Testimonies on the subject of diet." At Harbor Springs Sutherland became convinced that God's original diet for humans included no meat and decided to become a vegetarian without delay.

According to Sutherland, in the 1890s many Seventh-day Adventists still regarded Ellen White's "Testimonies" as messages of counsel for private individuals, not as statements of principle having general application. He recalled that "when we read what had been published from the pen of Sister White, we would place it on the bookshelf and thank the Lord that it had not been sent to us." But as the days passed and Magan and Sutherland studied together, Sutherland finally accepted the messages as having a general application. It was a conviction fraught with great import for the rest of his life. During these same meetings Magan also persuaded Sutherland to give up the plan he still cherished of taking medicine at Ann Arbor, Michigan; to give up going to Union College; and to accept a last-minute call to teach at Battle Creek College.

---

1 W. C. White to E. R. Jones, July 28, 1891, EGWRC-DC.
3 Sutherland, "Chapel Talk," 1949, p. 3.
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Ellen White spoke at least six times during the Harbor Springs Institute. She addressed the theme of righteousness by faith in two sermons. In her "Talk to the Teachers" she dealt with the importance of learning of Christ in education and the elimination of all exposure to authors who were "infidels" who had "prostituted their powers." She also read from her testimonies written nearly twenty years earlier regarding Adventist schools and their work. This undoubtedly included her 1872 counsel on "Proper Education" in which she emphasized the physical and practical side of education.

Magan recalled ten years later that at the time of the Harbor Springs Convention the words "Christian Education" were "unknown," but at that convention the challenging thought had developed that "righteousness by faith" and "education by faith" were to move forward hand in hand. He noted that the subjects of educational reform which were discussed and studied were:

- the elimination of pagan and infidel authors from our schools,
- the dropping out of long courses in the Latin and Greek classics, and the substitution of the teaching of the Bible and the teaching of history from the standpoint of the prophecies.

---

1Ellen G. White, "Talk to the Teachers," July 27, 1891, MS 8b 1891. The sermons on righteousness by faith were: "The Importance of Exercising Faith" and "The Great Sacrifice Made for Us," MSS. 83, 8, July 22, 24, 1891, EGWRC-DC.


He believed that "the definite beginnings of the work of an educational reformatory movement" owed their birth to the gathering at Harbor Springs.¹

The Battle Creek College board met soon after the convention; President Prescott and the board deciding to adopt the Bible course of study that had been recommended at Harbor Springs and to drop the English and academic courses by mid 1893. They also recommended three specific Bible classes during the 1891-92 school year: one in Old Testament, another in the Gospels and Acts, and the third in the Epistles.²

Up to 1891 Bible study was included in only two years, one course in Old Testament history and one in New Testament. Both were apparently taught at the high school level. A four-year plan was devised at Harbor Springs to take the students beyond the high-school level. The reformed curriculum would embrace a holistic approach to Bible study, would include four years of history taught with the objective of learning lessons for the present, and would include an advanced English course. New Testament Greek and Biblical Hebrew were to be optional. The holistic philosophy expressed by Prescott revealed his commitment to the message of righteousness by faith. In 1893 he wrote:

It has not been the purpose to put in the background those doctrines which distinguish us, but to make it appear that these are simply the doctrines of the Bible as a whole; that the third angel's message is simply the gospel, and that the message properly understood is an understanding of all the

¹Ibid.
²BCC Fac Min, August 26, 1891.
Scriptures, and that all of our doctrines have their basis in a proper knowledge of the gospel, and grow out of a belief in Jesus Christ as a living personal Saviour.

The enthusiasm for needed change immediately following the Harbor Springs Institute had greatly pleased Prescott. But a spreading resistance set in, and though Prescott shared the counsels that he had received from Ellen White, he was strongly opposed by key faculty members. This was particularly true regarding his view that the classics, higher math, and some philosophy should be modified or eliminated entirely. In spite of the opposition of the Battle Creek faculty to reform, Prescott was repeatedly reminded by Ellen White of the need for it. In June 1892 he had received her testimony "To Teachers and Students," and in October of that year he had received two of her personal testimonies regarding the school work. 

It is likely that it was this continued resistance and outright opposition from Seventh-day Adventists in general, and the Battle Creek College faculty in particular, that prompted Magan to lament ten years later:

In our first love of this new light, and in the joy begotten by the brightness of its radiance, we fondly thought that the work of educational reform would be gladly grasped by our educators, our ministers, our students, and our people everywhere. Since then ten long years have rolled away, during the whole of them the precious principles of Christian education have been struggling for recognition and the occupancy of their rightful place in the hearts of ministers, teachers, and people as well as in the organic system of this great work.

---


Bible Teacher at Battle Creek
College, 1891-92

Sutherland began teaching at his alma mater in the fall of 1891. When first asked to come he had been told he would teach history, but an urgent need developed for a Bible teacher and he was pressed into service. Wanting to be frank and honest regarding his personal philosophy, he talked with Prescott before classes began and expressed the concern that he might not be considered "orthodox on all points." He was told that he had taken all the courses in Bible offered by the college and that he should therefore go ahead and teach.¹

He began his class in Old Testament with a study of the book of Genesis. The students immediately encountered God's original plan for living—a home in a rural setting and a flesh-free diet. As they studied Genesis 1-9 and certain passages in Exodus, the conviction grew among the teacher and his students that Battle Creek College should not be serving meat as part of its menu. Prescott and Uriah Smith, president of the college board, urged Sutherland to stop teaching vegetarianism, but the conviction among the students continued and spread. It culminated in the signing of a petition by 150 students requesting a meatless diet in the college dining room.²

The school was sharply divided on the issue. While many believed a vegetarian diet was God's ideal and should be implemented without delay, others believed that Paul's counsel to judge not in

¹Sutherland, "Chapel Talk," 1949, p. 4.
²Ibid. BCC Fac Min, December 1, 1891.
matters of meat and drink was applicable. Prescott, apparently not totally convinced of the importance of the matter, took the opposite side to Kellogg in the argument. In spite of the fact that Kellogg was reasonable in his counsel—urging the elimination of pickles, vinegar, and fried carrots, and gradually all meat as well—Prescott resented his aggressive insistence that something must be done without delay.

Sutherland was not involved in the unpleasant debate between Prescott and Kellogg on the larger issue of the whole diet of the college. He had, however, played a major role in the issue of vegetarianism and that was enough to bring him to the attention of the General Conference president, O. A. Olsen. The influential Kellogg was also impressed, asking Sutherland how he had achieved success and adding that he had attempted to urge vegetarianism a number of times at the college, but had not even gotten a "look in." Sutherland's willingness to consider and encourage reform had begun to mark him in the eyes of the denomination's reform element. Thus, when talk began of creating an Adventist college in the northwestern part of the United States, the church leaders were attracted to Sutherland, the young reform-minded Battle Creek College teacher.

---

1John Harvey Kellogg was physician-in-chief of the Battle Creek Sanitarium and a dedicated health reform advocate. For an exhaustive study on Kellogg see Richard William Schwarz, "John Harvey Kellogg: American Health Reformer" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1964).


3E. A. Sutherland, wire recording of autobiographical address presented at the College of Medical Evangelists, ca. 1946, Madison Alumni Office. Hereafter referred to as Sutherland, Wire Recording.
In the spring of 1890 there were only 1,200 Adventist church members in the entire Pacific northwest, but they were dedicated and progressive. The North Pacific and the Upper Columbia conferences each had their own academies: The North Pacific Academy with over 100 students and Milton Academy with about 150. Both had been built in 1887 and both were prospering at the time Prescott visited them during the spring of 1890. Therefore, it was with real consternation that the brethren listened to Prescott recommend that the two schools merge into one centrally located institution. Neither school board desired to merge or to close their school, but when it was found that Ellen White supported the plan that Prescott urged, their attitude began to change. By the fall of 1890, a committee of thirteen had been appointed, with members from both conferences, to study the proposition.\(^1\)

It was no easy decision to make and it created marked dissen­sion, but the committee finally voted to establish the new school as a college and they named a committee to select a name and the best location.\(^2\) Portland and Milton, Oregon, and Spokane and Walla Walla, Washington, were all considered as sites. It was actually voted to locate at Milton and convert the existing academy into a college.


\(^2\)D. T. Jones to R. A. Underwood, January 5, 1891, RG 11: Box 60, Lb 6, GCAr.
At that critical juncture, however, N. G. Blalock, a physician who was also the leading fruit grower in the Walla Walla region, offered to donate forty acres of prime land located two and one-half miles southwest of the city of Walla Walla (population 7,000) if the church would sign an agreement to operate a school there for twenty-five years. Three church members signed without delay, agreeing to personally pay for the land should the denomination fail to maintain the school for the stipulated period of time.¹

The next General Conference session decided the matter without delay. On March 11, 1891, Walla Walla College was founded, if only on paper.² Money had to be raised and blueprints drawn up for the institution. Sometime between late March and the end of April 1892 ground was officially broken for construction.³ Gifts of land, according to Sutherland, finally totalled 360 acres. Of these, 350 were sold to raise money for construction, leaving the college with a tiny plot of ten acres. The surrounding land was bought up very quickly and the little village of College Place began to mushroom.⁴

¹Sixty Years of Progress, pp. 78, 89, 90.
³Sixty Years of Progress, p. 94. Conflicting dates exist for the groundbreaking.
⁴O. A. Olsen to W. C. White, April 19, 1892, EGWRC-DC. Sutherland, “Chapel Talk,” 1949, p. 4. The total number of acres given by Sutherland may be high. The GCB of March 11, 1891, p. 66, gives a figure of 175. Due to the large discrepancy between the two figures one wonders if the figure of 175 was calculated after considerable acreage had already been sold. Sutherland on the “Wire Recording” of 1946 stated that 320 were sold.
The denominational leaders were very concerned that the right man be selected to head the challenging enterprise of creating a new college from virtually nothing, but there were pressing needs in other parts of the work as well. At that very time W. C. White wrote to O. A. Olsen regarding the possibility of Sutherland going to help build up the educational work in Australia. Olsen confirmed that Sutherland was a good man, but that they had decided to send him to Walla Walla. They had hesitated to send him there due to his youth and inexperience, but they had decided it was the best they could do under the circumstances. They also reasoned that Walla Walla was not so very far away, and that they would be able to assist if complications arose or to make changes if that should be necessary.\(^1\)

The Sutherlands arrived at Walla Walla in July 1892 to help build and organize a college from scratch. Edward was twenty-seven and Sally twenty-one. Despite his inexperience, Sutherland had several factors in his favor. He had worked under Prescott at Battle Creek College and heartily believed in the variety of educational reforms that Prescott had sought for several years to implement. He also had learned much from Kellogg and was careful to serve a strictly vegetarian menu from the start. In fact, Kellogg later that year would hold up Walla Walla College as an example for Battle Creek College to emulate on the diet question.\(^2\) Sutherland had the added

\(^1\) O. A. Olsen to W. C. White, June 15, 1892, EGWRC-DC. W. W. Prescott to O. A. Olsen, February 10; May 4, 1896, RG 11: Bx 46, Misc Let (1893-1902); GCAr.

blessing of being sent to Walla Walla College as the "principal" of the institution under the watchful eye of Prescott as president.¹

Within one month Sutherland was enthusiastically writing to the General Conference president that the school would be able to open by December 1, 1892. He was concerned that if they waited until January they would lose students to other institutions. Olsen wondered if they could be ready in such a brief time, but encouraged them to try.² Much of Sutherland's time was spent in visiting churches, homes, and campmeetings to arouse interest in Christian higher education in general and Walla Walla College in particular. He sought also to raise funds wherever he went. By October the financial situation was so dire that Sutherland warned Olsen that the school would probably not open on time.³ In addition, Sutherland had to contend with the continuing criticism and destructive work of some of the church members. One man went so far as to write those who had made pledges, telling them not to pay because the school would not be a success.⁴ Dissension and confusion persisted regarding the academy situation.

Olsen promised to help as much as possible. He even made a special trip to Washington in the latter part of October to preach courage and perseverance. On his arrival, Olsen must have been

¹Prescott was still serving as president of Battle Creek and Union colleges as well.

²O. A. Olsen to E. A. Sutherland, July 25, RG 11: Bk 7, pp. 495-96, GCAr.

³O. A. Olsen to E. A. Sutherland, October 30, 1892, RG 11: Bk 8, p. 275, GCAr. Sutherland's letter to Olsen is not extant. Olsen, however, alludes to it, revealing the salient facts that Sutherland had mentioned.

⁴O. A. Olsen to W. C. White, November 1, 1892, EGWRC-DC.
pleasantly surprised to find the building up and "almost ready for use." He reported to W. C. White that the citizens of Walla Walla were "well pleased with the whole outlook" and Sutherland assured White that the school would be opening on time with Prescott there for a two-week period at the outset.¹

In spite of the difficulties, the four-story brick building constructed on "Sunflower Hill" was ready to open by December 7, 1892. It had two brick four-story dormitories connected to it with a capacity for 150 students. As snow flurries were beginning to fall, the new bell in the cupola rang its summons and all the students and most of the community gathered in the virtually unheated gymnasium for a brief service of welcome and orientation. The rest of the day was spent examining and classifying students. School began with ten teachers and 101 students. The kitchen was unfurnished, and no locks were on any doors. Since one had to travel two and a half miles to get to the nearest bank, Mrs. Sutherland reported that she kept the tuition money that had been collected beneath her pillow. As a further safeguard, she kept her bed against the door.²

On December 8 the two local newspapers gave reports of the official opening ceremonies. The report in the Walla Walla Statesman was quite brief, but The Morning Union-Journal reported that dignitaries on the program included the board chairman, R. S. Donnell, pastors of the Walla Walla Congregational and First Presbyterian

¹ O. A. Olsen to W. C. White, November 1, 30, 1892, EGWRC-DC.
² Sally Sutherland, quoted in Sixty Years of Progress, p. 102.
churches, Reverend Jonathan Edwards of Whitman College, Dr. Blalock, donor of the original property, and the former governor of Washington territory, Miles C. Moore. The main speaker was W. W. Prescott. His address was entitled "Christian Education." The reporter commented that his remarks were "well chosen and delivered in an eloquent and able manner."^1

While local reporters were present for the opening of the college they appear to have almost totally ignored it thereafter. During the five years of Sutherland's administration at Walla Walla College the school was very rarely even mentioned in the newspapers. They seemed more concerned about reporting the political scene, serialized stories, advertisements for medicines touted to be the ultimate panacea for the ills of mankind, and sensational crimes. Apparently unconcerned about the lack of newspaper coverage, Sutherland and the college personnel spent their energies building a reputation in a quiet, solid manner.

More important to them than the issue of a reputation was the problem of improving accommodations. In the beginning, creature comforts were very spare. There was one bathroom with one tub for all the young men and one bathroom and one tub for all the young women. When Sutherland sent a letter to the General Conference urging the appropriation of funds for more "water fixtures," Olsen answered with a letter in which he referred to page 351 of Kellogg's book, Man the Masterpiece, where a mode of bathing is prescribed which does not require "very expensive fixtures." Olsen also wrote an entire page

^1The Morning Union-Journal, December 9, 1892.
extolling the virtues of a "sponge or hand bath" that requires little water—even "a pint will answer admirably in an emergency." He made it clear that this kind of "knack of meeting emergencies" would stand the students in good stead in "the canvassing work" and for "meeting the world in its varied phases."¹

Though weary and hungry from travelling, the new arrivals certainly found the first meals rather unappetizing. Ella Evans, the preceptress and last of the staff to reach the school, later recalled that her first meal consisted of white crackers and milk. They had not been able to get the new range to heat—only smoke. She noted, however, that soon Mrs. Sutherland, the matron, and Mrs. Giddings, the cook, were providing "excellent vegetarian food."²

In preparation for the first school year, Sutherland had prepared an informative bulletin called the "First Annual Calendar." The contents began with a Bible verse indicative of the primary emphasis at this new college: "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom, and the knowledge of the Holy One is understanding."³ The administration was serious about keeping things under tight control. The section of the bulletin concerning regulations made it very clear that unrestricted association of the sexes was strictly forbidden. They were not even to associate in public.⁴ Mrs. George Enoch recalled many years later that several single people were on the

¹ V A. Olsen to E. A. Sutherland, December 28, 1892, RG 11: Bk 8, pp. 529-30, GCAr.
² Ella Evans, quoted in Sixty Years of Progress, p. 98.
³ WWC Cal, 1892, p. 2.
⁴ WCC Cal, 1892, p. 9.
faculty that first year and two or three weddings occurred the following summer: "We all wondered how they had got acquainted, when boys and girls were not even supposed to walk on the same side of the street." She remembered that a young man could visit a young woman in the dormitory lobby once a month "if it didn't take too long."  

The college offered two four-year courses of study—the classical and the scientific. The required curriculum greatly resembled the curriculum at Battle Creek and Union colleges. It is doubtful that Sutherland would have modified the basic curriculum at that point in his career, even if he had been at liberty to do so. Although Sutherland and Prescott were amenable to the implementation of curricular reform, they were uncertain as to how best to achieve it. Classical Latin and reading in the classics were required at Walla Walla in both the scientific and classical programs and in the English literature course—"the Reading of Standard Authors." Those taking the classical course also took Greek and read a variety of the Greek classics. In addition to the four-year courses, the school offered a three-year "Biblical Course" that excluded classical Latin and Greek, but required New Testament Greek. Even in the three-year biblical course, the class in "Higher English" required a "Critical Study of the Masterpieces of English and American Authors."  

Although the school calendar did not list "Bible" as a required subject in the curriculum of either of the four-year courses, it was specifically listed as required in the first and second years

---

1Mrs. George Enoch (Bertha Graham), interview with Lorenz, p. 13.

for the biblical course. Bible was not required, however, for the third or final year of the biblical course. On the other hand, the calendar section describing the "Plan of Work" clearly stated that "the study of the Holy Scriptures, and of history interpreted in the light of Scripture, will be made prominent features of the work." It went on to spell out the four years of work--earlier Old Testament period, the life and teachings of Jesus, the epistles, and Old Testament prophecies.\(^1\) Apparently the four years of Bible were offered as electives but were not required in most courses of study.

One might gain the impression that because the biblical course was only three years long, it was deemed a less rigorous or less important program of study. One possible rationale for the three-year course was that it originated in the counsel received from Mrs. White urging the preparation of workers in as brief a time as possible. Less than two months after Walla Walla College had opened, the General Conference president was urging the creation of a department for older students that would give a "thorough course of Bible training in one or two years time." He even outlined a suggested curriculum: Bible, reading, English language, health, temperance, and medical missionary work. He also suggested a name for the department--"Bible Missionary Training Department."\(^2\)

---

**Developing an Educational Philosophy**

As a child and youth, Edward Sutherland had been taught by his father to place little importance on higher education. This was

\(^1\) WCC Cal, 1892, p. 15.

\(^2\) O. A. Olsen to W. C. White, January 25, 1893, EGWRC-DC.
partly because Joseph felt higher education was not needed to be a good farmer and partly because of the enduring resentment he harbored toward his "educated" father. Edward, however, chose to do what he personally thought best. Instead of farming, he became a teacher immediately upon completion of his high-school training. Exposure to the questioning minds of students served to heighten his awareness of the value of further education. During his first stay in Battle Creek, studying under Professor Bell, he not only learned English grammar but was probably exposed to Bell's philosophy of Christian education and the history of the beginnings of Adventist education.

As a student from 1886 to 1890 young Sutherland had listened to educators like Prescott, Kellogg, and Mrs. White exsoumd their philosophy regarding Christian education. He knew that as early as 1872 Mrs. White had emphasized that Adventist educators were to be "reformers" who were to balance a study of books with thorough-going preparation for the practical side of life. Sutherland had almost certainly discovered that Ellen White repeatedly emphasized certain themes: (1) that the ancient School of the Prophets is the model to emulate; (2) that the science of salvation is the greatest of sciences; (3) that fictitious and infidel books are to be avoided; (4) that "agriculture and the mechanical arts" should be taught in every school; (5) that the study of the Bible is of redemptive importance and to be emphasized above all other studies; (6) and that students must be helped to become thinkers--able to reason from cause to effect.\(^1\)

---

\(^1\)White, Fundamentals of Education, p. 44.
\(^2\)Ibid., pp. 95, 186, 92-94, 72, 27, 266.
Sutherland made some profound and far-reaching decisions in the summer of 1891, for his attendance at the Harbor Springs Institute had a strong impact on him. The deep impressions that many felt were succinctly expressed in Prescott's statement:

We expected to receive and did receive light from God, not only in the study of the Scripture but in our plans for educational work. I will speak further of the changes which grew out of that institute, which to my mind, with the plans discussed and adopted, marked a remarkable change in the history of our educational work.1

As Sutherland confronted the new role of college principal, his closest mentor continued to be Prescott. Prescott found in Sutherland a willing learner who took seriously his declaration that Adventist schools were no longer to have two classes of students: some preparing to work in "the message" and some to teach and go into other business. All were to be taught of God and be "workers in God's cause," even while they pursued their studies. Prescott held that the dichotomy of "religious education" and "secular education" should not exist. All was to be "religious education" with the objective of developing to the utmost the abilities of each "for labor for God wherever he may be."2

With his faculty, Sutherland made a careful study during preschool sessions and other special occasions together of the Ellen G. White writings on Christian education. They also studied Painter's History of Education.3 Sutherland would recall many years later that

---

2Ibid., p. 357.
they followed with great interest the development of the educational work in Australia. He declared that they had sought to model their college after the Avondale School for Christian workers that was established in 1894.¹

Curricular Modifications

Sutherland could not forget the strong emphasis that Mrs. White placed on manual training. He had read the numerous counsels and had heard them reiterated at Harbor Springs, but building a college from nothing had proved to be too large a project. He had been unable to plan and implement a manual training program while building the college. This situation, however, soon began to change. The school needed enlargement and improvements, so manual labor was available. Because of the financial panic which hit the northwest in 1893, many of the new landowners who had bought acreage from the school were unable to meet their payments and the school was able to regain sixty acres of fine-quality farmland. The college promptly put in crops and fruit trees and began a dairy. These projects all utilized student labor.²

Though the college had been able to acquire additional land, it too was affected by the marked financial depression. Although attendance had reached 165 the first year, and the school year ended

¹E. A. Sutherland, "The Light Must Go and We Must Be Ready for the Day Break," commencement address at Emmanuel Missionary College, 1951, AUHR.

with a $9,000 surplus, by the end of 1893 the school had accrued a debt of $1,200 and was incurring a deficit of over $200 a month. The school business manager was away much of the time and the bills were not being paid. Fortunately, the General Conference stepped in and sent one of their finance men, A. R. Henry, to save the situation. In spite of the hard times, attendance the second year increased to 216.1

With rare exceptions, the college did not allow any student under fourteen to attend school and live in the dormitories. From its inception, Sutherland urged the attendance of older, more mature students who would take full advantage of the flexible academic program. The faculty and staff viewed the college as a missionary enterprise with the dual purpose of acquainting the local citizenry with Seventh-day Adventists and of preparing missionary workers for the denomination's worldwide task. The entire Walla Walla region was very enthusiastic over the school and its positive influence. It had generated surprisingly strong support that included sizable donations of funds.2

A new outreach was established beginning with the 1893-94 school year. The faculty organized a free night school for the "people of the village." Courses were available in "Bible, history, English, physiology and hygiene, and healthful cookery." The evening classes created "a close bond of unity and fellowship between patrons

2Gr-enville Holbrook to O. A. Olsen, March 18, 1893, EGWRC-DC.
and school which made for lasting results."\(^1\) The General Conference president was very pleased and wrote W. C. White:

I have come to think that here is a point in which we have been negligent in the past. It should have been the case that in every community where our schools are located, we ought to arrange for lines of study outside of the regular school and school hours, to reach a larger number of people that are equally desirous to learn the way of life that some others have.\(^2\)

It must have brought great joy to Sutherland to be able to write in the Review and Herald in 1894 that only two out of 216 students did not study Bible or sacred history, and that thirty-two had been baptized. He testified:

The power of God has been felt in a marked manner. A restraining influence has been over the students, and the work has moved with scarcely a jar... We have been almost free from sickness. One of the best physicians in Walla Walla has said that this is due to our way of living. Let all the glory be given to the Lord, for we have simply tried to follow the instructions given us in the testimonies.

A central goal developed at the college, that of making the "work of the most benefit to our people in the shortest amount of time." With the 1894-95 school year, therefore, a flexible academic program was implemented—one that was tailored to the age, maturity, and needs of each student. Sutherland wrote:

One feature that is encouraging is that a goodly number who are with us this year are men and women of mature minds and good ability, who, with a short training, can be prepared to do useful work in the field. For this class we have arranged a special line of work consisting of Bible, history, English language, natural sciences and sacred music. The work is conducted on such a plan that if the student can remain in school

\(^{1}\) Helen Conard, quoted in Sixty Years of Progress, p. 106.

\(^{2}\) O. A. Olsen to W. C. White, March 29, 1894, EGWS-DG.

\(^{3}\) E. A. Sutherland, "Walla Walla College." RH (June 19, 1894): 397.
but one year, he will receive a good start and a fair preparation; or if circumstances will allow him to return another year, he can take up the same line of work more extensively than the preceding year. This work is not for those who are young and who desire to pursue a regular course of study, but for those of mature minds who can spend but a short time in school.

Olsen wrote to Prescott that the course was "the most satisfactory that I have ever yet seen for this class of students." He felt that on the basis of what "Sister White has written," the Bible schools that had been held in recent years in connection with denominational meetings were not the answer, but that this specialized training should be conducted in the "regular schools and colleges." He felt that the faculty at Walla Walla had "virtually solved the problem."2

Since the college had been avidly vegetarian from the beginning, it was only logical that cooking classes should be offered. Initially, due to limited facilities, only twenty-five of the more than one hundred interested students could receive instruction. This, however, was a beginning. Sutherland believed that as a direct influence of the college there were more vegetarians in the two conferences the college served than in "any two conferences" in the United States. He was growing increasingly convinced of the central role the colleges played in molding and changing the people. Thus, he argued, "let them be really and truly denominational schools, and for the denomination."3

1E. A. Sutherland, "Walla Walla College," RH (October 8, 1895):653.

2O. A. Olsen to W. W. Prescott, January 6, 1895, EGWRC-DC.

While Sutherland was seeking to provide short, intensive training for those who needed it, he was feeling the need for graduate study for himself as an educator. He wrote Olsen and Olsen agreed fully with Sutherland's suggestion because he felt Sutherland was "of that age that his mind is settled." Events, however, would not allow Sutherland to do any graduate study until nearly twenty years later. At the very time he was writing to Olsen about his desire to study, Sutherland received an invitation to go to help build up the educational work in Africa. Olsen felt the loss would be too great for Walla Walla College, so he sent Sutherland a wire "to place your name as President of the faculty." In the telegram he also recommended "Professor E. B. Miller as Bible teacher." The General Conference stratagem was to have all things appear as normal. Then, if Miller's health and courage proved up to it and he favorably impressed the administration, he might take over at Walla Walla, allowing Sutherland to go to Africa. But it was not to be. Miller did go to Walla Walla and did good work, but by early 1896 he had contracted tuberculosis. Sutherland's invitation to Africa was filled by another.

In early 1895 Mrs. White wrote a thirty-nine page tract on

1 O. A. Olsen to W. C. White, April 18, 1895, EGWRC-DC.
2 O. A. Olsen to E. A. Sutherland, May 7, 1895, RG 11: Bk 14, p. 188, GCAR.
3 E. A. Sutherland to O. A. Olsen, April 17, 1896, RG 21: 1896-S, GCAR. O. A. Olsen to E. A. Sutherland, April 29, 1896, RG 11: Bk 15, p. 422, GCAR. P. T. Magan to W. W. Prescott, April 21, 1896, EGWRC-DC. Magan revealed that E. B. Miller, Tina Wigg (who had been teaching healthful cookery), and Carrie DeGraw (sister of Bessie DeGraw) had contracted tuberculosis. The three were living and working at Walla Walla College.
the subject of education. A dozen copies were sent to Sutherland. After careful reading, he distributed them and requested another dozen. This presentation by Ellen White made a very deep impression on him, for the ringing plea was for the urgent, brief preparation of workers. She contended: "If we had a thousand years before us, such a depth of knowledge would be uncalled for, although it might be much more appropriate; but now our time is limited." She was concerned that some students would become so fascinated with books that they would lose sight of the goal for which they had come to school. They were to be trained to be successful missionaries rather than "mental dyspeptics." To Sutherland this must have seemed like one of the strongest indictments Ellen White had ever written. It prompted him to devise a plan, which, though radical, would be an honest attempt at putting theory into practice. He had T. E. Andrews, his teacher of English language, write out his view of the "best plan of work for the college," and Sutherland wrote out his own. He sent these to Olsen with a cover letter in which he asked Olsen to "criticize freely."

---


2E. A. Sutherland to L. T. Nicola, July 16, 1895, RG 21: 1895-S, GCAr.

3White, Our Educational Work, pp. 4, 8.

4E. A. Sutherland to O. A. Olsen, July 15, 1895, RG 9: Misc Rec, Olsen, O. A. -3, GCAr.
Sutherland believed his plan would not "narrow" or "cheapen" education, but would make it more "liberal" and "extensive." There would be only one course of study. It would, however, "cover fully as much as our present Biblical, Scientific, and Classical courses."¹

This single course would simply be referred to as "the work" offered by the institution. It would obviate granting diplomas and degrees, but a "certificate of scholarship" would be awarded. Sutherland was advocating what might reasonably be described as a non-graded, non-credit, accelerated learning program at the college level. While it seems overly strong to state that he "was not a believer in traditional curricula or degrees," it is true that what he was advocating would necessarily do away with both.² He clearly felt, however, that the inspired indictment warranted such a radical departure from the "traditional."

Perhaps he reasoned that a worthy precedent had been established for departing from the norm when the Union College Calendar, five years earlier, had listed the names of the teachers without their degrees. Prescott had been the president of Union at the time, and Sutherland said it was Prescott's presentation of principles that had set him "thinking in a line that I had never thought before." According to Sutherland the Union College teachers had been told "that it

¹E. A. Sutherland, "A Line of Work for the Walla Walla College," n.d., p. 1. This was an eight-page, single-spaced, typewritten position paper that was included with Sutherland's letter to O. A. Olsen, July 15, 1895, RG 9: Misc Rec, Olsen, O. A. -3, GCAr. Andrews' paper, a little over three pages long, single-spaced, and titled "To the Faculty at Walla Walla College," was also included with the Sutherland letter.

would be more pleasing to the Lord to drop degrees, titles, etc.\(^1\) He further reasoned that "it is well known that degrees are bought almost as cheaply as a cayuse pony out in this country." He did not denounce diplomas and degrees per se but felt the church had "no business to hold out a degree or diploma before our young people as an inducement to finish a course of study."\(^2\)

Over a year earlier, Mrs. White had urged in the Review and Herald a rejection of a worldly influence that encouraged "pride, ambition . . . . and striving for high rewards and honors as a recompense for good scholarship. All this should be discouraged in our schools."\(^3\) It is not difficult to see how Sutherland quite easily interpreted that statement to support a deemphasis on diplomas and degrees.

He also reasoned that there were eschatological implications related to the granting of degrees. If the teachers published their degrees, students would want the same. In order to have "an honest degree or one that really means anything," they would have to "complete a long course of study." Thus students would be induced to remain in school and "there is little force in the argument that time is short and that students had better prepare rapidly for the work and lay aside the completion of their course." In addition, if students are compelled to remain in school for a long time, they not only begin to feel time is not so short but also "grow careless about

\(^2\)Sutherland, "A Line of Work," pp. 1, 2.
\(^3\)E. G. White, "To the Students at Battle Creek College," RH 71 (January 9, 1894):111.
their habits and deportment, and slowly drift away from the Lord."^1

How to achieve his objectives was now the issue. He and Andrews postulated a plan of study which would not divide a subject into sections, but would treat it as a whole. Sutherland used history as an example. Instead of spending four years in ancient, medieval, and modern history, the first year would "cover the whole subject." It would not, of course, cover history in detail, but would rather deal with "the philosophy of history, that is, study causes and their effects, thus giving the student the key that will unlock all the dealings of God with man." Sutherland would emphasize in that first year those major principles involving God's ancient people, and those relating to God's people now. This would give a basis for understanding both the "papacy" and the "image."

If the student could stay a second year, the history program would "lead him over the same ground by going deeper into the subject and developing the principles more extensively." Each year the basic material would be refreshed in the memory and then they would "dig deeper and deeper." Sutherland readily recognized that not all would be capable of such accelerated learning, but he reasoned: "the good student who can do in two years without any greater effort what the slower student must have four years to do will not be kept out of the work." Andrews concurred with a parallel line of reasoning regarding English. He confirmed that when a student studies rhetoric and literature, grammar is "largely laid aside." Sutherland's plan, aimed to build "precept upon precept," repeatedly fixing the "great principles"

---

in the student's mind and adding details as applicable. He believed the same methodology was viable for teaching the natural sciences. Professor Droll who taught those courses was said to be "heartily in favor of it."\(^1\)

Sutherland's proposal to Olsen recognized the problem of adequate textbooks and asserted that textbooks should not be discarded completely. He urged, rather, a "freeer [sic] use of reference books" so students would do more "original work." His plan, Sutherland believed, would make the college "strictly denominational, for the denomination, and by the denomination."\(^2\)

Sutherland and his faculty evidently began to increase their experimentation during the 1895-96 school year. No curricular changes, however, were printed in the school calendar. Sutherland was still seeking more counsel and critiquing of his plan. He was quite concerned that he be in harmony with Ellen White. On the matter of degrees, for example, Sutherland wrote twice to Prescott in the early months of 1896. Prescott was in Australia holding meetings and assisting in the initial development of the Avondale School for Christian Workers. Sutherland asked him to question Mrs. White about her views regarding degrees. Prescott did so and she told him that she had never written anything regarding degrees. She expressed almost total ignorance of their significance. She said that the question for Adventists to ask was not "whether a young man had a degree, but whether he had suitable preparation so that he could be a blessing

\(^1\)Sutherland, "A Line of Work," pp. 1-6.
When Sutherland asked Prescott whether he should seek to secure a charter that would enable Walla Walla College to grant degrees, Prescott answered:

For myself I should say, No. If I were in your place, I should want to feel perfectly free to arrange the work just as I thought would be best for the young people and for the work, without being bound by the idea that you must maintain a course of study so that you could consistently grant degrees.

Not everyone agreed with Sutherland's proposal. George W. Caviness, president of Battle Creek College, had evident reservations about it. He considered the plan extreme and felt that some of the moves of the last few years had hindered the work rather than benefitted it. His letter rather strongly implied that Sutherland's plan would do the same. Since he felt that Prescott and Ellen White approved of his plan, Sutherland ignored the negative reactions of some and began to implement his ideas more vigorously.

When Olsen informed Prescott in early 1896 that he considered Sutherland's experimentation at Walla Walla a success, Prescott was pleased. In fact, Prescott said that he "had laid the same plans before the faculty at Battle Creek and they had not been prepared to give them a fair trial." He added that Sutherland's plans were "nothing different" from the ones he had presented to the teachers.

Meanwhile, in March 1896 an important development took place

---

1W. W. Prescott to E. A. Sutherland, April 29, 1896, DF 520, EGWRC-AU.

2Ibid.

3G. W. Caviness to E. A. Sutherland, September 22, 1895, RG 11, Bk 14, p. 942, GCAR.

at Walla Walla College with the inauguration of a correspondence school offering courses in nearly a dozen subjects. The year ended auspiciously with the first college graduation. Two young men had completed the four-year scientific course: Floyd Bralliar, brother-in-law to the president; and Walter Sutherland, the president's brother. The other graduate, George Enoch, had completed the three-year biblical course. With 238 students enrolled during the 1895-96 year, the college set a record that stood for a number of years.\footnote{“Walla Walla College,” RH 73 (June 16, 1896):381. \textit{Sixty Years of Progress}, p. 116.}

In the early spring of 1896, Sutherland and his faculty decided to implement his "best plan of work for the college," beginning with the fall term.\footnote{Sutherland, "A Line of Work," p. 1.} They carefully incorporated it into the 1896 calendar. Sutherland described the plan in very similar language to that of his original position paper. He sent one of his first copies to Mrs. White in Australia. In a terse bit of understatement, he wrote: "We have made several changes in our work." Then he said:

As far as we understand we have endeavored to conform strictly to the plan that has been given in the Bible and the Testimonies. Wherein we have failed to meet the mind of the Lord we are ready to step out when we see it is our duty to step.\footnote{E. A. Sutherland to E. G. White, May 22, 1896, LLUAr.}

Sutherland asked her to critique both the plan and the correspondence lessons for ministers which he had included.

Ellen White may or may not have concurred wholeheartedly in his experiment. She did not correspond with him directly regarding the matter at all, nor is there any record of her having done so with
others. Mrs. White's apparent silence regarding the matter may possibly be explained by the fact that she was deeply involved in the development of the work in Australia and was determined to make certain that Avondale College, which was being established at that very time, would be a school "different from any school that has been instituted," with the Bible "taking the place in the school that it should always have had."¹

She wrote a manuscript in the autumn of 1896 which may have been intended as an answer through a reiteration of principles. It could only have served to confirm Sutherland's conviction that, at least in his basic objectives, he was right on the mark. Again she urged that "time is limited"; that not all were to pursue studies "with the same degree of thoroughness"; that having learned the basics, they should acquire "knowledge in connection with their labor"; that "as a people we are in some respects far behind in missionary work"; that we should have "twenty ministers where we now have one"; that the ambition should not be to produce "intellectual giants" but people of "firm principles"; and that "a line of Bible history should be the foundation of knowledge."²

The 1896-97 school year was destined to be a challenging and significant one for the three sister colleges at Walla Walla, Lincoln, and Battle Creek. At Union, attendance had been on a steady decline for several years and had dropped abysmally by 1896-97. Its young president, J. W. Loughhead, had been moved at the end of the

¹E. G. White to brethren Irwin, Evans, Smith, and Jones, April 21, 1898, EGWRC-DC.

²E. G. White, MS 30, October 3, 1896, EGWRC-DC.
previous year. E. B. Miller, temporarily recovered from tuberculosis, was serving as president. It would be his only year there as a result of his worsening health. The situation at Battle Creek College had been steadily deteriorating also. The problem centered on the president and would end with his resignation before the year was over. In that context the measure of success Walla Walla College enjoyed would naturally appear greater.

Given the elimination of the classical course, and the deemphasis on Greek and Latin at Walla Walla, one can surmise that an interesting situation must have developed between Sutherland and his sister, Lydia Sutherland (Mrs. George Droll), who taught the Greek and Latin. She felt a genuine concern over the deemphasis of the classical languages. In an attempt to increase interest in their study she organized a program to ceremoniously plant the first mountain ash tree on the Walla Walla campus. The program was scheduled for April 25, 1897. It included music by the school band, a song in Latin, and one of Cicero's orations given by a freshman girl. Charles Hobbs, another student, gave a flowery oration in Greek, with his teacher translating it. To finalize, the tree was planted at sunset as a student played on his silver trumpet. The next morning a thirty-two-line poem was found pinned to the ash sapling. It was titled "Thanatopsis--A Benediction on the Tree." The note was signed by "Xeximus Yuliga Zuzaverabulum." The real author, whose identity was never discovered, clearly did not like Greek and Latin, or the people who were attracted to those languages. He finished the poem with the words:
So bless this tree, and those who sang,
and those who on it ought to hang:
and when they die with all their sense,
And the tongues that this tree represents
Where they belong, there to abide,
May each be buried, side by side,
With that dead race who used to speak
The Latin language and Greek.

In the calendar of 1896, the Bible was added as "a text" that would be used in the Latin and Greek courses. Though the "Classics" were still mentioned as optional reading material, the "Vulgate," "Ecclesiastical Writings," and the "Septuagint" were now added.\(^2\)

The 1897 calendar, prepared while Sutherland was still at Walla Walla, reflected only minor changes. The classics were still listed for optional reading, but in Greek they were only allowed in the third year. Though the classics were still optional for the three years of Latin, during the second year students were required to memorize passages from both testaments of the Vulgate. The result of the increased emphasis on the centrality of the Bible may be reflected in the graduating class of 1897. Five young ladies graduated: one from the scientific course, and the remaining four from the biblical course.\(^3\)

**Perspective**

Sutherland at age thirty-two was considered a successful teacher, speaker, and administrator. The experiences of farming, canvassing, and teaching had helped to mature him. The challenge of

\(^1\)Sixty Years of Progress, pp. 117-18.
\(^2\)WWC Cal, 1896, pp. 35-36.
\(^3\)WWC Cal, 1897, pp. 34-35. WWC Second Annual Commencement, 1897, p. 3, DF 594, EGWRC-DC.
building a college from scratch and administering it had sobered him. He had discovered in himself a will and zeal for educational reform. He was willing, even eager, for advice, and he had received invaluable orientation from Prescott and Ellen White. He had, however, come to realize that he, as president, must ultimately make and be responsible for the administrative decisions, and he had done that.

His reforms had grown increasingly innovative, even radical, but Walla Walla College seemed to approve, and the school was prospering. Soon his educational philosophy and administrative acumen were to be tested in a much more critical context. He was going to be the president of Battle Creek College.
CHAPTER II

THE BATTLE CREEK YEARS, 1897-1901

Battle Creek College: A School in Tension

Battle Creek College offered a classical education from its inception in 1874. Its administrators consistently offered courses of study patterned after the degree-granting institutions of the nation. When W. W. Prescott became president of the college in 1885, he was not opposed to reform. In spite of his own thoroughly classical training, he was increasingly convinced that Ellen White's counsels on Christian education were correct and should be followed. His attempts at implementing some of the counsels, however, proved frustrating. For example, his plan to establish a viable manual labor program failed because it was resisted by the students as well as some of the faculty.1 On the basis of Mrs. White's counsels, Prescott saw wisdom in designing shorter courses, at least for the older students, but he was unable to appreciably alter the curricular programs that were already well-established.2

Realizing the importance of the students' physical development, Prescott encouraged an active sports program. This was only

natural since he had been an outstanding athlete during his college years. The program was abruptly terminated, however, when he received very specific counsel from Ellen White against the practice of organized sports because of the brutalization and spirit of rivalry they engendered.¹

As a result of the Harbor Springs Convention of 1891, Prescott sought to reduce the emphasis on the study of the classics and increase the study of the Bible. Neither effort, however, met with very noticeable success. As he tried to advance a variety of reforms, he was consistently opposed by some of his own faculty.² In spite of many setbacks, Prescott did enjoy success in two important areas: strong discipline and genuine spiritual revival. His work had so favorably impressed the General Conference leaders that they asked him in 1894 to become the first full-time educational secretary for the denomination.³

The leadership of Battle Creek College passed into the hands of George W. Caviness. Born on an Iowa farm in 1857, Caviness graduated from Battle Creek College in 1882. He taught at the secondary level for five years, one year at Battle Creek College, then served

¹Comstock Scrapbook, ADBML, quoted in Valentine, "W. W. Prescott," p. 27. E. G. White to W. W. Prescott, September 5, 1893; W. W. Prescott to E. G. White, October 5, 1893, EGWRC-DC.

²W. W. Prescott to O. A. Olsen, November 8, 1893, RG 9: Misc Rec, GCAR.
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as principal of South Lancaster Academy in Massachusetts. Caviness had a solid reputation as a fine Christian and an even-tempered gentleman. He was, however, predisposed to the maintenance of the status-quo. This was quickly noted by those who were reform-minded in Battle Creek, especially Dr. J. H. Kellogg. Thus Caviness was perceived as an impediment to advancement in Christian education.\(^1\)

Several leaders of the denomination at Battle Creek were urging educational reform. O. A. Olsen, as president of the General Conference, had urged the leaders at Battle Creek College in 1894 to invite E. J. Waggoner to leave London so he could teach Bible at the college and give the scripture its proper emphasis.\(^2\)

In 1895 Kellogg strongly urged the formation of a "regular Missionary School" where "Live Gospel teaching and actual training in the methods and means of helping humanity and saving souls" would constitute the central curricular thrust. The college, in Kellogg's view, was "stimulating students to become ambitious to get grades" which would give them "worldly renown and respect." It was all a "fraud and hypocrisy [sic]," he asserted. Caviness' wife had been granted a Master of Science degree and Kellogg doubted if she even knew the number of legs on a spider let alone "the periods of the planets." Magan had been made a "Bachellor [sic] of Philosophy," and, Kellogg conjectured, would probably be made a Doctor of Philosophy within a year. Kellogg was incensed. He believed the college was


\[^2\] O. A. Olsen to W. C. White, May 23, 1894, EGWRC-AU.
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simply offering the same work as that done at "worldly colleges" with
the exception that "it is a little inferior." A "genuine missionary
school" would provide the solution.¹

Meanwhile, Sutherland had been establishing an enviable record
as president of Walla Walla College. Consequently, in the spring of
1896 the Battle Creek College board began discussing the possibility
of bringing him in to replace Caviness. Olsen, however, was strongly
opposed for two reasons: (1) with his faculty, Sutherland was working
up a special course that Olsen wanted to have thoroughly developed
and tested; and (2) the conditions existing in Battle Creek in connec­
tion with the college would "not permit Professor Sutherland to do
justice to his own convictions of what is right." He would be "ham­
pered and bound up, discouraged and criticized to such an extent that
he could not do justice to himself nor the school." Only time would
tell how distressingly accurate Olsen's words were. He considered
Sutherland to be a "very promising and growing man in our educational
work."²

In the first two years of his presidency, Caviness had suc­
cceeded in alienating the board. His character was considered above
reproach, but as a president he was viewed as a "complete failure."
The reasons given were: a lack of "a just appreciation of the needs
of the work," a lack of "energy," and a lack of "executive and

¹J. H. Kellogg to O. A. Olsen, June 2, 1895, RG 9: Kellogg,
J. K. -l, GCAR.

²O. A. Olsen to W. W. Prescott, March 27, 1896, EGWRC-AU.
W. W. Prescott to O. A. Olsen, May 4, 1896, RG 11: Bx 46, Misc Let (1893-1902), GCAR.
administrative ability." The leading members of the faculty, P. T. Magan contended, were unanimous in their rejection of Caviness.\(^1\) The school board had apparently decided it would not be wise to try to get Sutherland just then, so it considered replacing Caviness with a "Committee of Management," a troika with one member serving as principal. It would be a temporary arrangement until the 1897 General Conference session. This plan, however, was considered too cumbersome. Emmett J. Hibbard, Frederick Griggs, and Magan were suggested as possible candidates for the presidency, but finally a vote was taken to invite Henry P. Holser to be president. He, at the time, had general charge of the European mission and felt he could not accept the invitation; his poor health also deterred him.\(^2\)

Caviness, by default, therefore, would be president another year. That was a "bitter pill" for Kellogg to swallow, claimed Olsen, for Kellogg would "not for a moment approve of his [Caviness] taking the lead" again. Worse yet, it created an antagonistic environment for the beleaguered Caviness with the "management of the Sanitarium dead set against him."\(^3\) The situation at Battle Creek College continued to deteriorate.

Prescott followed the developments while he was in Australia and felt keenly that his own "hard work of years" was being eroded.

\(^1\) P. T. Magan to W. W. Prescott, April 21, 1896, EGWRC-AU.
\(^2\) Ibid. O. A. Olsen to W. W. Prescott, April 24, 1896, EGWRC-AU.
\(^3\) O. A. Olsen to W. W. Prescott, April 24, 1896, EGWRC-AU.
He felt constrained, nevertheless, to concur with Olsen and let things ride for another year. When Prescott returned to the United States, however, he acted without delay. On his arrival in Battle Creek in late December 1896, he apprised himself of the situation and met with the faculty and board on January 5.

Prescott presented a four-point strategy for reform at Battle Creek College: (1) reorganize the educational work at the college and at the same time devise a plan whereby there would be cooperation with the sanitarium—duplication of programs would thus be avoided; (2) establish a training school for Christian workers, ministers, missionary teachers, and other missionary laborers; (3) appoint a permanent committee for maintaining worthy students; and (4) select teachers who would be willing and able to cooperate with the board. The board immediately appointed an ad hoc committee comprised of Prescott, Kellogg, and G. C. Tenney to develop plans for implementation of the four-point strategy. They were to present them one week later.²

By the middle of January 1897, Prescott presented to the board the plans of the committee. After further study, the board recommended the creation of a two-year evangelistic course and a one-year teacher's course; however, the "question of diplomas and degrees" was tabled for "future action." The board was very pleased with the proposals and determined that Prescott should once again serve as

---

¹W. W. Prescott to O. A. Olsen, May 4, 1896, RG 11: Bx 46, Misc Let (1893-1902), GCAr.

²BCC Bd Min, January 5, 1897. Caviness was not a member of the board, nor was he invited to this meeting.
president, though he, as later events would make clear, believed Sutherland to be the most appropriate man for the position.¹

Meanwhile, Prescott met with the faculty to lay plans for a teacher's institute to be held at the college. It would meet three times a week between mid-January and mid-February for the presentation of position papers and discussion. Caviness was to chair the meetings.

At the first session the discussion centered on "long courses." Hibbard stated that while the highest possible development should be sought, Battle Creek College graduates would never be considered the world's "best educated men." Other items considered were the importance of stressing the Bible and the problem of textbooks. Prescott spoke on the significance of the "highest education." Three days later the group met again and reemphasized the Bible as the "best educator in the world." G. C. Tenney noted that he did not think that the Bible could be made a textbook in all classes, but that it should "mould the ideas of the teachers." Prescott asserted that "every teacher should be a Bible teacher."² On the other hand, E. D. Kirby, in his presentation on the classics, continued to assert that the best understanding of the Greek and Latin grammar was to be obtained, at least in part, "outside of the Bible."³

The educators continued to meet for discussion of differing positions and views, especially regarding the role of the Bible and

¹BCC Bd Min, January 13, 1897.
²BCC Fac Min, January 14, 17, 1897.
³BCC Fac Min, January 19, 24, 28, 1897. Emory D. Kirby taught biblical Greek and Latin at the college.
the classics. Soon, however, events would give the reformers the upper hand.

General Conference Session of 1897

In early 1897, the General Conference session was held at Lincoln and College View, Nebraska. Prescott's four-point plan, revised and somewhat enlarged, was presented to the session on March 4, but a vote on it was deferred to the final meetings of the Seventh-day Adventist Educational Society to be held in Battle Creek beginning March 10.¹ On March 5 Caviness presented his progress report on Battle Creek College. It was very positive and referred to some reforms that were already being implemented and some that were in the planning stage. Not even the slightest hint suggested he would soon be an ex-president, since he referred to the future with optimism.²

Sutherland spoke for a chapel service at Union College during his attendance at the General Conference session. The topic was "The Bible a Textbook on Agriculture." His fundamental premise was that "since God is the author of all true knowledge, what he [sic] may say on this or any other subject must be par excellence the truth." What the Bible says about agriculture must therefore be correct and balanced. Farming conducted "according to Scriptural principles" would attain "better success." He illustrated his premise with numerous

¹"Meeting of the Seventh-day Adventist Educational Society," GCB, March 4, 1897, p. 287. It was necessary to transact legal business in Michigan because the various denominational corporations held their charters there.

²G. W. Caviness, "Battle Creek College," GCB, March 5, 1897, pp. 262-64.
Bible passages and "no little interest was evoked." The nature and treatment of his subject could only have endeared him more to the reform-minded men from Battle Creek.

Sutherland addressed a session of the General Conference nine days after his chapel talk. The report of his discourse gives no title, but it revealed his growing conviction that true religion and true education are inseparable. The one, he held, is unable to exist without the other. "True religion cannot long remain pure while encouraging a false system of education, nor can a true system of education stand if connected with an impure religion."

Two systems of education exist, he declared. "One impresses the image of God, the other the image of Satan which is the image of the world." The roots of the latter system are traceable to Egyptian pagan philosophy. To follow such a system is to make "an image to the beast." Sutherland warned that it was no safer to "pattern after worldly schools and their methods" than for Adventist ministers to "pattern after methods of popular theologians." He urged that Adventist educational institutions be converted into training schools to prepare workers. Their preparation was to be balanced between book learning and practical training. The amount of time spent in school was not to be long enough to permit the students to "go as far as they please in any truth." In school they were to be taught to study and given "a start in the different branches." Their preparation in college was simply to provide them with the tools and impetus for lifelong study.

---

1See "Biblical Agriculture," GCB, February 16, 1897, p. 47.
Sutherland, in this discourse, also spoke against the granting of degrees; his rationale was novel and thought-provoking. Since "we are candidates for the university of heaven," we should avoid giving the impression that we have "finished our course of study." He asked: "In a Christian school, does the little that we may learn entitle us to a degree?" In his estimation students must be satisfied with nothing less than "a bachelor's degree conferred by Christ." To summarize the presentation he included a quotation from Ellen White which he felt justified his position: "When we reach the standard that the Lord would have us reach, worldlings will regard Seventh-day Adventists as odd, singular, strait-laced extremists." Before sitting down he asked those present to give advice and share from their experience so he and his faculty would know better how to adequately prepare students to "meet the issues which we are now brought to face."¹

The delegates returned to Battle Creek by train in time for the first session of the Seventh-day Adventist Educational Society on March 10. During the following two weeks the society held six business meetings. When they were over, Caviness had resigned and Sutherland was the new president of Battle Creek College. Official remarks regarding the changes were terse, understated, and euphemistic. The General Conference Bulletin reported:

In consultation with the General Conference Committee, there were some changes effected to the satisfaction of all; the

Sutherland at Battle Creek College

An Overview

The four years Sutherland would spend at Battle Creek College were central in his development as an educational reformer. At Walla Walla he had begun to experiment with educational reform in a limited way. The Battle Creek years provided him with the specific invitation to reform the denomination's foremost educational institution. On the other hand, the location of the college made it impossible to experiment as fully as Sutherland would have liked. The Battle Creek years, however, did provide him with reform ideas that he later sought to put into practice at Emmanuel Missionary College and Madison College.

Elected without warning to the presidency of Battle Creek College, Sutherland bravely confronted the challenge of bringing educational reform. The personnel of the school and its constituency, however, were not united in their desire for change, and some strongly opposed it. The legal structure of the college was an impediment to reform. Thus, a first order of business for the new college administration was the reorganization of the Educational Society. With the

1"Proceedings of the Educational Society," GCB, first quarter, 1897, p. 72. The General Conference minutes stated that the "President of the College had just resigned, and that the College Board had invited Professor E. A. Sutherland to fill the vacancy." GCC Min, March 24, 1897. Caviness confirmed that he was a truly Christian gentleman by his restrained behavior throughout the difficult transition. He accepted a position in Mexico to help with the translation of the Bible into Spanish. "Change in the Conference," Nebraska State Journal, March 1, 1897, p. 8. Caviness did not know Spanish but he was conversant in the ancient languages. He gave years of service in Mexico.
help of the General Conference leaders a new, supportive organization was created.

With the way thus opened for reform, curricular changes were instituted: courses were shortened, academic programs were made flexible, degrees were eliminated; and the value of textbooks was debated and, in some courses, eliminated. More important than anything else to the reform-minded faculty was the goal of making the Bible the great textbook and the cornerstone of all study. The plan was that students should come, spend a brief but intensive period in Bible-based, missionary-oriented instruction, and then go out to serve the church.

In view of the considerable counsel of Ellen White emphasizing the indispensability of manual labor in a balanced program of studies, the college leadership tried hard to provide opportunities for work, particularly in agriculture. They bought a farm and involved the students in working it, teaching them lessons about the Creator as they worked with the soil. Practical, agriculture-oriented missionaries, Sutherland believed, would make the best workers anywhere.

Unfortunately, accusations of extremism plagued Sutherland and his faculty during most of his presidency at Battle Creek College. He was reputed to have rejected textbooks altogether, spoken against killing insects on the farm, and even advocated the elimination of fertilizers. Though frank to admit that he had expressed some extreme ideas, he denied having taught extreme views on farming, and, in spite of his other responsibilities, he wrote textbooks at the very time some were claiming he had rejected them.

One of the most important accomplishments of the Sutherland
era in Battle Creek was the creation of the church school and the industrial school movements. Late in the 1890s many Adventist parents began to realize that Christian education was fundamentally different from secular education, and that their children needed to be taught by teachers who held the Bible as the word of God and gave all studies a spiritual orientation. Once the desire for church schools was kindled among the church members, the college was taxed to the limit trying to provide adequately trained teachers. Sutherland was a major motivating force in all of these endeavors.

One of Sutherland's contributions in the area of teacher training was his work in the philosophy and history of Christian education. Concerned over the dearth of literature in this area, Sutherland wrote Living Fountains or Broken Cisterns to educate leaders, teachers, and laity on what he viewed as the crucial role of Christian education to the successful mission of the church. He also taught courses on these topics to teachers-in-training.

Perhaps the most frustrating problem Sutherland inherited at Battle Creek was a large college debt which was passed on to the reform administration in 1897. Coping with it consumed an inordinate amount of faculty and student energy. Impressed to help, Ellen White donated the royalties of her new book, Christ's Object Lessons to be applied to the debts of Adventist colleges. Eventually the debt was eradicated, but not while the school was still located at Battle Creek.

In the spring of 1901 the time finally came to relocate the college in a more advantageous, rural environment. By then, Sutherland and his faculty had lived through four of the toughest, most
challenging years in the history of Adventist education. They had made errors, they had gone to some extremes in their quest for the ideal, but they would leave the city knowing that much they had done was right and believing that the Lord approved of their work. At the time the decision was taken to move the college into the country, Ellen White declared:

Changes will have to be made. But it is hard to break away from old habits and practices; and there are those who have felt inclined to stubbornly resist everything in this line. I am glad to say that Brother Magan and Brother Sutherland have made advancement in reform. . . . The members of this faculty have been getting hold of right methods, and they are coming to see eye to eye. . . . There has been much prejudice indulged in regard to those who stand at the head of the school. But these teachers are not to be moved by that which has been reported, much of which is untrue. . . . Our brethren are to go right along in the work, and let all see that God is working with them, giving them, as his agencies, varied experiences.

Sutherland's Supporters and Advisers

The challenge of a reform administration would have been too much for one person to confront alone, but Sutherland had the benefit of a coterie of advisors. He considered Ellen White's counsel to be inspired instruction given her by the Lord, counsel which he felt he could ignore only at his own peril. Thus, as soon as he had received the position as president at Battle Creek, he wrote to her in the spirit of a learner:

My reason for writing you is this. I feel that it would be worse than folly to undertake the work here unless the instruction given by the Lord is closely and faithfully followed out. There is a great and responsible work to be done here. I try to realize that it will be impossible to do

---

E. G. White, "Instructions Regarding the School Work," GCB, April 24, 1901, p. 452.
this work in a manner to please God if we are not closely connected with the Lord and living up to all the light we have. Our strength and success must be drawn from him. If I know my own heart I have no other desire than to work in harmony with the Lord on this school question. . . . In making changes we need to be guided continually by the spirit of the Lord or we will fall into errors.

As a result of his desire to benefit from Ellen White's counsel, Sutherland was an avid reader of her publications. At the same time he was moving into office at Battle Creek, Prescott was preparing a compilation of her most recent writings on education for publication. Special Testimonies on Education covered the major areas of educational reform, and Sutherland must have felt its publication provided him with definitive guidelines. He also read the articles in the Review and Herald regarding developments at the Avondale School for Christian Workers in Australia, especially since he knew that Ellen White was personally involved in its establishment.2

While Sutherland's closest friends and supporters were Magan and M. Bessie DeGraw, who worked with him during his entire four years at Battle Creek College, he also received valuable advice from Kellogg and A.T. Jones, two of the most valued speakers in the denomination at that time.3 Jones, as the recently elected editor of the Review and Herald, and Kellogg, as the head of the Battle Creek Sanitarium, enjoyed unique vantage points from which to view the work at large.

1E. A. Sutherland to E. G. White, April 8, 1897, EGWRC-DC.


3See GCB for 1891, 1893, 1895, 1897.
and the educational work at Battle Creek in particular. The young president had been acquainted with both men. Consequently, they felt at liberty to give him their counsel. Just as importantly, they gave him much-needed support—in the pages of the church paper and behind the scenes in committees.

Another supporter was Prescott, who had been Sutherland's mentor for over a decade. His influence on Sutherland's educational philosophy had been great. At the 1897 General Conference session at which Sutherland was named to the presidency of Battle Creek College, Prescott had delivered three substantive discourses on "True Education" that indicate the direction of his influence on Sutherland. According to Prescott, when Christians speak of education, they are talking about the reception of divine light, life, and wisdom that comes from God through Christ. Contrasting Christian and secular education, Prescott declared:

What is the difference between the true method of study, of education, and the false method of study and of education? The true method is to study all things as the study of God; the false method is to leave God out, not to get to Him at all, or have His laws control. . . . Let me say that this will not put simply a sort of religious fervor in the place of study, a sort of sentimentalism in the place of intellectual work. We are not making our schools simply a place where our young people are to go and be preached to; but we are supplying a motive, and furnishing a power in the life, and opening up the field of study, and giving a zeal to that study that we have not known before.

In addition to receiving counsel from colleagues, Sutherland

---

was a man of prayer. His ultimate confidant was God and he talked to Him often. Mary Lamson years later recalled how deeply Sutherland's praying had impressed her. She had arrived at Battle Creek College in the summer of 1898 and lived in the women's dormitory (West Hall). On the second floor was a little two-room apartment which was vacant, except for a few chairs with cushions in front of them. "I knew," she later recalled,

what happened in that room. I knew that those teachers went there to pray. I knew that Prof. S. and Prof. Magan spent hours there agonizing with the Lord that the right thing might be done. . . . More than once a student would come to me and say, "Miss Lamson, somehow we go on tiptoe past that room, for we hear the voice of prayer and we feel that it's a sacred room in a sacred corridor." And we did feel that way, all of us. We felt that . . . decisions, weighty decisions, were being made. And we felt that the Lord had set apart that place for prayer and for victory.

"There were some sad times too," she admitted. Lamson sensed a lot of opposition "to the whole movement," particularly that of establishing church schools. Many felt that "their children were safe enough in public schools." Even among those in "responsible positions," she sadly admitted, there was a tendency "sometimes to make fun of us and feel that we were misguided."\(^1\) It appears, nevertheless, that those who knew Sutherland best and worked most closely with him did not believe him to be misguided or unbalanced, and strongly supported his ongoing experiments in educational reform.

**Reorganization**

By 1897 the denominational leadership had centralized its power in Battle Creek. There were leaders and denominational

\(^1\)Mary Lamson, interview with Lorenz, p. 133.
employees who were unscrupulously trying to manipulate the major institutions of the church. Battle Creek College was under the firm control of the Seventh-day Adventist Educational Society, which was constituted in such a way that an individual or faction could accumulate proxy votes and effectively control all of the college's administrative decisions.

Two years of very careful and tense negotiations and legal maneuverings would pass before the Educational Society was finally reorganized, thus breaking the power of the anti-reform forces over the school. Sutherland was greatly aided in the struggle for reorganization by Kellogg. Both men heartily wanted to see the implementation of educational reform at Battle Creek College and rejoiced at having created a more favorable environment for that to happen.

As the 1897 General Conference session neared, W. C. White told a friend that according to a prevailing rumor "our old plan of work and organization will be broken up." Some believed that a "state of anarchy" would follow the conference. White was not fearful that anything that serious would happen, but he realized that the "right spirit" would have to be brought into the "workings" of the organization. Decisions outlining major reforms at Battle Creek College were taken during the sessions of the General Conference, but White had feared the reforms would meet with strong opposition. He was, therefore, very pleased when he heard that Sutherland had been named president of Battle Creek. It was a move that White felt had "cleared up many difficulties."\(^1\)

\(^1\) W. C. White to Sarah Peck, February 17, 1897, EGWRC-DC.

\(^2\) W. C. White to F. W. Howe, April 26, 1897, EGWRC-DC.
At a faculty meeting on October 7, 1897, the Battle Creek College board took a major step toward giving Sutherland the clout needed for effective administration. Jones claimed that two things had been "crippling the work" at the college: "the great gulf between Board and Faculty" and the officers of the college board being officers of "about everything else." Wanting to help solve the problem, Tenney promptly resigned as president of the board and Sutherland replaced him. Magan was made vice-president "to look after the work when Prof. Sutherland is away."^1

While the new position significantly increased Sutherland's power to implement reform, it was portrayed by the anti-reform faction as a sinister move prompted by evil intentions. Looking for an excuse to oppose Sutherland without openly opposing reform, they began to circulate rumors asserting that the two top leaders of the school were, in fact, involved in a "dark scheme to break up the College, and to sell it to Dr. Kellogg."^2 Apparently their accusation was based on the fact that there were some men connected with the sanitarium who felt that the educational work would "eventually go into the hands of the Medical Missionary work and thus, the college with it."^3

Sutherland, however, was definitely not urging such a move. When he wrote to Ellen White to ask her for advice, he made it clear

---

^1 BCC Fac Min, October 7, 1897.
^3 E. A. Sutherland to E. G. White, August 16, 1898, EGWRC-DC.
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that he did not want her to think he was finding fault with those who advocated such a move. Yet, he added, "I have felt, that for myself, it would not be right to use my influence to throw a responsibility upon the Sanitarium that should not be there just simply to get the college out of debt and to have a little more means to use in our work." 1

It did not help to allay problems with the opposing faction when Uriah Smith and J. H. Durland, two of the college board members, announced their resignations early in 1898. Smith, apparently, had simply not wanted to serve in the first place and had "cherished the determination to retire" as soon as possible. Durland, however, was responding to the "proceedings and the proposed plan for the future" that had been presented at the meeting of the college board of trustees the day before. He was resigning because he felt that the plan of reorganization was not "a correct one." In a shrewd move, the reform-minded board promptly elected two prominent reform supporters, Kellogg and C. M. Christiansen, the school treasurer. 2

While the pro-reform men now had a strong representation on the college board, the opposition knew that the Seventh-day Adventist Educational Society was the legal entity that controlled Battle Creek College. They would use it. The charter had been set up in such a way that, by adroit maneuvering, one could acquire proxy votes that allowed him to increase his voting power proportionately. In addition, there was no effective legal measure that could be taken to expel a member of the society, even if that member were found to be holding

1 Ibid. 2 BCC Bd Min, March 27, 1898.
views diametrically opposed to the objectives and goals of the society.

Reorganization of the Educational Society was sorely needed if Sutherland were to be given the freedom he needed to initiate reforms. In a move to force action, Sutherland declared that the existing form of organization of the society was so unadaptable to "the character of the institution" that he was "unwilling to proceed with his work in the college while it rested on such a precarious basis." On paper the college needed to be sold, thus allowing for the formation of a new controlling organization. Six months had passed since the first plans had been laid to close out the society through a "mortgage sale protecting all the creditors and to form a new association based upon a more practicable organization." Kellogg now recommended a five-point proposal which urged the implementation of that original plan with an agreement from "the principle [sic] creditors" not to sell or dispose of the obligations of the Educational Society but to "hold them and turn them over to the new organization when it shall be ready to receive them." Now that the proposal was in hand, the aim was to perfect the plan and have it ratified by the Seventh-day Adventist Educational Society stockholders.

In bringing Sutherland to Battle Creek and in the reorganizational planning, Kellogg had played a major role. A man of extraordinary stamina, it is evident that he was as willing to help the cause of reform at Battle Creek College as was any individual living in Battle Creek at that time. Deeply involved in many facets of the

1 Ibid. 2 Ibid.
medical work and other areas of church leadership, he purposely involved himself in several subcommittees to complete the reorganization of the Educational Society. He moved that he be included on the committees "to prepare legal plans for the new corporation," "to prepare plans from an educational standpoint," "to study the industrial side of the new educational scheme from the standpoint of a businessman," and "to study the industrial work as it should be connected with the new corporation." Surely it was not easy for him to dedicate so much of his time to the work of the college, but his commitment no doubt served to endear him even more to Sutherland and Magan. That deep friendship would eventually almost be their undoing, but for the present it was invaluable.

Naturally, the committee on legal plans had to produce guidelines for membership in the reorganized educational society. They were quickly prepared and distributed for reaction and input from the church leaders. Writing from London, Prescott expressed concern about an article of the plan that would drop a person from membership if and when it became clear that his goals were inimical to those of the society. He felt that such a rule was too autocratic. Kellogg knew that the issue was a crucial one. Thus, he answered Prescott's criticism by asking if it was not just as autocratic to restrict membership in the first place, contending that not to include those stipulations was to expose themselves to the "risk of accumulating a majority of

1 BCC Bd Min, March 28, 1898.
2 P. T. Magan to E. G. White, December 11, 1898, EGWRC-DC.
traitors or conspirators in the camp. This method keeps the camp clean."¹

Concerned to know Ellen White's views regarding the proposed reorganization, Sutherland wrote to her explaining the matter. He described the membership stipulations, adding that at present the school "is so organized that if the state should demand anything it would have to comply." He said that they were trying to "put the school on the same basis as the church." That meant that each member of the association would be allowed but one vote and "not to be given power according to the amount of money which he has placed in the institution."²

The matter of reorganization continued unresolved throughout 1898. Near Christmas, Magan wrote to Ellen White and mentioned a plan proposed by Waggoner that there be "no association at all, but simply arrange matters so that the General Conference, in session, will elect trustees who will look after the interests of the school." Magan thought that such a plan might go against the counsel of the "Testimonies" which warned against "centering too much responsibility in the General Conference." If it did not, he thought it might be "a good plan."³

Encouragingly, Ellen White's counsel arrived a short time later. Her position was clear: "The school in Battle Creek should be made secure from ruthless hands, and unconsecrated minds." Later

¹J. H. Kellogg to W. W. Prescott, July 15, 1898, RG 9: Misc Rec, Kellogg, J. H. -2, GCAR.

²E. A. Sutherland to E. G. White, August 3, 1898, EGWRC-DC.

³P. T. Magan to E. G. White, December 11, 1898, EGWRC-DC.
she wrote that the time had come for the school to "receive thorough reconstruction." She declared: "Had they [the anti-reorganization faction] not been resisted and defeated, there would have been as fearful a state of rebellion as when the spies returned who were sent to view the land of Canaan." ¹

Finally, in the spring of 1899, Magan wrote triumphantly: "The reorganization of the Battle Creek College is now quite well along. The new College corporation has been organized." The school had been reorganized under the "Benevolent Act, as our institution is benevolent, and this enables us to save our taxes, which amount to all the way from $300 to $700 per annum." Under the new organization, the General Conference would biennially elect thirty men who would comprise the constituency of the new corporation "which is known as the S. D. A. Central Educational Association." The existence of a constituency was a "legal fiction," but was necessary in order to satisfy the statutes of the state of Michigan. Magan exulted that the plan did away with "memberships, fees . . . and places the control of the College in the hands of the people, through the delegates assembled in General Conference." ²

Though the legal reorganization had at last been resolved, for some it had been costly. The reformers had been accused of being "thieves, robbers, and swindlers." Magan believed that the opponents had realized that "if the college were reorganized, the old wrong kind

---

¹E. G. White to A. T. Jones, December 16, 1898, EGWRC-DC. E. G. White to Prescott, Irwin, Jones, Smith, and Waggoner, February 22, 1899, EGWRC-DC.

²P. T. Magan to W. C. White, March 31, 1899, EGWRC-DC.
of education could and would be eliminated, and that education on Christ's lines would be substituted for it." Tragically, some opponents of the plan had initiated lawsuits against the reorganization and eventually apostasized from the church.¹ A strong element of opposition persisted in Battle Creek until the college was moved to Berrien Springs, but the opposition followed it even there.

The College Debt

For years Battle Creek College had been going more deeply in debt. One of the major problems had been charging too low a tuition fee. Money had also been borrowed repeatedly from the Review and Herald Publishing Association and from private creditors for capital improvements, expansion, and even for operational expenses. When Sutherland assumed the presidency of the school, it had a $70,000 debt. To pay the yearly interest was difficult, let alone to make payments on the principal. The assumed debt, which inevitably continued to increase, hung like a pall of impending disaster over the college administrators until the school was finally sold in 1901.

Sutherland had to wrestle with the problem from the outset of his administration. In a letter to Ellen White, written in the fall of 1897, he asked if she would "see any harm in the Battle Creek college going into the hands of the general conference the same as Union College and Walla Walla?" The General Conference, he reasoned, would thus assume the debt. Another option he asked about was the

¹P. T. Magan to E. G. White, August 16; October 24, 1900, EGWRC-DC. The letter does not mention the names of the apostatizers.
possibility that the college might be able to "go into the hands of
the Sanitarium to be used as a training school."\(^1\)

Those two options, with some variations, continued to be the
most frequently suggested solutions to the debt problem during most
of the last four years the college remained at Battle Creek. As the
end of 1897 neared, lenders pressured the college for repayment of
loans. Sutherland lamented that "there was no money to meet these
obligations."\(^2\) When he asked L. A. Hoopes, the General Conference
treasurer, to draw from his account to pay $10 on a personal pledge,
Sutherland apologized for asking because he said he realized that the
General Conference was in financial stress as well. Wryly, he added:
"I know you are about as poor down there as we are up here, we might
draw lots to see who is entitled to the lowest seat in poverty."\(^3\)

A building called the North Addition had been added to the
Battle Creek College complex in the early 1890s during the Prescott
era. The General Conference leaders had planned to hold conferences
for ministers in the structure. Ellen White, however, was very upset
when she heard that another building had been added to the college.
She had already counselled that no more buildings should be construc
ted. Without equivocation she added that ministerial institutes were
"directly contrary to the light given me." Explaining her position,
she wrote that

\(^1\)E. A. Sutherland to E. G. White, October 28, 1897, EGWRC-DC.
\(^2\)BCC Fac Min, December 10, 1897.
\(^3\)E. A. Sutherland to L. A. Hoopes, February 17, 1898, RG 21:
1898-S, GCAr.
ministers taken from their fields of labor and held in a series of meetings in Battle Creek, would not be so well prepared for the work as if they gave themselves wholly to consecrated labor in the destitute fields where the standard of truth is to be uplifted.

As a result of her counsels, the $12,000 building was currently being used by the burgeoning sanitarium for housing and sundry purposes. The cost of the building and its maintenance, however, was being charged exclusively to the college. In an attempt to decrease expenses, the college tried to rent it to Kellogg's Medical Missionary College, but Sutherland complained to G. A. Irwin, the General Conference president, that Kellogg refused to pay. Kellogg asserted that there had been a verbal agreement made between Olsen and himself that the General Conference would pay the rent if Kellogg's Benevolent Association would pay the other expenses. The General Conference could not find "any clue" to the agreement. There it stood. Neither entity was willing to pay its purported share until the other paid his. Meanwhile, the school was left to bear all of the costs.

The counsel received from Ellen White describing how to acquire the funds needed to pay the bills and to service the huge debt only frustrated Sutherland and Magan even more. She made a general statement that a principal cause of the problem was that "tuition has been altogether too low in America." Mrs. White also urged wise financial management and the practice of the "strictest economy."

---


2 E. A. Sutherland to G. A. Irwin, April 3, 1898, RG 21: 1898-S, GCAr. L. A. Hoopes to E. A. Sutherland, April 5, 1898, RG 21: Bk 24, GCAr.

3 E. G. White to Irwin, Evans, Smith, and Jones, April 21, 1898, EGWRC-AU.
The problem was that Battle Creek College tuition of $16.50 a month, was already high in comparison with that of sister colleges. Nevertheless, tuition was increased to $17.50 for the 1899-1900 school year, making it the most expensive Adventist college to attend. The college had already taken remedial measures and was managing to "meet running expenses." What they were unable to pay were the bills left by previous administrations.

The first major step toward payment of the debt took place in the spring of 1899 on the day the delegates to the General Conference session were returning from South Lancaster to Battle Creek. A strong appeal was made to the students by the faculty and staff of the college to join with them in making a real sacrificial offering to help eradicate the debt. The response was extraordinary. Well over $5,000 dollars in cash had been pledged in addition to provisional pledges and "considerable work which was donated." Several teachers had given between $100 to $300 each. One lady, an orphan, gave "all of her maiden dower [sic], everything she had, namely, three thousand dollars in U.S. gold bonds." The good news was telegraphed to Jones, the president of the board, and he went from car to car on the train to inform the delegates. Magan, as dean of the college, exulted: "It had a wonderful effect. There had been great prejudice against the school and against its work. . . . But when the news of this gift reached them, they knew that a power more than human must
be working in the school." The "wonderful effect," however, brought no monetary relief from the General Conference.

Casting about for urgently needed solutions, the college administration began to think that it might not be unreasonable to ask the Review and Herald to cancel their portion of the debt entirely. It also wondered if the General Conference should not be asked to shoulder a major share of it, especially since the college was making large sacrifices to do its part. There seemed to be some openness to the suggestion until a written counsel was received from Ellen White mid-year in 1899. She stated categorically: "The Lord does not require the General Conference or the Review and Herald, that is now under a burden of debt, to bear the burden of the College debt." Continuing, she explained that if they were to do so it would be "doing injustice to the general necessities of the cause in new fields and in foreign lands." While chastising the Review and Herald employees for grasping "all the wages they could obtain," she declared: "Under the present embarrassment, I could not advise that the interest of the money due from the College to the Review and Herald should be remitted."

Magan was deeply concerned that the church leaders had misinterpreted her counsel. She had told them that they were not obligated

1P. T. Magan to W. C. White, March 31, 1899, EGWRC-DC. Sutherland, though concerned about the college debt and active in dealing with it, had a school to run. Therefore Magan, as dean of the college and knowledgeable in finance, assisted him through major personal involvement in their attempts to eradicate the institutional debt. For additional details on Magan's role, see Neff, For God and C. M. E., pp. 67-69.

2E. G. White, "The Review and Herald and the College Debt," MS 86, June 6, 1899, EGWRC-DC. E. G. White to "Dear Brethren," June 16, 1899, EGWRC-DC.
for the college debt, but they had construed that to mean that the college did not even have permission to "make an appeal publicly for money." What should he and Sutherland do? He knew that she had said that the debt would never be paid until there was a greater spirit of consecration and self-sacrifice "in the churches." Magan felt the leaders were ignoring that part of the counsel. Making reference to her counsel that "those who were implicated in the placing of this debt upon the College should now do what they can to lessen it," he lamented that those individuals were all gone. Prescott had loaned the school $3,500, but he too was asking for repayment. They, however, could scarcely even pay him the interest on his loan.1

Within a month Magan again wrote to Ellen White. He informed her that the Michigan Conference committee had interpreted her counsel regarding the debt to mean "that the Battle Creek College should be allowed to go by the board, to close, and come to an end." Apologetically he admitted: "I am afraid I am troubling you a great deal of late with matters concerning the College, but I do not know what else to do." Sutherland and Magan simply could not believe it to be God's will for the college to close. "We have certainly done everything we can, as far as we know, to make a change in the things taught and the methods of teaching, and God has wonderfully blessed."2

At the Educational Society meeting in October, Magan brought things to a head by stating that "some definite settlement of the matter must be reached." He would no longer do as he had been doing

---

1 P. T. Magan to E. G. White, August 3, 1899, EGWRC-DC. Cf. P. T. Magan to W. C. White, August 3, 1899, EGWRC-DC.

2 P. T. Magan to E. G. White, September 8, 1899, EGWRC-DC.
in the past; wrestling with the debt and meeting "notes and interest when there was no plan by which money was being brought in." As a result, the General Conference committee proposed a plan which would allow solicitation of funds in "District No. 3"—the states contiguous to the college. Magan accepted the invitation to head the campaign. That would help resolve the problem of the debt, but it would virtually deprive the college of a very effective teacher and administrator, and leave it even more shorthanded. The college, however, had little choice. If the debt was not lessened the school would have to close.

Sutherland and Magan promptly prepared a plan which they presented to the General Conference committee nine days later. It included a proposal to set aside a day "to take up a special collection for that indebtedness." It was reluctantly approved with the understanding that they would not solicit in Ohio, even though that state was a part of the district.

At that very time W. C. White was writing a very pointed letter to the General Conference president, G. A. Irwin. It outlined a campaign that would involve every church member in the denomination and would undertake to eliminate the debts of all the Adventist educational institutions of North America.

---

1 BCC Bd Min, October 12, 13, 1899. GCC Min, October 13, 1899. District No. 3 included Wisconsin, Illinois, Michigan, Indiana, and Ohio.

2 GCC Min, October 22, 1899.

3 W. C. White to G. A. Irwin, October 23, 1899, EGWRC-DC. At that time Battle Creek College owed $80,000, Union College owed $90,000, Walla Walla College owed $53,000, and Healdsburg owed $50,000. The total debt was $273,000 and rising: "General Conference Proceedings," GCB, February 17, 1899.
Having talked to his mother "about the educational work," White listed the numerous statements she had made on the topic of the educational debt. She had told him, for example:

The time has fully come for us to make a general effort in behalf of our educational institutions, to put their organization upon right lines, to insist upon their best management being efficient [sic] and based upon right principles, and to go before our people with united and earnest . . . appeals that they shall lift from our schools the heavy debts which are crushing our educational work out of the position and from which God would have it occupy.

Overworked ministers and presidents, she had said, were no longer to be as widely included on the boards. It made for poor financial management because they were too preoccupied with other matters. She held "no sympathy for nor confidence in the movement which would cut down school faculties" to the point where it caused inefficiency or overwork. Adventist schools were "to be made the best ones in the world."

The time had "fully come" when Adventist children were to be withdrawn from public schools. She fully supported the establishment of church schools in many places.²

After quoting from his mother, White outlined a four-point plan that she had elaborated. First, employees of the schools were to show "their desire to lift the burden by accepting as moderate salaries as is consistant [sic] with their necessary expenses." Second, the conferences were to be "more liberal than they have been in the support of teachers in the schools." Third, the publishing houses, sanitariums, health food factories, and other institutions

¹W. C. White to G. A. Irwin, October 23, 1899, EGWRC-DC.
²Ibid.
were to "make liberal contributions of their labor or products toward the schools." Fourth, they were to "go to our people in all the conferences, showing them what the employees of the schools have done, what the conferences have done, what our institutions have done," and they were to plead with them to make "large sacrifices" to unitedly accomplish the "good work." Ellen White intended to make a large sacrifice herself by committing all the royalties from "her book on the parables of Christ" to the retirement of the educational debt.

Sutherland and Magan must have been elated as they were informed of her plan. It was far bolder and broader than anything they had dared to propose. The letter also made plain the soundness of the rationale that had prompted Ellen White to reject the idea that the publishing house or the General Conference assume any of the Battle Creek College debt. The forgiving of the debt by the Review and Herald would have established "wrong principles." That precedent would have led "other schools and institutions to feel that if they could borrow largely from the General Conf., from the Review and Herald, or from some other institution, there was a possibility that that debt need never be paid." At last, a concerted denomination-wide

---

Ibid. Magan had just finished writing a 196-page book titled The Peril of the Republic of the United States of America. Following Ellen White's example, he decided to donate all the royalties from the sale of his book toward the reduction of the Battle Creek College debt. The Review and Herald, however, refused to publish it because some of the denominational leaders felt that the content was too political for the times. Magan took it to Revell in Chicago and they were happy to publish it. In a short time it was selling well and was accepted by the denomination as a worthwhile book. F. Griggs to L. A. Hoopes, May 17, 1900, RG 21: 1900-G, GCAr. GC Min, October 23, 24, 1899. S. N. Haskell to E. G. White, October 24, 1899, EGWRC-DC. P. T. Magan to W. C. White, November 24, 1899; February 1, 1900, EGWRC-DC. W. C. White to P. T. Magan, February 12, 1900, EGWRC-DC.
plan for debt reduction in its institutions was underway.\(^1\)

The book Ellen White had decided to donate, *Christ's Object Lessons*, would not be ready for sale until the late fall of 1900. There was a great deal of preparatory work to be accomplished first. Aware of Magan's business and organizational skills, the General Conference asked him to oversee the "work of handling the book." It also put him on General Conference salary. His quandary was how he was to effectively manage the college job of debt reduction while he also sought to manage the publication and sale of *Christ's Object Lessons*. The explanation of how he tried to resolve it may lie in an eighteen-page progress report he sent to W. C. White the following December in which he claimed he was working eighteen to twenty hours a day.\(^2\)

Without delay, Ellen White prepared a manuscript titled "Help to Be Given to Our Schools." It dealt with numerous important matters, one of which was of particular interest to Sutherland and Magan. They had written to W. C. White the previous fall to ask if it was correct for the Review and Herald to be charging the college 7 percent interest, compounded annually, on its debt. The encouraging answer had finally come in her manuscript:

> The interest on this debt should be made as low as possible. Interest should not be charged upon interest, neither should those who have loaned money charge a higher rate of interest than they themselves pay. One institution should have the tenderest and most kindly feelings for its sister institution.\(^3\)

---

\(^1\) W. C. White to G. A. Irwin, October 23, 1899, EGWRC-DC.

\(^2\) BCC Bd Min, April 18, 1900. G. A. Irwin to E. G. White, April 26, 1900, EGWRC-DC. P. T. Magan to W. C. White, December 9, 1900, EGWRC-DC.

\(^3\) E. G. White, "Help to Be Given to Our Schools," MS 10, January 22, 1900, EGWRC-DC.
The Review and Herald responded with positive action. In the fall of 1900 they modified the rate on the college debt to 4 percent simple interest to be applied retroactively.¹

Ellen White urged everyone to support the campaign and work cheerfully:

Only in this way can be rolled back the reproach that has come upon our schools all over the land. If all will take hold of this work in the spirit of self-sacrifice, for Christ's sake, and for the truth's sake, it will not be long before the jubilee song of freedom can be sung through our borders. ¹

That paragraph contained the great rallying cry of the campaign—"Roll Back the Reproach."²

Kellogg declared that the sanitarium had already been helping the college and made it clear that it intended to continue doing so. The sanitarium had been paying the tuition of "as high as one hundred and fifty-seven students . . . for the sake of the principles which the College was inaugurating."³

The college personnel continued to stand in the vanguard of those willing to make large sacrifices. In the spring of 1900 they held another "day of offering" and received between $2,000 and $2,500 in cash and pledges. Two teachers pledged their entire year's salary. Magan noted: "Prof. Joseph Haughey has given his salary for this year to the school, and made a pledge of $100 also. He is a wonderfully good and kind man."⁴

¹P. T. Magan to G. A. Irwin, September 11, 1900, LLUAr.
²E. G. White, "Help to Be Given to Our Schools," MS 10, January 22, 1900, EGWRC-DC. P. T. Magan to W. C. White, November 24, 1899, EGWRC-DC.
³BCC Bd Min, October 19, 1900.
⁴P. T. Magan to W. C. White, March 16, 1900, EGWRC-DC.
The General Conference proved to be the most reticent to comply with the counsels received from Ellen White. She had said that they should assume responsibility for the bills on the North Addition. When Magan presented this to the General Conference committee, however, they insisted that they were "not really responsible for this debt at all, and that body did not see its way clear to accept the responsibility." It is likely that a major reason they were so stubborn on the issue was because they were in very difficult financial straits themselves.¹

Meanwhile, preparations were progressing for the publication of *Christ's Object Lessons*. All of the arrangements were made for the printing to be done by the Review and Herald and the Pacific Press. Magan found an artist in New York to do the illustrations. Though the financial details were complex and numerous, everything was eventually worked out. Each publishing house would print 150,000 copies, charging only for the materials. The first books were scheduled to be available about September 1, 1900. A pamphlet titled "Rolling Back the Reproach" was prepared in order to arouse as much interest as possible, and fifty thousand were distributed to the church members. By the end of the year, fifty thousand more were being printed.²

¹ P. T. Magan to E. G. White, October 24, 1900, EGWRC-DC.
Church leaders, conferences, institutional workers, and church members everywhere got involved in the sales campaign. In November, Sutherland and Magan rejoiced over "the spirit of love and unity which the move in behalf of the schools is bringing about." Magan wrote proudly of his family to W. C. White at Christmas:

I have had a precious experience in my own family over the matter. My wife has always felt that she never could canvass or sell anything. She is naturally of a timid disposition and does not take to such work; but then your mother's last Testimony came. I was away in the State of Iowa working up the matter of the big fund for the RELIEF OF THE SCHOOLS. Prof. Sutherland brought the letter up and read it to her. The Spirit of the Lord came upon her and she felt a longing to go out and canvass for the book. The same Spirit moved upon our two little children and they each want to sell their proper quota of books. . . . All these experiences have done us a great deal of good. . . . Everything is moving splendidly. Money is beginning to come in quite rapidly on the fund.

A few months later, at the time Battle Creek College was being moved out of the city, Sutherland wrote:

So nobly have our people responded to the call for the relief of the schools, that the matter is well-known throughout our ranks. . . . What was begun in faith, but in weakness, has grown beyond the most sanguine hopes of man. . . . Nothing in all the history of the message has so bound the hearts of Seventh-day Adventists to the educational work as this effort to raise the debt. To God belongs the praise. This is the beginning of the end.

Though Sutherland had reason to be hopeful, they had only made a good start. By 1901 $25,000 had been paid on the "denominational

---

1BCC Fac Min, November 27 [second number crossed out and followed by question mark. Internal evidence suggests a date between 24 and 28], 1900.

2P. T. Magan to W. C. White, December 9, 1900, EGWRC-DC. Cf. P. T. Magan to W. C. White, December 20, 1900, EGWRC-DC.

3E. A. Sutherland, "Battle Creek College Educational Report," GCB, April 2, 1901.
school debt," or roughly one-tenth of the total amount. Enthusiasm and support were increasing, but much time would be spent during the early years at Emmanuel Missionary College in an effort to keep the "Relief of the Schools" campaign alive.¹

Curricular Modifications

The curricular modifications that Sutherland had implemented at Walla Walla College he fully intended to pursue at Battle Creek College. He knew without question that it was his work of curricular reform that had persuaded the leaders to bring him to Battle Creek so urgently in the spring of 1897.

Challenging words had been written by Ellen White to the teachers and students at Battle Creek College back in 1893: "The Lord opened before me the necessity of establishing a school at Battle Creek that should not pattern after any school in existence."² That message had come while Prescott was president of the college. He had conscientiously tried to bring about reform, but he had enjoyed very limited success. Prescott's successor, the conservative Caviness, had also sought to initiate some reforms. The responsibility to act, however, was now in Sutherland's hands.

Realizing that any successful reforms would have to be supported by the faculty, Sutherland met with them immediately. He presented to them a plan for studying "the new lines and methods of work." Every few days they met together to discuss in detail the

¹S. H. Lane, "'The Sale of Christ's Object Lessons,'" RH 78 (June 4, 1901):368.
²E. G. White, "To Teachers and Students," MS 51, October 1893, EGWRC-DC.
questions of manual labor, textbooks, domestic work, the best location for schools, missionary teachers, the school calendar, student "Home life," expenses, literary societies, religious meetings, and the redesigning of the "courses or lines of work" that would be offered.¹

The 1897 school calendar, prepared within a brief time after Sutherland's arrival in Battle Creek, presented a synthesis of the history of Christian education, as he viewed it. He sought to show that every true educational reform emphasized Christ as the great educator, the centrality of the Bible, and the eradication of prejudicial textbooks. It sought to avoid "strife for high rewards and honors as a recompense for good scholarship."²

A comparison of the school calendars of Battle Creek College from 1897 through 1900 shows that the Sutherland administration was active in curricular experimentation. His administration's goal was to approximate God's ideal (see table 1 for a comparison of the curricula for these years).

The three standard courses were no longer designated biblical, scientific, and classical. A careful reading of the calendars, however, shows that most of the course content continued to be offered. Even the most controversial subjects were not summarily expunged. The ancient languages continued to be offered as long as the college remained in Battle Creek. Koine Greek, however, replaced classical Greek, and Latin was deemphasized. The classics were no longer

¹See the BCC Fac Min, March-September, 1897.
²BCC Cal, 1897, pp. 9-13.
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### TABLE 1

**A COMPARISON OF "DEPARTMENTS OF INSTRUCTION" AND "COURSES OF STUDY" IN THE BATTLE CREEK COLLEGE SCHOOL:**

**CALENDARS FROM 1896 THROUGH 1901**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Departments of Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1896 (Caviness' last year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetoric and English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek and Latin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygiene and Sanitary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting and Drawing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual Training and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Electives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Courses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1897</th>
<th>1898</th>
<th>1899</th>
<th>1900</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministerial</td>
<td>The Ministry</td>
<td>The Ministry</td>
<td>The Ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Missionary</td>
<td>Teachers'</td>
<td>Teachers'</td>
<td>Teachers'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers'</td>
<td>Canvassers'</td>
<td>Medical Missionary</td>
<td>Canvassers'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canvassers'</td>
<td>Scientific</td>
<td>Musical</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific</td>
<td>Philosophical</td>
<td>Musical</td>
<td>Manual Training and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical</td>
<td>Musical</td>
<td>Manual Training and</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1898</th>
<th>1899</th>
<th>1900</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lines of Instruction</td>
<td>Lines of Instruction</td>
<td>Lines of Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Bible</td>
<td>Preparatory Classes</td>
<td>Preparatory Classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Science</td>
<td>[remedial]</td>
<td>[remedial]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language</td>
<td>English Bible</td>
<td>English Bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek and Latin</td>
<td>English Language</td>
<td>English Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td>Modern Languages</td>
<td>Modern Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Languages</td>
<td>Ancient Languages</td>
<td>Ancient Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1899</th>
<th>1900</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Courses of Study</td>
<td>Courses of Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No course requirements listed</td>
<td>No course requirements listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>List of minimal course requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1900</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of minimal course requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Complete course requirements listed for two years of preparatory and four years of college**
studied, being supplanted by the Bible in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. ¹ Without delay Sutherland began to place greater emphasis on the study of modern languages. The rationale was eminently logical in the light of the missionary perspective of the college. The 1900 calendar stated: "Since our denominational work is an international one, the study of living languages ought to be, therefore, in nowise neglected by us." Consequently, the college offered three years of German, two years of French, two years of Spanish, and Italian if there was "sufficient demand."² 

Education, to be worthy of its name, Sutherland believed, must also be Christ-centered. In the August 1897 issue of the new educational journal, _The Christian Educator_, an article on "True Education" was included by Ellen White. She declared:

> Now, as never before, we need to understand the true science of education. If we fail to understand this, we shall never have a place in the kingdom of God. "This is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." If this is the price of heaven, shall not our education be conducted on these lines? . . . Men who are not burdened to learn Greek and Latin may yet possess a most earnest zeal to prepare in this life to receive life eternal, and enter the higher school, taking with them the result of their studies in this world. When they reach the heavenly school, their education will have advanced just in proportion as in this world they strove to obtain a knowledge of God and the world's Redeemer.

Sutherland sought to give the education offered at Battle Creek that

---

¹ _BCC Cal_, 1897, p. 35.
² _BCC Cal_, 1900, pp. 48-49. Only German and French had been offered until 1897. Vande Vere erroneously states: "The course offerings in the languages shrank sharply" (Vande Vere, _The Wisdom Seekers_, p. 83).
redemptive orientation. To reflect the Christocentric orientation, the board changed the name of the school to "the Battle Creek College and Training-School for Christian Workers."\(^1\)

Desirous of explaining the holistic missionary perspective of the college, Sutherland published articles in the denominational journals and spoke on the subject in churches and campmeetings. Each year the school calendar also spoke more clearly to the issue. In The Training-School Advocate (a periodical published by the school), the description of the work of every department was decidedly spiritual. For example, one of the statements read: "Mathematics places within our reach a means of testing and proving God. He is ever exact, ever precise, and mathematics is our means of expressing his exactness and precision."\(^2\)

G. C. Tenney, president of the board, was enthusiastic over the new emphasis of the college:

> There never was a time when its purposes to do a faithful work were more intense or its aims were higher than at the present moment. During the past few months the difficulties which have long seemed to bar the way marked out by the Lord for our schools, have been grappled with by faith. . . . Obstacles have been giving way, and prospects now appear where only faith appeared a short time ago. . . . It is not a revolution. It is not to cheapen education. It is simply conformity to God's plan of education and the adoption of his mind as the standard of education. . . . It will be, God in the Bible; God in science; God in nature; God in history, in language, and in the every-day duties and experiences.

---

\(^1\)BCC Bd Min, April 10, 1898. BCC Cal, 1900, p. 1.


\(^3\)G. C. Tenney, "Battle Creek College," The Christian Educator (September/October 1897):39, 40.
No studies were to be secular in orientation. Everything and everyone was to be God-oriented.

Short courses

Caviness had paved the way for at least one of Sutherland's curricular modifications. In 1896 the college had offered a "new course of instruction"--the "Department for Christian Workers." The purpose was "to afford special facilities for the training and education of those who desire to fit themselves in the shortest possible time for usefulness in various lines of Christian and philanthropic work."\(^1\)

The counsel, titled "Speedy Preparation," that came from Ellen White in 1895 had surely been read by Caviness as well as Sutherland. He knew that she had declared that "those who come to Battle Creek are not to be encouraged to absorb several years in study."\(^2\) His administration had tried to meet the challenge. How to put her counsels into practice was the difficult and perplexing question. Prescott, in January 1897, speaking for his ad hoc committee, had recommended to the Battle Creek College board the initiation of shortened courses. It was recommended that the teacher's course be one year in length and the evangelistic course two years long.\(^3\) Caviness and Prescott had laid helpful groundwork for Sutherland's implementation of short courses.

---

\(^1\) BCC Cal, 1896, pp. 10-11.


\(^3\) BCC Bd Min, January 13, 1897.
In June 1897 Ellen White reemphasized the importance of a shortened course of study. Her counsel was clear:

The student should place himself in school, if he can through his own exertions pay his way as he goes. He should study one year, and then work out for himself the problem of what constitutes true education. There is no dividing line. . . . Let them [the teachers] not advise students to give years of study to books.

She was also very clear in her counsel to Sutherland: "From the light given me from the Lord, I know that four or five successive years of application to book study is a mistake."^2

The calendar for 1897 announced that "our students must obtain a preparation for the work in a much shorter time than is usually spent by ministers of other denominations." "Special advantages" were to be given "for a brief, yet thorough and comprehensive course, in the branches most needed to prepare for this calling." No specific time limit was mentioned. Rather, graduation depended on the successful completion of a series of examinations on a specified list of subjects.^3

In the "Commercial Department," a short course was added in 1898 in bookkeeping for "those who desire to prepare themselves to take charge of a set of tract society books, and for ministers and canvassers." It did not state the length of the course.^4

The calendar for 1898 was twice as large as the one for 1897. Considerable space was dedicated to an explanation of the philosophy

---

^1E. G. White to G. A. Irwin, July 22, 1897, EGWRC-DC.
^2E. G. White to E. A. Sutherland, July 23, 1897, EGWRC-DC.
^3BCC Cal, 1897, p. 17.
^4BCC Cal, 1898, p. 17.
and rationale underlying the curricular changes. The 1899 school calendar appeared in a special issue of the new educational journal, The Training School Advocate. Included in it was the most extensive explanation to date regarding the counsels of Ellen White, and an emphasis on the need for "a speedy preparation." It also laid great emphasis on the fact that a rigorous scholastic standard would be demanded of everyone.\(^1\) Seeking to show broad support for the school's reforms, the calendar for 1900 introduced a large section dedicated to quotations from many secular sources which substantiated the educational philosophy of Battle Creek College, including the approach the college took toward elective studies and courses of study.\(^2\)

The administrators tried to be careful in the preparation of short courses in spite of their enthusiasm for getting workers out into denominational labor. Magan wrote:

> We are now planning for short courses for our students, in order that they may go out into the world as God calls them. We want to move cautiously and carefully, that nothing may be done that will be wrong, and that now that the Lord has broken the ice of indifference, Satan may not be permitted to drive us into the fires of fanaticism.\(^3\)

Sutherland and his colleagues knew very well that balance, when attempting reform, is quite elusive. In the school calendar for 1900, the preface ended with:

> A reform of any kind always presupposes the possibility, even the probability, of extremes. There can be no question that many plans now advocated, as for example that of the election of studies, which if judiciously followed would prove an

\(^1\) *TS Advocate* 1 (June 1899): 290, 293, 296, 298.

\(^2\) *BCC Cal.*, 1900, pp. 30-36.

\(^3\) P. T. Magan to E. G. White, December 11, 1898, EGWRC-DC.
unmixed blessing, will, if carried too far, do much harm. These extremes, the management of Battle Creek College wish carefully to avoid; but while seeking to be wise, they wish to keep the educational work moving always abreast of God's pillar of light and truth.

The challenge they faced and the goal Sutherland and his colleagues aimed at was to create shorter courses of study without sacrificing quality.

Academic degrees

The offering of shortened courses at Battle Creek College had a direct bearing on the granting of degrees by the school. While Sutherland was still at Walla Walla he had begun to wrestle with the question of both issues. It was obvious that students could take shortened courses or they could pursue academic degrees, but they could not do both. Ellen White had said virtually nothing regarding degrees. But she had written:

Most earnest work should be given to advance those who are to be missionaries. Every effort should tell to their advantage, so that they shall be sent forth as speedily as possible. They cannot afford to wait until their education is considered complete. This can never be attained; for there will be a constant course of education carried on throughout the ceaseless ages of eternity.  

Sutherland wanted every student to be a missionary, thus he felt impelled to give them an adequate preparation in the briefest time possible. He realized, however, that degrees could not be conferred for non-standard, accelerated education. Moreover, the goal of obtaining a degree was considered detrimental to true missionary

\[1\] BCC Cal, 1900, p. 9.

motivation. Therefore, the 1899 school calendar explained that, in the college, "management will be less hampered than heretofore, and instead of holding degrees before students as incentives for work, the one all-absorbing motive is, 'Go ye therefore, and teach all nations.'" ¹

In addition to being president of Battle Creek College, Sutherland was editor of the recently created Training-School Advocate. One article quoted a writer from the Detroit Free Press who was talking about University of Michigan students and examinations:

While it is said by some that by the time a student gets into college he should have exchanged the mere desire to pass, for the ambition to acquire knowledge for its own sake, that is an ideal state and does not exist. As long as a prize is offered, men will strive for it. In the University the degree is the prize, and it is a sum total of 120 'passed' slips.

That was precisely what Sutherland wanted to avoid.

He had also come to believe that degrees were totally objectionable because of their papal origin. That conviction he supported by citing certain books that traced the history of Christian education. ³

The alternative to the "degree or diploma" at Battle Creek College was "suitable credentials" depending on one's area of study.

A person who had completed the teacher's course would receive a certificate that indicated "the exact amount of work done, and the character of the work"—renewable annually. The teacher, however, must remain in "harmony with the principles of Christian education," maintain a good character, take at least one continuing-education course annually while in the field, and have "a fair degree of success in his teaching." This would require maintenance of a close teacher-student relationship. It was stated that "a certificate or recommendation of this kind will be worth far more to the student who leaves this college than the ordinary degree."

In July 1899 a critical situation arose which motivated the college board to state its position clearly on the matter. Battle Creek College had discarded all prescribed courses and all degrees. Meanwhile Union College had "started eleven courses, with a faculty of nine teachers, and degrees or diplomas for each one of the courses." Magan felt that this forced Battle Creek College into "a war" with Union College. Clarifying their rationale, he stated that the trustees and the faculty of Battle Creek College were "opposed to degrees on principle, considering them as contrary to the fundamental principles of the gospel." As a result, it was voted, on a motion by Kellogg, that

it is the sense of this body that the conferring of degrees is inconsistent with the principles of Christian education, and that these trustees do put themselves on record on the matter, [sic] These trustees will make no provision for the granting of degrees.

Kellogg explained that his American Medical Missionary College was preparing a "two years' course, in which no degrees will be granted, but which will prepare competent doctors who will practice their calling wherever the laws of the land will permit."¹

Not all of the faculty were in accord with the decision of the Battle Creek College board. A short time before, William E. A. Aul had presented a request to Sutherland asking that he be awarded a master's degree in the science course. Granted a bachelor's degree two years earlier, he believed he had "done enough work since to entitle him to the master's degree." Sutherland and the faculty did not feel he was qualified. Aul, however, had hurriedly entered his request because he knew the college would "not be able to grant degrees in the future, and therefore he [would] be prohibited from obtaining that upon which he has set his heart."² There is no indication that he was granted the degree.

The relations between Union College and Battle Creek College must have been tense. The church at large needed to be informed regarding the rationale behind the position of Battle Creek College. Sutherland, therefore, wrote a lengthy article in the Review and Herald titled "Why the Battle Creek College Can Not Confer Degrees." The college, he said, sought to be under Christ's control. It could not, therefore, be in harmony with "worldly ideas of education." In

¹BCC Bd Min, July 21, 1899.
addition, the granting of degrees is the result of an "attempt to measure the mind of man, which God alone can do."

The educational system of the Middle Ages, he asserted, was a "gigantic monopoly of education." Its objective was to "compel the students to study the ideas of men so faithfully that they would become obedient slaves to one man, the pope." In his view, the system would not have worked without "prescribed" courses of study. Otherwise there would have been "freedom in selecting the studies required for the best development of the individual mind." A "course of study" compelled the student to behave as "a mere automaton." Moreover, the student was induced to submit to that system solely because of the hope of "the final reward--the degree."

He perceived in the granting of degrees an unwarranted union of church and state: a degree was given value by the seal of the state affixed to it. The state, in so doing, was placing its approval on that system of education. Consequently, the church, in seeking state approval, was tacitly aligning its system with that of the state.

Sutherland was convinced that the issue had serious spiritual and eschatological implications as well.

If our school conforms to the worldly principles of education in its work, the students in their religious life will seek the spirit of worldly religion; if they are educated to receive honors from men while in our school, they will crave more honors from men in the church, or even in the world. Literary degrees are the germs, the beginnings, of the destructive evils which have permeated Protestantism, and from which the third angel's message is now calling the people. Can we nurse in our educational system principles from which we must be separated in the church?

---

1 E. A. Sutherland, "Why the Battle Creek College Can Not Confer Degrees," RH 76 (October 10, 1899):655; (November 14, 1899):740.
He had made what he believed were absolutely essential alterations in the Adventist system of education; he felt fully justified regarding his position. In the place of prescribed courses, students pursued elective studies. They were not to be chosen lightly: "Each student on matriculation is urged prayerfully to decide upon a course of training best adapted to his natural ability and in accordance with the manifest guidance of the Spirit of God."¹ No degree must stand in the way of higher motivation of service to God and a lost world.

Students were informed that there would be no more degrees given. The college declared that "character and the power of useful service in the world" must be "the final test of education." If students revealed those characteristics through "efficient lives," the "artificial marks would be worse than useless; with them, they are unnecessary."² The system adopted by the college apparently proved workable for denominational employees. It must have created problems, however, for those who tried to pursue graduate studies or work outside of the Adventist church. One must remember that the ultimate goal of Battle Creek College was to prepare committed workers for the denomination world-wide.

The Bible and other textbooks

The issue of the Bible as the basis of Christian education was given highest priority by Sutherland at Battle Creek College; the question of textbooks was directly related to it. For years Ellen White had been addressing both issues. At Harbor Springs in 1891 she


²BCC Cal, 1900, pp. 36-37.
began a concerted effort to eradicate the heathen classics; this would require, inevitably, the demise of the traditional school curriculum. With a series of six articles published in the *Review and Herald* from November 10 through December 15, 1891, she addressed the problem squarely: Adventist educators must be reformers, textbooks that express "infidel sentiments" breed skepticism, the Bible is the great educator, all truth harmonizes with scripture, and true education transforms the character.¹

Reform could not come soon enough for Ellen White. During the decade of the 1890s, as Adventist educational institutions grew and multiplied, Ellen White repeated her warnings and admonitions. In 1895 she penned a strong rebuke aimed at Adventist teachers. They were still showing "great respect" for authors and books that she likened to "chaff." She challenged the teachers to prepare books that would "educate them [the students] to have a sincere, reverent love for truth and steadfast integrity." "Many books," she declared, "have been introduced into the schools which should never have been placed there." Reiterating her favorite theme, she wrote: "The word of God is to stand as the highest educating book in our world, and is to be treated with reverential awe."²


²E. G. White to W. W. Prescott, June 13, 1895, EGWRC-DC.
The problem of proper textbooks perplexed Adventist educators. Magan recalled that "Prof. Prescott has told me many times that he would be very glad if we could use in our schools nothing but books written by those who were Christians; but he himself has always said that he did not know what these books would be or where we would find them."\(^1\)

The problem of textbooks involved two important aspects. Not only were appropriate textbooks lacking, but the classics continued to play a prominent role in the curriculum. Only slowly did the educators realize that either the Bible or the classics would dominate the curriculum; it could not be dominated by both.

A personal experience Ellen White had with a young worker, Herbert Cambden Lacey, reinforced her concern over the lack of Bible study at Battle Creek College. Lacey, who had been raised in Tasmania, had become a Seventh-day Adventist in 1887. He took the ministerial course at Healdsburg College and had then completed the classical course at Battle Creek College. Graduating in 1897, he married and went directly to Australia to help build up the work there.\(^2\)

Shortly after his arrival, Ellen White had a conversation with him which she recorded in her diary:

Brother Herbert Lacey . . . stated that while in America at Healdsburg, he engaged in Bible studies. After going to Battle Creek, he went deeper into study but did not take Bible studies at all. Here he has lost much, for the most important of all education is to understand what saith the Scriptures—

---

\(^1\) P. T. Magan to E. G. White, June 21, 1895, EGWRC-DC.

and yet he was ordained for the ministry when he had not fitted himself at all for such a position. . . . The Word of God is our lesson book, lying at the very foundation of true education.

Assuming that his experience was not unique, she was convinced that students were leaving Battle Creek College with a "deficient education in spiritual godliness." Such a situation only served to reconfirm her conviction:

I see more and more the folly of five years in succession devoted to the education of any student. Let them learn common hard work, in exercising the muscles and their hands, and let them learn from books that have not one grain of infidelity sprinkled in through their brilliant productions. It is like the sugarcoated pills that are used—a drug to destroy rather than to restore.

Fear of contamination dominated her feelings regarding the influence of Battle Creek College. As she sought to guide the development of Avondale she declared:

No breezes from Battle Creek are to be wafted in. I see I must watch before and behind and on every side to permit nothing to find entrance that has been presented before me as injuring our schools in America.

As the new president of the college at Battle Creek, Sutherland determined to accord the Bible its rightful role in the curriculum and to eliminate the classics. The topics were frequently discussed in faculty meetings and personal conversations, and in September 1897 Sutherland read to the faculty the counsels of Ellen White urging a change in "literary lines."

The classics were not eliminated until 1898, but the Bible and biblical courses were emphasized beginning with Sutherland's first year.

---

1 E. G. White diary, MS 174, July 10, 1897, EGWRC-DC.

2 Ibid.
at Battle Creek. Unfortunately, it is impossible to determine how many different Bible courses were offered during the last Caviness years because individual courses were not listed. In the 1897 Calendar, however, twenty-five biblical-historical-philosophical courses were offered. The next year twenty-eight courses were available, with two on the writings of Ellen White. Certainly worth noting is the fact that many of the other courses were described in terms of how the subject related to the Bible and the mission of the church. This was a significant effort to perceive "secular" subject matter within a biblical framework.

Concerned over the considerable confusion regarding "the Bible as a textbook," Sutherland prepared a discourse for the first Conference of Church-school Teachers held in Battle Creek, June 20 to July 11, 1900. In his presentation he constructed an interesting dichotomy between "text" and "study" books. The Bible, he said, was a textbook because it was a "book of principles." If facts are needed one should use "study or reference books," he explained. His central point was that the Bible is not to be the only "study book," but must always be the only "textbook." In other words, all of one's learning must be based on the principles of scripture.

As the personnel at Battle Creek College experimented with

---

1BCC Fall Announcement, 1897, pp. 20-22. BCC Cal, 1898, p. 48.
2BCC Fall Announcement, 1897, pp. 5-12. BCC Cal, 1898, pp. 25-33.
the integration of the Bible in classroom instruction, the needed balance was sometimes lacking. The official position of the college from 1897-1901 appears to have been consistent: the Bible was to be the basic textbook, though other textbooks would also be used. In 1898 the school calendar stated that "the Bible should hold first place" but clarified, as an example, that in the study of science "books must be used for this purpose; but they should be in harmony with the Bible, for that is the standard." A list of some of the specific textbooks that would be used in those courses was included in the calendar for 1899.¹ Some of the college teachers, however, took the extreme position of regarding the Bible as the only textbook. J. Ellis Tenney said he could teach English courses using only the Bible and the Testimonies, while Marion E. Cady stated that he could do the same in science. Elmer E. Gardner was willing to try to teach bookkeeping from scripture.² "Teachers as well as students," penned E. B. Miller, "receive harm from the constant use of textbooks."³

Even Prescott did not speak with complete clarity on the issue. At the General Conference session of 1899, C. C. Lewis seemed to be baiting Prescott when he asked: "What do you mean when you say take the Bible as a foundation? Can we use nothing else but the Bible?" Prescott gave a very lengthy answer which was interrupted


²M. Bessie DeGraw, "Battle Creek College Advances," RH 75 (December 20, 1898):819.
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several times by Lewis, who asked that he apply the Bible to the study of the "multiplication table." Somewhat evasively Prescott related arithmetic to the former questions: "I would not lay down any rule as to that. If, as I went on with the Bible, I found the need of any other book, I would use it. But I would not use it until I found the need of it." Haughey interjected: "You would find the need." Prescott conceded: "I think so."

The problem was not an easy one. Prescott had enjoyed considerable discussion with Ellen White regarding the topic. Consequently, he may have felt he had reason for restraint in expressing himself too strongly. For example, W. C. White, a few months after the General Conference session of 1899, penned: "Mother maintains that if people had followed God's methods through the ages, that schools could now be conducted without the use of other books than the Bible." On the other hand, she did not advocate such a position for Battle Creek. W. C. White clarified: "She also maintains that the ideal toward which our teachers should work is to take the Bible as 'The textbook,' and use other books as helps." "The Lord presents before us a correct ideal," he added, "and then gives us time to work to it." The problem is that "We are in constant danger of making the mistake of jumping at the ideal without reaching it, or of settling down content with our present position, and making no effort to approach it." He seemed to advocate reform but with due restraint.

Affirming that the Bible was not to be the only textbook,

---

1 GCB, February 17, 1899, p. 35.
2 W. C. White to J. E. White, August 14, 1899, EGWRC-DC.
W. C. White agreed with Sutherland that the biggest problem was that "we are no [sic] ready for a full line of books because we have no one to prepare them." Spurred into action by the need for textbooks, Sutherland, within a year, had produced his first textbook—Bible Reader Number One.

Fully convinced of the importance of the centrality of the Bible in education, A. T. Jones, as co-editor of the Review and Herald, addressed the topic wherever he went. When he preached, for example, at the campmeeting at Ionia, Michigan, in 1899 he spoke on the subject. There, however, he expressed the novel rationale that one's first thoughts are one's last thoughts, so people should put the Bible into the mind first "in the study of language or English or any study. This is the philosophy of learning from the Bible, and of using the Bible as the first thing, in every line of study." Lest, however, some should be tempted to carry his ideas to an extreme, he warned: "Bear in mind that the Bible as the textbook in every study does not mean the Bible as the only text-book in education."²

In spite of the official position of the college and the clarifications of some of the leaders, the idea spread that Sutherland and Magan were against the use of any textbook but the Bible. Even Ellen White seemed uncertain as to their position. Magan, however, was categorical: "We have never taught that all text books should


be discarded." He offered to send her a list of the textbooks which they advised the teachers to use.¹

The rumors, nevertheless, persisted. Consequently, at a meeting of the college trustees in October 1900, Sutherland defended himself, insisting that "he had never advocated that textbooks should not be used." At the same time Sutherland sent Ellen White a copy of his first textbook which had just been published.²

While objectionable textbooks were eliminated, the faculty at Battle Creek College grappled with the difficult question of how to make the Bible the basis of every subject. Surely, they reasoned, it must be utilized to create a consciousness of God at work in every area of human lives. "It will be," wrote Tenney, the English teacher,

¹P. T. Magan to E. G. White, November 24, 1899, October 24, 1900, EGWRC-DC. In August 1899, Ellen White, in response to a letter from Edson White in which he apparently claimed that Sutherland advocated the elimination of all textbooks except the Bible, wrote: "There must be books of some order in the school, and why have not our own people taken the word of the Lord and made appropriate selections from the Scriptures for reading and spelling books? Until they do this, it is not best to take all books except the Bible from the students. The light that I have is that we must move cautiously and solidly. Bro. Sutherland is going to extremes." Later in the letter, Mrs. White alluded to Miss Ellis considering herself competent "to instruct from the Bible as the only book to be used," but added that she thus "confused but did not enlighten." As is noted in the paragraphs above and below in the text, Sutherland and Magan categorically denied ever having taught that textbooks should not be used. Thus, one is forced to conclude that Ellen and Edson White were misinformed or that Sutherland and Magan were guilty of reprehensible prevarication. The former seems more likely. The letter quoted above bears the date August 14, 1898, and in the upper lefthand corner, July 25, 1900. The 1898 date, however, cannot possibly be correct since the letter speaks of Miss Ellis who did not arrive in Australia until mid-1899. The year date must therefore be 1899. Cf. pp. 121-32 (particularly Ellen White's letter to S. N. Haskell).

²BCC Bd Min, October 19, 1900. E. A. Sutherland to E. G. White, October 19, 1900, EGWRC-DC.
"God in the Bible; God in science; God in nature; God in history, in
language, and in the every-day duties and experiences."\(^1\)

Trying to determine the practical significance of Ellen
White's counsel, Sutherland taught that it would be better to teach
nature from the Bible rather than to teach the Bible from nature.
Arithmetic, in his opinion, was also to be drawn from the scriptures
rather than only spicing arithmetic with God's word; thus "instead of
making the principle of mathematics the end of the study, it [would
be] a means to reach an end in God's great, natural universe."\(^2\)

A realization eventually grew among the faculty, ably ex­
pressed by F. W. Howe, that to use the Bible as a textbook, signified, in
the broadest sense, that "all their teaching and personal influence
must be positively in harmony with the Bible. And when this is char­
acteristic of all our schools and teachers, the Bible will have become
the leading textbook."\(^3\)

With the classics eliminated, the dual challenge of preparing
denominational textbooks and, with balance, making the Bible the basic
textbook was a major preoccupation of the faculty at Battle Creek.
Nevertheless, there were other major concerns, such as manual labor
and its role in holistic education that needed to be addressed.

\(^1\)G. C. Tenney, "Battle Creek College," \textit{The Christian Educator}
\(^2\)E. A. Sutherland to E. G. White, August 16, 1898, LLUAr.
\(^3\)F. W. Howe, "The Bible as a Textbook," \textit{The Christian Educator}
1 (August 1897):30-31.
Manual labor and the issue of extremism

Manual labor. Sutherland was compelled to action on the issue of manual labor and practical training primarily because of the counsel of Ellen White. It was not, however, an Adventist innovation. Perceptive educators had been advocating the training of the hand as well as the head for a long time. Some educational institutions, such as Oberlin College in Ohio, had followed a work-study program earlier in the century. Adventists, however, were slow to grasp the importance of holistic education.

In 1872 Ellen White had written:

Physical labor will not prevent the cultivation of the intellect. Far from it. The advantages gained by physical labor will balance a person and prevent the mind from being overworked. . . . The world is full of one-sided men and women, who have become such because one set of their faculties was cultivated, while others were dwarfed from inaction. . . . In connection with the schools should have been agricultural and manufacturing establishments. There should also have been teachers of household labor. And a portion of the time each day should have been devoted to labor, that the physical and mental powers might be equally exercised.

Prescott's attempt to implement manual labor at Battle Creek College in the late 1880s had been thwarted. At Walla Walla,

Sutherland had enjoyed reasonable success with a limited program, and he intended to continue and develop the program at Battle Creek.

Manual labor was the one specific reform that Sutherland mentioned in his first letter to Ellen White as Battle Creek College president. "We are making some changes," he wrote, "and are endeavoring to plan the work so that we can take some time for manual labor."  

At a faculty meeting on March 31, 1897, Sutherland initiated the development of a plan by presenting a study from Ellen White's writings on the subject.

After meeting five times and having addressed only the question of whether or not something should be done, Magan finally told the faculty that he did not think it would help to pray or study the question any longer. Claiming that "we must now act," he proposed a number of questions for discussion:

(1) Shall the amount of domestic work be increased? (2) Shall we have manual training? (3) If so, shall it be compulsory? (4) How many hours a day shall we require students to take it? (5) Shall we pay students for taking it, or shall it be on the basis of a study? (6) What relation shall the faculty sustain to the practical work in the school?

Spurred into action, the faculty and the college board each appointed a committee to develop a plan. By May 9 the faculty committee reported that it was looking for acreage to purchase so the school could have a farm.

For a work-study program to succeed, the students would have

---

1E. A. Sutherland to E. G. White, April 8, 1897, EGWRC-DC.
2BCC Fac Min, March 31, April 11, 14, 1897.
3BCC Fac Min, April 18, May 9, June 7, 1897.
to be educated to the idea of the value of physical labor. As soon as the 1897 school year began it was decided to use chapel time to present the topic to the student body. They were offered training and work in carpentry, printing, blacksmithing and tinsmithing, broom-making, tailoring, and a variety of areas in the domestic department as options in manual labor. Pleased with his contribution to the work program, Kellogg, in a letter to Ellen White, mentioned that he had been able to acquire permission of the college to manufacture "a new kind of broom" that a friend of his had invented. Kellogg was also instrumental in making the cooking classes especially successful. Forty students, male and female, were allowed to use thirty-three "practice kitchens" located in the sanitarium, each "complete in itself."¹

Inevitably the question was raised as to whether the students should receive payment for all of their manual labor. The faculty divided on the matter. L. J. Hughes argued that it was a "fatal mistake to set forth the idea that the student is to receive remuneration for all manual labor," but Sutherland thought that "it should be put upon a business basis." A reasonable compromise was eventually reached: during the period of initial training in any specific skill, the student was required to pay tuition, but once a certain level of proficiency had been acquired, the student was paid "fair wages."²


By the spring of 1898 the Educational Society had become so enthused over the value of a manual-labor program that it voted to raise "a fund of $10,000" for the purpose of "establishing industrial and manual training work" at the college. Thus teachers could be trained to "establish these several lines of work in local church schools and intermediate schools."^1

With experience, some of the industries were showing marked improvement. By early 1899 the broom shop employed sixty male students who worked from two to eight hours a day. Magan exulted: "If you wish to see enthusiasm, visit the boys in the College broom shop. God has blessed this work more than they had asked or even thought." They were producing four thousand brooms a month, which were sold under contract to Chicago wholesalers.^2

Though the tailor shop employed only six students, it was teaching a saleable skill and was producing clothing purchased by students and faculty. Its objective was "to make this a means of support while doing missionary work in some home or foreign field." A dressmaking department was added in 1898 and employed "young women who could cut hygienic garments, and teach others to do the same." The students employed in the carpenter shop carried out the "general repairs" on the college buildings and were taught elementary architecture for the construction of small buildings. A shoe shop was added in 1899. The college also had its own printing office.^3

---

^1 BCC Ēd Min, April 10, 1898.


Of all the areas of manual labor that Ellen White wrote about, agriculture was one of the most prominent. As early as 1872, writing about traditional education, she observed: "In connection with the schools [there] should have been agricultural and manufacturing establishments." In 1882 she declared: "Every institution of learning should make provision for the study and practice of agriculture and the manual arts." Regarding Avondale, the school being established in Australia, Mrs. White wrote in 1894:

There must be . . . education in plans and methods of working the soil. . . . Agriculture will open resources for self-support, and various other trades also could be learned. . . . Let the teachers in our schools take their students with them into the gardens and fields, and teach them how to work the soil in the very best manner.

The faculty recognized the impossibility of practicing her counsel on the tiny seven-acre college campus, so a committee had been appointed in May 1897 to look for land. Happily, a group of private donors was found that supplied the needed funds, and in October 1897 the college purchased an eighty-acre farm located one mile north of the campus. Within a short time students planted thirty acres in fruit trees, shrubs, and vines. Vegetables and other crops were planted on the rest of the acreage. A few months later a generous individual agreed to allow the college to use an adjacent sixteen-acre fruit farm. To help provide the faculty with the needed skills to work the farm, a professor from the agricultural college at Lansing

---
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agreed to come and give some basic instruction.¹

On the part of the administration, agriculture quickly assumed such importance that, beginning in 1898, the school calendar stipulated that "no gentlemen students will be recommended as teachers or ministers who cannot pass satisfactory examination" on farming and fruit raising. Very missionary oriented, the training was considered indispensable in preparing young men to enter new fields and to teach the people that "God has not forsaken the earth"; He "will open the windows of heaven, pouring out a blessing on all those who will follow his instruction in the spiritual and natural world."²

Considering all that had been accomplished at Battle Creek College in the line of manual labor since Sutherland had arrived there, the letter he received from Ellen White in September 1898 must have been difficult to accept or even comprehend. She spoke first of the educational work in America in general terms. Enumerating a number of deficiencies, she categorically declared: "If all in America had encouraged the work in agricultural lines that principles [sic] and teachers have discouraged, the schools would have had altogether a different showing." Then came the passage that must have bewildered Sutherland. "The directions God has been pleased to give you," she wrote,

you have taken hold of so gingerly, that you have not had the ability to overcome obstacles. It reveals cowardice to move as slowly and uncertainly as you have done in the labor line:

¹BCC Fac Min, October 21, 1897. BCC Cal, 1898, p. 21. C. M. Christiansen, "Battle Creek College Farm," RH 75 (August 23, 1898): 545.

²BCC Cal, 1898, p. 61; 1900, p. 71.
for this is the very best kind of education that can be obtained.

It appears from the context that Ellen White was still speaking to Adventist educators in general and not to Sutherland alone, though the letter was addressed to him. He perhaps took some consolation from the possibility that Ellen White had not been informed of all the recent labor developments at Battle Creek College, but he could not have helped feeling that he was included in the rebuke. The college had a farm and several industries in operation. Desiring to improve the quality of instruction and work, the administrators invited agricultural educators to lecture at Battle Creek. The faculty also made visits to the farm at the state agricultural college at Lansing. Since the faculty was more enthusiastic than the students about manual labor, they tried to increase student involvement by dedicating one monthly Saturday night program to agriculture. The only thing Sutherland and his faculty could do was to continue his aggressive reforms and hope that they would prevent any future rebukes from Ellen White.²

The accusation of agricultural extremes. Ironically, it was Sutherland's views on agriculture, a subject so dear to his heart, that labelled him a radical and brought the reform program at Battle Creek College into general disrepute. Raised on a farm, he had a broad practical knowledge of farming, and it had been his chosen topic when he addressed the students at Union College during the General

¹E. G. White to E. A. Sutherland, September 21, 1898, EGWRC-DC.
²BCC Cal, 1898, p. 21.
Conference session in 1897. Sutherland's interest in what he taught as biblical concepts on farming possibly had their origin in certain statements written by Ellen White in 1894. "There must be education," she penned,

in plans and methods of working the soil . . . . This country needs educated farmers . . . . There is much mourning over unproductive soil, when if men would read the Old Testament Scriptures they would see that the Lord knew much better than they in regard to the proper treatment of land.

Sutherland wrote in February 1899:

The same principles that govern the body govern the soil. Radical reforms in cultivation, fertilization, drainage, variety of crops, rest, etc., are needed. God is calling for men who will believe that this is a part of the third angel's message. Farm reformers."

Writing to his mother in June, Edson White reported that Sutherland was teaching that the "land is sick, like human beings." He was reputedly teaching that to manure the soil was "to stimulate it as human beings do in drinking coffee, tea, whiskey, and in eating meat, and so we should never manure the ground." The natural remedy was to "plow under crops of clover, or such things." Clearly there had been a semantical problem when the two men discussed "kinds of soil." When Edson had shown him "rich, black soil" and some "white-livered stuff that will not raise white beans," Sutherland had "claimed that one soil was as good as another, and that [Edson] was bringing in the color line in the soil."

Edson's most serious accusation was that Sutherland was


2E. A. Sutherland, "Farming," TS Advocate 1 (February 1899): 100.
teaching that "it is wrong to kill the bugs that devastate the crops." Edson added that he "farms by faith, and if the Lord wants the bugs to eat his crops he must not interfere." Though Edson asserted that because of Sutherland's teachings "some of the college crops are destroyed already," there is no evidence that this was a fact.¹

Naturally concerned over the revelation of Edson regarding "Sutherland's ideas in Bible farming," W. C. White wrote his brother as soon as he could. He assured Edson that he and his mother were very pleased that Sutherland was "giving this subject diligent study," but he suggested that it would be much better to present new ideas "in a modest way."

Agreeing that the land is sick, that there are kinds of manure that "act as a stimulant, and leave the land weaker . . . every year," White said his mother had told him that "whatever will develop properly without manure is better without it." Nevertheless, she had explained that while plowing under crops was good, "barn-yard manure" was also "natural and good." As for allowing insects to infest the crops, White wrote: "I see nothing in it. We want to be merciful . . . but we have to free our trees from insects; also our potato vines, pumpkins and melons." In reply, Edson assured his mother and brother that he had given Sutherland and Magan copies of W. C. White's letter. "I know that it has effected [sic] them," he claimed, "and it will work out in their work for the future."²

¹J. E. White to E. G. White, June 18, 1899, EGWRC-DC. See pp. 127-31 for a further discussion of this problem.

²W. C. White to J. E. White, August 14, 1899, EGWRC-DC. J. E. White to W. C. White, September 21, 1899, EGWRC-DC.
Sutherland certainly must have felt that he was under fire for the statements he had made, or was reported to have made, regarding biblical agriculture. His reputation and that of the school was tarnished enough already, but it was about to worsen with the arrival of Miss Ellis in Australia.

In December 1898 W. C. White asked Sutherland and Magan to send a school teacher to Australia right away. To expedite this, he provided names of three persons, none of which could go. Realizing the pressing need, they provided instead a twenty-five year old woman named Ray Ellis. She was a Jewess from the east coast and a relatively new Adventist. A "magnificent stenographer," Ellis was considered a good teacher who, besides travelling to campmeetings and churches, had helped organize church schools. Magan described her as "kind and gentle . . . [a] very fond of children, and [as] true to principle as the needle is true to the pole." "I am sure," Sutherland observed, "you will find her straight on the educational work, and willing to learn everything she can." ¹

Ellis had been working in Australia less than five months when Ellen White wrote Magan, chagrined over the ideas she understood were brought from Battle Creek. Her concern included Sutherland and Magan's spiritual balance as well as that of the young lady:

God help Brother Sutherland and yourself, that neither of you shall place unimportant and frivolous matters, the imaginations of men's minds, in the same chapter with sacred truth. Your influence would soon be of little value if you emphasized the theories and advocated the plans and ideas that were brought to us from Battle Creek by Miss Ellis. The thought

¹P. T. Magan to W. C. White, March 31, 1899, EGWRC-DC. E. A. Sutherland to W. C. White, April 25; August 4, 1899, EGWRC-DC.
that a young and inexperienced teacher could call together young persons of less experience than herself, and in a few months give them a training that would fit them to go out and establish church schools, was not safe or wise. The proposition that these young and inexperienced teachers could lay aside at once all the books that their students have been accustomed to use, and teach all studies from the Bible, according to the plan which she might introduce, would be expecting too much. It would be too sudden a change for both students and teachers. Some of her theories presented to the children, intimating that they ought not to destroy mosquitoes or other insects that were preying on them, were not beneficial, and would lead to unprofitable questioning and condemnation. . . . The thought that we must not destroy the insects, which prey upon trees and plants, is not based upon a sound foundation.

Replying promptly to Ellen White's letter, Magan expressed sadness over Ellis's situation. He felt he and Sutherland clearly had committed an "error in judgment" in sending her since she was taking positions which they had "never taken and never countenanced." Magan was adamant:

I have never taken the position, and I do not believe that Bro. Sutherland has either, that mosquitoes, etc., should not be killed, or that the insects destroying vines and plants should not be themselves destroyed. On the contrary, I have always said that this doctrine was mingling of common, low ideas with sacred things, and would bring good things into disrepute. I have taught that if the instruction in the Bible and the Testimonies concerning farming on Bible plans and the proper use of our means were followed, we would have a right to trust God to fulfill [sic] the promise that he would rebuke the devourer for our sakes. But I have always looked at the thing this way: that if there was anything in that text at all, it was this, that God would bless a man who did right with the products of his farm and his means, and that to a greater or less extent, at least, God would rebuke the devourer, so that it would not come upon his crops. But if the devourer should come upon my crops, I would feel perfectly free to use any legitimate means, by spraying, etc., to destroy him.²

¹E. G. White to P. T. Magan, October 21, 1899, EGWRC-DC.
²P. T. Magan to E. G. White, November 24, 1899, EGWRC-DC.
One can see from Magan's explanation how some might have extrapolated an extreme position from his assurance that God would rebuke the devourer, even though the concept is biblical. In addition, he might not always have been careful to add the clarifier that he would feel "perfectly free" to spray and destroy the devourer.

Considering it important that his position also be clarified, Sutherland wrote to Ellen White, commenting briefly on Ellis's sincerity and clearly denying that he had taught such ideas.

I have only this to say, that I trust Miss Ellis will be led by the Lord into the place where she should be. I believe she is a sincere, earnest Christian. She took a course that we did not expect, but I believe the Lord loves her dearly. The ideas you mention in your letter that she was teaching have not been taught here. I realize the danger of taking extreme positions, and know that God must keep us here or we will fail.

Sutherland later told the college trustees that the things Ellis had taught in Australia "were not rightly chargeable to the Battle Creek School." He emphatically added that he had "never advocated that textbooks should not be used." Had the misunderstanding resulted in part, from a lack of communication? It is possible, but evidently Ellis had imbibed several extreme ideas from someone while living at Battle Creek and had taught them with little discretion.²

Because myth easily blends with fact, and because there are always some who are ready to assume the worse, Sutherland, Magan, and the college they represented found themselves in a very unenviable

---

¹E. A. Sutherland to E. G. White, November 29, 1899, EGWRC-DC.

²BCC Bd Min, October 19, 1900. For further discussion on Ellis and the problems she stirred up, see pp. 127-31.
position. Interestingly, in spite of the negative things that Edson had written about the two men's teachings, he still strongly supported them. In a letter to his mother he declared: "I believe with all my heart that they are . . . trying to carry on the school on right principles."

In spite of some isolated support for his position, Sutherland viewed the situation as so critical that in the spring of 1900 he decided to request a General Conference investigation of the school. It was not carried out. That fall Magan wrote despondently to Ellen White:

I can not look at this whole matter in any other light than that the enemy of the work is determined to hinder and thwart that which he knows will be an injury to those who are working for him. Elds. Daniells and Haskell look at it in the same way. We have asked to have our school investigated, but this has never been done. We think if it were investigated, if our leading brethren would publish a statement, telling exactly what they find out about the school, a great deal of this trouble might cease.

Fortunately, Sutherland eventually found a good opportunity to explain his position and quell the widespread rumors at the Conference of Church-school Teachers in 1900. All of the principal educators and most of the Adventist school teachers were there.

In a post-conference report to Ellen White, Hetty Haskell admitted that "there was a general feeling by most of the teachers out side [sic] of Battle Creek, that Prof. Sutherland was going to extremes." There were also, she said, many reports that were

1J. E. White to E. G. White, June 28, 1900, EGWRC-DC. S. N. Haskell to E. G. White, August 9, 1900, EGWRC-DC.

2BCC Bd Min, March 28, 1900. P. T. Magan to E. G. White, October 24, 1900, EGWRC-DC.
circulated about Sutherland that were "very much inflated and a distance from the truth." His restraint in responding to these reports had impressed her:

He could not be surprised or in any way led to retort to any cutting thing, he simply went ahead and whenever opportunity offered he would present his views in clear concise terms that did not compromise any of the principles he was advancing. By his simple Christian, gentlemanly, straightforward manner he gained every day.

As Sutherland presented his views at the conference the teachers questioned and cross-questioned, yet by the time it was over they saw that "the principles he advocated were true." Nevertheless, reported Mrs. Haskell, Sutherland also frankly acknowledged that "in his zeal sometimes he had gone too far and made mistakes and he was sorry for them."²

That openness and honesty spawned a spirit of unity that made Mrs. Haskell rejoice. As an example of that spirit, she described the encounter between W. T. Bland, president of Union College, and Sutherland. "Prof. Sutherland and Bland are strong men," she observed, "and have for some time stood at two extremes." But as the conference progressed "they seemed to blend together more." At the closing talk

Bro. Bland broke down and choked up so he had to sit down for a while until he could control his feelings, he very urgently asked for the prayers of the teachers as he went back to his school and tried to carry out the light he had received at the council.

As a result of the conference, many of the educators for the first time viewed Sutherland and his educational reforms in a

¹H. H. Haskell to E. G. White, August 9, 1900, EGWRC-DC.
²Ibid.
³Ibid.
positive light. G. A. Irwin, as president of the General Conference, was quite willing to take credit for the successful conference. In his letter to Ellen White, he claimed that it had been his idea to hold the meetings, adding that he had personally presided and had given the "fullest liberty and freedom for each one to speak his mind." "The result," he exulted, "was even beyond my expectation." However, he betrayed a lack of understanding of the issues when he commented:

I was pleased to note that there was but little difference between the different schools; and what little did exist consisted more in their individuality and their way of getting at the thing, than a disagreement in the underlying principles.

While most of those who had opportunity to talk with Sutherland came away with a positive impression of his ideas and balance, a generally hostile attitude persisted against him throughout the denomination. Enrollment therefore declined so drastically that at a meeting of the Battle Creek College trustees in October 1900, Sutherland announced that there was not "a sufficient number of students to pay running expenses." He claimed that the number would have to be increased "or the school closed." He also suggested that "there were causes for the lack of attendance, and that these causes should be carefully investigated." The board members realized what he was intimating and frankly admitted that there was a "general feeling in the field that our brethren of the General Conference were opposed to the work being done by the Battle Creek College and its

1G. A. Irwin to E. G. White, August 16, 1900, EGWRC-DC.
allied schools." The others present confirmed that they too were aware of that negative sentiment.¹

In the minds of Sutherland and Magan there was no doubt that the serious diminution of students was principally due to the rumor-spreading of leaders in the denomination. One of the "leading men of the General Conference," reported one of those present to the college board, "had told a general meeting of church workers in Ohio" that "Sutherland and Magan would not kill a mosquito if it lit upon their hand."² As a result, one conference president had written to say that "he could not send any students to the school, or endorse it in any way, because this heresy was taught there." When asked by Jones if they had talked to the man, Sutherland and Magan confirmed that they had, but not at his instigation. Jones remarked that it was sad that "young men had to go to older men, instead of the older men coming like fathers to the younger men."³

C. M. Christiansen, head of the industrial department at the college, stated to the board that the story had spread everywhere that the "College brethren did not believe in putting fertilizers on land, and that they did not believe in taking the life of any insect." He asserted that those stories had been "carried by General Conference men and told by General Conference men for truth." Nevertheless, Christiansen categorically declared that

this doctrine had never been taught by the teachers in the school, but that it had been advocated by a man who was

¹BCC Bd Min, October 18, 1900.
²The name of the speaker does not appear in the minutes.
³Ibid.
employed to take charge of the College farm, and that when he discovered that this man was teaching such doctrine, he discharged him.

John D. Gowell, president of the Michigan conference, commented that when he had heard the rumors, he "talked with Prof. Sutherland, and with the students, who assured him that such things were not taught in the college." He did what few apparently had cared enough to do--talk to those at the source of the problem.2

At the next day's session, the board chairman insisted that the discussion continue because men had been coming to him between meetings with stories of the "teachings of heresy in Battle Creek College." When the "bug and insect heresy" was brought up again, Christiansen became adamant:

no matter what the theories were, all the fruit trees on the College had been sprayed during the year when these heresies were alleged to have been taught, and that the man supposed to teach the heresies more than any other man [meaning Sutherland] was the man who did the spraying of the trees.

Christiansen had talked to the farmer, Mr. Fletcher, about his "extravagant ideas," and also to Sutherland, and he was "sure that Prof. Sutherland had not been teaching such ridiculous things." Sutherland, according to Christiansen, did believe and teach that "if land should be allowed to rest at proper times, that if crops were rotated properly and green crops plowed under that fertilization by the use of manure etc. would be unnecessary." Christiansen said that he believed in that himself and claimed that "all agricultural journals at the present time were teaching it."3

---

1Ibid. 2Ibid. 3BCC Bd Min, October 19, 1900.
Seeking to lighten the spirit of the meeting a little, S. H. Lane expressed the hope that "we would soon all be in Heaven, where bugs would be no more." Irwin felt the humor was out of place and proceeded to report some things that he believed would reveal the seriousness of the matter. He reported having heard Sutherland say that "if we did not raise one hundred bushels of wheat to the acre, we were robbing God of ten bushels." He had also seen a card "with an exhibition of insects in the Tabernacle, and on the card was written, 'Thou shalt not kill.'"

Convinced that serious errors had been taught, Irwin insisted that "the troubles would never be righted until there were confessions made by those in the school." As for the card in question, Sutherland replied that he had not see it "and never knew it was there until Eld Irwin mentioned the matter to him more than a year afterwards." Sutherland, however, admitted that he had "stated things on some points that were extreme; that he was perfectly willing to admit this and did admit it."  

Magan hastened to clear his own name: "he could not conscientiously admit," reported the board minutes, "that he had ever taught the insect or fertilization heresies," but he had to "confess that when he had heard that some of the brethren had told that he had done this, he had said some pretty hard things about them." Then Magan alluded to the Ellis case and intimated that she might have acquired the "non-killing of insects heresy" in a book that had been published by the Review and Herald Publishing Company, written by a General Conference worker. Picking up the book, The Abiding Spirit, by S. M. I.

---

1Ibid.
Henry, he read the incriminating passage for everyone to hear. Feeling moved to make a defense on behalf of Sutherland, Magan reminded the men that the General Conference had put Sutherland in the college to reform it, and that he "had made those reforms." The testimonies [counsels of Ellen White] had ceased to come that condemned the "games and sports of the world which had formerly existed in the school" and condemned "infidel textbooks and the holding of students for a long time away from the work of God." Magan rested his case with the statement that, as far as he was concerned, Sutherland was "the father of church school work amongst us." 

A third and final meeting of the college board was convened three days later with another tedious recital of the "rumors and reports about the school." Trying hard to assuage Irwin, Sutherland again stated that "he endeavored to rectify his own mistakes and to rectify false reports which might be in circulation." Although his statement was not substantively different from what he had said

---

1The book Magan alluded to was S. M. I. Henry, The Abiding Spirit (Battle Creek, MI: Review and Herald Publ. Co., 1899). It is a strange work; metaphysical in nature and pantheistic in orientation. It was related to some of the ideas then being set forth by Kellogg. Magan probably read the statement found on pages 47-48: "By this it appears not only, as before stated, that the birds upon the wing, the microscopical creatures under our feet, are all our kindred, but that the man who kills any living thing takes upon himself the responsibility of arbitrarily turning the Spirit of God out-of-doors, taking his work out of his hands, and saying, 'You shall no longer inhabit this tenement. I hold a mortgage against it by right of my grant of dominion, which I now choose to arbitrarily foreclose.'" It is possible that Ray Ellis's aversion to killing insects may have come from listening to Mrs. Henry's exposition of her ideas, for the author stated at the end of the book that she had "given many studies on the subject treated in these pages" (p. 315).

2BCC Bd Min, October 19, 1900.
previously, this time it seemed to satisfy Irwin's insistence on confession. It prompted Irwin to respond that "he wished all the brethren might hear what Prof. Sutherland just said, as he believed it would satisfy everyone." Not surprisingly, the meeting ended with "much discussion" on the wisdom of taking one's complaints directly to the one who is considered to be at fault.¹

Accusations of Other Extremes. Another separate but painful matter that Sutherland believed had "hurt the College very much" was brought before the college trustees at the same meetings in October 1900. A "testimony" Ellen White had given to S. N. Haskell as he was leaving Australia in August 1899, specifically instructing him not to reveal its contents in any way, had been misused. Haskell, not realizing that there was another copy in existence, had kept the testimony secret, but one of the other copies had been circulated and its contents had been used in some very unfortunate ways.²

Deeply distressed over the strange ideas and extreme plans being advocated by the newly arrived Ellis, Mrs. White had written to Haskell, assuming that Ellis reflected Sutherland's ideas of reform. She began the letter by addressing the issue of textbooks, warning Haskell to be very guarded as he visited Adventist schools in America. Fearing that anything spoken on the topic of textbooks might encourage Sutherland to push "things to extremes," she advised

¹BCC Bd Min, October 22, 1900.
²BCC Bd Min, October 18, 1900. E. G. White to S. N. Haskell, July 31, 1899, EGWRC-DC. See S. N. Haskell to E. G. White, October 24, 1900, EGWRC-DC. For further explanation, see pp. 110-11.
Haskell not to present "the ideas that are so clear and plain to you in reference to the text books in our schools."

White's main point was not intended to deny the need for reforms, but to express her concern that "in Brother Sutherland's hand" they would be "carried to extremes." Regarding the topic of "teaching the Bible alone," she emphasized: "If we follow on to know the Lord, we shall see things more clearly than we discern them now. But neither teachers nor students are prepared to make rapid changes."

Apprehensive over the rapid proliferation of church schools, she warned: "Sutherland has caught up the idea that there must be many church schools built; but this would mean the misappropriation of means that are called for to open new fields." But, she continued, "wherever there is a settled church, a small building should be erected as a church school." These seemingly contradictory counsels were clarified in the next paragraph: "Sutherland needs to put on the brake, and move no faster than the Lord has designated." That statement and similar ones in the letter help provide a key to understanding what she considered to be some of Sutherland's errors and extremes. She advised: "Do not let us dwell on the changes to be made until we have something definite to work to. . . . Decided changes are to be made in every one of our churches in America, but everything cannot be introduced now."¹

The most potentially damaging passages were those regarding "state schools" and debt. Misunderstanding what was intended by the term "state school," she categorically rejected their establishment:

¹E. G. White to S. N. Haskell, August 1, 1899, EGWRC-DC.
"to create state schools is the farthest from any movement that should be made." From her statement it is evident that Ellen White understood the term to mean that there would be only one centrally located school in each state. That, she vigorously opposed. As some denominational administrators had already been wary of the industrial schools Sutherland was establishing, they used her statement to exempt themselves from any fiscal support of those schools and to justify criticizing their existence.1

The counsel that touched Sutherland most keenly was that concerning the Battle Creek College debt. She said:

Too large sums of money have been invested in the school building at Battle Creek, and too little wisdom and brain power has been brought into the practical methods to stop the increasing indebtedness of each year. It would have been far better to have closed the school until it should become a science how to conduct the schools in different localities on a paying system. When one year after another passes, and there is no sign of diminishing the debt, but it is rather increased, a halt should be called. Let the managers say, I refuse to run the school any longer unless some sure basis is devised.2

By giving an erroneous interpretation to the passage it was suggested that she advocated closing Battle Creek College. Those denominational leaders who took that position were completely missing the fact that she was calling on the church at large to implement effective financial reorganization and policy.

White begged: "For Christ's sake, as the chosen people of God, call yourselves to task, and inaugurate [sic] a different system in the school." Reform that would bring fiscal responsibility was

1Ibid. For further discussion of "State" schools, see p. 144.

2E. G. White to S. N. Haskell, August 1, 1899, EGWRC-DC.
urgently needed, and if that could not be accomplished, her advice was to "close the school until a plan can be devised to carry on, with the help of God, without the blot of debt upon it." She, however, hastened to assure them that a workable plan was possible: "This can be done, and should be done."¹

Magan, who was travelling on the west coast, learned about the letter before Haskell had even arrived in Battle Creek. Evidently, a "conference president," "one of the church school teachers," and "others too numerous to mention" possessed extracts of the testimony. Learning that Irwin had a copy also, Sutherland and Magan went to him and asked about its content. At first he refused to divulge its contents, but finally let them read "one or two paragraphs" because they pressured him into it. Having refused to give them a copy he was later surprised to find that copies had been distributed "everywhere." In addition, a "large part" of the testimony had been read in the Battle Creek Tabernacle to a "promiscuous audience" by a man who was not even a member there. That individual divulged that he had received it from "a General Conference man." It was after that incident that Haskell had found out about other copies being available. He "then, and only then" had given a copy to Sutherland.²

Annoyed, A. T. Jones told the conference presidents that it was their "duty to correct the reports which had been circulated against the college in their territory." "It should be done," he insisted, "even if it appeared to place them in antagonism to the General

¹Ibid.
²BCC Bd Min, October 18, 1900.
Conference.\textsuperscript{1} The meeting ended with a vote, introduced by Sutherland and seconded by Magan, to ask the General Conference to "investigate the Battle Creek College and its allied industrial schools."\textsuperscript{2} It is, of course, impossible to determine whether the conference presidents acted decisively to quash the harmful rumors. Nor is it possible to find evidence that a General Conference investigation of the college was carried out at any time before the college left Battle Creek. Amid the rumors, the college, nevertheless, experienced impressive spiritual growth which manifested itself in social action in the city and surrounding areas.

Spiritual Growth and Mission Outreach

A non-formal curricular modification promoted by Sutherland was an intensified emphasis on spiritual life and active witness. He reminded all who would listen of the words of Ellen White: "'The Spirit of God, getting into the mind of a student, will do more in a few months to make him wise than could be done for him in five years in the ordinary way.'"\textsuperscript{3}

In the fall of 1897, those at the college experienced, through a disciplinary problem, an extraordinary evidence of the Holy Spirit's power. Magan recounted the incident. On discovering that some of the students were about to violate "plain precepts of the Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy" (the specific violations are not mentioned), the faculty decided not to "ferret out the offense" but

\textsuperscript{1} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{2} Ibid.  

\textsuperscript{3} E. G. White, quoted by [E. A. Sutherland], "Battle Creek College," \textit{RH} 75 (August 30, 1898):562.
to pray for wisdom to discipline "according to God's own lines." After seeking guidance from God for over three weeks, they began to work with the students one by one. In almost every case "the blessing of the Lord came in." This experience precipitated a revival which involved both the college and the preparatory school, and culminated in a baptism of "over ninety souls, almost every one College students."¹

The student spirit affected the faculty too. Frederick Griggs, principal of the preparatory school, wrote:

From week to week the work in the College is becoming stronger in its interest in gospel work. Perhaps at no time in its history has there been such an earnest class of students as at present. . . . Students are already leaving for fields of labor. . . . The Lord is cutting short the work in righteousness. The Saviour, in the miracle at Cana, taught that the Lord can do, in a short time, what ordinarily takes much longer. . . . This is the spirit which the faculty desire the entire school to possess.²

Right after the beginning of the 1898 school year, the college again experienced a time of widespread revival. "Only the Spirit of God," wrote DeGraw, "could give the young heart the bravery to lay bare its sins as was done by hundreds." Taking advantage of the positive student spirit, Sutherland read to the students from a letter written to him by Ellen White on the subject of manual training. According to DeGraw, it was at that point that the college turned in favor of work-study.³

²F. Griggs, "In the College," RH 74 (November 9, 1897):715
The revival spawned an intensified interest in mission outreach: one student was prompted to visit his home church where his efforts resulted in two baptisms, seventy-five students decided to "enter [teach in] church schools in January," and at least ten students canvassed Battle Creek with the newly published *Desire of Ages*. Feeling burdened to witness to people of his own race, an Indian student walked the eighteen miles to a reservation with a friend. As a result of their visit eight of his listeners asked for prayer and "four were converted."²

The young ladies also became involved in missionary work. A waif was brought into the female students' residence, given a bath, and put to bed "while underclothes were made for her." At the same time, other young women cleaned the home of the child's father.³

The students also planned a big dinner for Thanksgiving in 1898. Over two hundred of the young women decided to give up their own meal "for some poor child." After canvassing the poor districts of the city to find needy children, the students spent two busy days making clothes and buying shoes for the poorest ones. The sanitarium caught the spirit and also provided meals for 180 children, thus approximately 380 children were fed. Wanting to be included in the project, the young men did their part by taking care of all the kitchen clean-up. So successful was the occasion that the college

---

²M. B. DeGraw, "Another Week in Battle Creek College," RH 75 (December 6, 1898):786.  
³Ibid.
repeated the Thanksgiving celebration the next fall.¹

As a result of the revival, a large number of students went out visiting and contacted "nearly every family of Adventists" in Battle Creek. In fact, students were so busy with missionary work that studies were laid aside. DeGraw wrote: "If you are inclined to think that a suspension of studies means a waste of time, you should follow some of these students whose hearts are aglow with brotherly love."²

The students must have felt encouraged by the counsel that Ellen White had written after an earlier revival:

When the students thus beheld Jesus, the suspension of their studies was counted as no loss. They were catching glimpses of Him who is invisible. . . . The Holy Spirit wrought not only for those who had lost their first love, but also for souls who had never placed themselves on the Lord's side.

Although much of the outreach by the college was spontaneous, the "Jackson Mission" was an organized program initiated in the fall of 1897. Since medical missions had been successful in a number of towns and cities, but no "purely gospel" mission had been attempted, the college leaders chose Jackson as the site for an experiment. There they acquired the use of two floors of a building with a large assembly hall on the second floor and five rooms for "the mission family" above.

¹Ibid. C. L. Stone, "Thanksgiving Day at the College," RH 76 (December 12, 1899):810.

²M. B. Degraw, "Work in Battle Creek College," RH 75 (December 13, 1898):803-04.

³E. G. White, "Manifest Working of the Spirit," Special Testimonies on Education, pp. 77-83. The exact date of this manuscript is unknown.
In spite of the fact that a faculty member was sent to superintend the mission, the actual work was done by students. Eight to ten students at a time would spend "from two to four weeks" in Jackson. Working night and day they held well-attended meetings nearly every evening, but most of the work consisted of "searching for the poor," "visiting the penitentiary," and giving "Bible readings." As a result of the Jackson experiment, the college became convinced that "a mission can be conducted on denominational lines; students can profitably engage in this work as a part of their college education; [and] constant effort is needed to accomplish any lasting good."1

The college's most ambitious mission project, begun in 1899, was its work for the deprived blacks of the South. To prepare for this work, Sutherland and Magan made a number of trips to the South to consult and plan with Edson White. They also reconnoitered for possible outposts. Within a short time the college sent a self-supporting couple who had been students at the college to establish a mission outpost in Mississippi. The school also helped by purchasing beans, peas, and peanuts for distribution by workers on Edson's boat, "Morning Star." Wanting to get church members involved, a day of special prayer and sacrifice was organized by the college in its "district" in early 1898 to help the work in the South. By June 1

church members had donated over $600.¹ In the summer of 1897, and each summer thereafter, a six-week teacher training course was offered at the college especially for those "going as teachers to the South."²

The college helped not only with donations and training but also with its equipment. For example, a part of the basement at the college had been remodelled as a printing office to take care of the printing needs of the school as well as some outside jobs. Arrangements were made to let Edson use the facilities so that "the work [in the South] could be brought into closer touch with Northern people." There he published The Gospel Herald, a missionary journal telling about the work in the South.³

Committed to the work in the South, especially because of Ellen White's frequent urgings, the college under Sutherland and Magan remained active in providing funds and workers for the South as long as the school was at Battle Creek. This outreach continued when the college was moved to Berrien Springs.

¹"The South," TS Advocate, 1 (June 1899):380-82. What area comprised the "district" is not specified.


By 1901 major strides had been taken in curricular reform: the classics had been dropped, supplanted by the Bible; and unusually flexible academic programs emphasized short courses and awarded no degrees. Manual labor and mission outreach had become integral, vital aspects of the curriculum and constituted major elements of the holistic reform at Battle Creek College. Since many at the college had come to believe that the children of the church should also be exposed to such Bible-centered, holistic education, the college organized a teacher training program, and did much to forward the church-school movement.

The Church School Movement

Church schools

The development of a church-school system occurred slowly among Seventh-day Adventists. The church did not establish its first official elementary school until nine years after its organization in 1863. By 1890 the church had six elementary schools, five secondary schools, and two post-secondary schools rather grandly called "colleges."\(^1\)

Sarah Peck, a lifetime educator, in her later years would "good-naturedly" quarrel with Sutherland over which of the two had started the "church school work," since she had been developing church schools in Africa at the same time that Sutherland was spearheading their growth in America. As far as she was concerned: "the Lord was

\(^1\)For a contextual explanation of the development, see George R. Knight, "Spiritual Revival and Educational Expansion," RH 161 (March 29, 1984):8-11. Cf. Knight, Early Adventist Educators, pp. 43-44.
working, and not me, and the Lord started it, and... He started it here and over there at the same time."¹

To those who believe in divine providence it does appear that the decade of the 1890s was God's chosen time for the rapid development of a church-school system in the Seventh-day Adventist denomination. In a whirlwind of expansion, the church by 1900 had established a system of 220 elementary schools and 25 secondary schools and colleges worldwide.²

Ellen White had been emphasizing the importance of a Christ-centered education since the 1870s. The state could not, and should not, blend religion with education, yet Adventists realized that there could be no "true education" without a biblical, Christ-centered, religious framework. Without the integration of faith, there could be no true learning. In spite of the fact that most Adventists believed that God spoke through Ellen White, they were very cautious and apathetic if not actually opposed to removing their children from public schools and placing them in a school system of their own creation.³

Addressing the need for a separate school system in Australia, she wrote to W. C. White in May 1897: "In this country parents are compelled to send their children to school. Therefore in localities

¹Sarah Peck, interview with Lorenz, p. 7.

²Christian Education 3 (September/October 1911):14.

where there is a church, schools should be established, if there are no more than six children to attend."¹

At the time that counsel was given, Sutherland was beginning his presidency at Battle Creek College. As he and Magan studied Ellen White's literature on Christian education, they became convinced that the development of an Adventist church-school system was a concept whose time had come. One of Sutherland's colleagues later recalled that Sutherland talked about church schools "considerably in the beginning of that year [1897] both to the faculty and committees, and expounded his convictions and theories." Growing bolder he initiated the creation of a plan and presented his ideas to the school at chapel. Within a short time faculty and students had begun to catch the vision.²

Sutherland soon received his first request for a school teacher. Albert Alkire, an Adventist farmer living in northern Michigan, needed a teacher for his five children and some neighbors' children. Unfortunately the man died before a teacher could be sent, but his widow reaffirmed the request and a teacher went. In fact, it appears that the farmer's untimely death helped spur a number of the college students to lay aside their studies in order to volunteer to go as missionary teachers to instruct in one-room schools under rather primitive conditions. Five schools were established within a very brief period near the end of 1897: one for the Alkires, two

¹E. G. White to W. C. White, May 5, 1897, EGWRC-DC.

in Indiana, one in Pennsylvania, and one in Wisconsin.¹

Concurrent with the initial development of the elementary schools was the initiation of industrial schools. The term and idea appear to have been Sutherland's. Ellen White had written some pointed counsels against erecting new buildings in Battle Creek and had urged Adventists not to congregate there but to move out. Consequently, Sutherland wrote to her asking if it would help to relieve the situation "if small industrial schools were to be started in this district," with possibly one each in Michigan, Indiana, Wisconsin, and Illinois. He recommended that they be kept small: none should have more than 150 students, and they were to operate an industrial plan so that students could work on the farm and in the shops "to avoid running in debt." By keeping the "younger element" from going to Battle Creek, the college could be turned into a "training school for the last part of the education of the students." Another advantage, Sutherland believed, was that the plan would "do away to a great extent with many subjects which we now feel compelled to teach."²

The denominational leadership resisted Sutherland's plan to develop industrial and elementary schools. In fact, Sutherland and Magan at one point were even called to appear before the General Conference committee. Apprehensive that funds would be diverted from

---

¹A. W. Spalding, Origin and History, 2:361-64. E. Griggs to A. W. Spalding, December 17, 1946, Spalding Coll, AUHR. H. R. Salisbury, "The College," RH 74 (October 26, 1897):682. Schwarz's claim that the "considerable disenchantment" on the part of students toward "Sutherland's extremism" led to the sharp decline in enrollment is not supported from the evidence. R. W. Schwarz, Lightbearers to the Remnant, pp. 205-6.

²E. A. Sutherland to E. G. White, October 28, 1897, EGWRC-DC. For further discussion on industrial schools see pp. 132-33.
other projects, the church administrators reproached the two men for "ever taking the money out of the denomination to start these schools." During that same decade, the denomination was experiencing rapid growth in the number of overseas missions and the church leaders feared that the church-school movement would decrease the funds available for foreign mission work.

Sutherland and Maqan, however, had no desire to retreat. An argument that Sutherland used with increasing effectiveness with church administrators and at campmeetings, focused on parental concern for their children. "You must remember," Sutherland claimed, that the education of the children is the greatest and dearest purpose in the hearts of parents, and they will do anything to bring that about. They will sell their cows or an acre of land, or move from one place to another to do it. And you can just as well count on it that this thing is going to go because the parents will have it go.

In 1897 Sutherland's declaration was mostly wishful thinking, but as Adventist parents slowly began to realize the potential benefits of Christian education they did "have it go," and it has never stopped. The church by 1984 had 4,337 elementary schools, 892 secondary schools, and 91 colleges and universities.

From 1897 Sutherland dedicated a large part of his time to the development of an Adventist school system. He recalled years

---

1Sutherland, Wire Recording, 1946.
2For more on Adventist missions in that period, see R. W. Schwarz, Light Bearers, p. 214.
3Sutherland, quoted by Benjamin G. Wilkinson, interview with Lorenz, p. 108.
later, with quite a bit of exaggeration: "Magan, Miss DeGraw and myself [sic] practically at the end of every week would pick up a teacher and go out and establish three schools before Monday morning." Later he asserted that with the help of a number of his colleagues, over six hundred church schools were established in four years time. While this figure is greatly inflated, it is still true that Sutherland was principally responsible for the explosion in the number of church schools in the United States in the late 1890s.

Teacher training

It was not, however, enough to establish the schools; teachers must be adequately trained. By April 1899 Sutherland was publicly admitting that the great danger threatening the burgeoning church-school work was that of poorly qualified teachers. To meet the urgent demands for schools, some teachers were sent out who knew "little or nothing of the principles of Christian education."²

Teacher training had not been consistently offered by the college in its early years. Although the college had a "normal" department in the 1870s, it did not have a teacher-training program from 1881 through 1897. In 1897 it reestablished a "normal" department.³

Frederick Griggs, a man who was destined to play a significant role in the development of teacher training at Battle Creek College, had joined the staff as principal of the "English Preparatory

---

¹Sutherland, Wire Recording, 1946.
³See BCC calendars for 1874-98.
Department" of Battle Creek College in 1891. That department was responsible for the elementary school, which included "a beginners' grade, four primary [grades], four grammar grades, and a High School grade." As head of the elementary school, Griggs became increasingly aware of the need for qualified teachers--qualified not only in biblical orientation, but in correct methodology. Consequently, in 1894 the college began to offer a one-term, three-hour elective course in pedagogy for seniors.¹

In 1896, O. A. Olsen, the General Conference president, wrote to Prescott regarding teacher training. He was very favorably impressed with the "new departure" that Sutherland had initiated at Walla Walla which included "instructing teachers on how to teach." Consequently, he consulted Prescott on the advisability of organizing an "Institute" at Healdsburg College in California and inviting all of the teachers to attend. Olsen wanted them to be "taught by Prof. Sutherland how to plan their courses." Interested in W. C. White's opinion on Sutherland and his teacher-training program, Olsen wrote White, who responded that he was "highly gratified" with the innovative work at Walla Walla. In fact, White complained, he had "laid the same plans before the faculty at Battle Creek repeatedly but they have not seen light enough in them to give them a fair trial." While the only solution, in White's opinion, was to educate teachers "in these new lines before we can bring about any satisfactory changes in our older schools," he claimed that the teachers at Battle Creek

and College View had "too good an opinion of their own judgment" to be willing to be taught by Sutherland.¹

Trying to foment action on teacher training, Olsen consulted Prescott, the General Conference educational secretary, about making "normal work" available in "one or more" of the colleges. Prescott answered: "At this [sic] distance it seems to me that Prof. Griggs is making a good start in this direction." He recommended that Olsen consult with Griggs directly.²

Meanwhile, Griggs had been studying the counsels of Ellen White on the subject and discussing his conclusions with his church-school teachers. He would recall fifty years later that

it was because of Sister White's writings perhaps more than any thing [sic] else that led the faculty of the preparatory school of Battle Creek College to give careful study to the training of church school teachers.

Deciding, with Olsen's encouragement, that the time had come for action, Griggs talked to the college board about initiating a formal teacher-training program. Two of the faculty, Aul and Howe, strongly opposed such a department and even presented "a number of Testimonies" which they believed spoke against its formation. Disregarding the dissenters, the school board decided to support Griggs and put him in charge of the program. Griggs, however, did not feel qualified to teach "Pedagogy, Child Study, etc." Thus, he and two


²W. W. Prescott to O. A. Olsen, February 10, 1896, RG 11: Bx 46, Misc Let, 1893-1902, GCAR.

³F. Griggs to A. W. Spaulding, December 17, 1946, Spalding Coll, AUHR.
of his church-school teachers, in response to their request, were sent
to the School of Pedagogy of the University of Buffalo.¹

Sutherland's arrival as president of the college lent impetus
to the teacher-training plans because he too realized the need.
Favorably impressed with the new president, Griggs was pleased when,
without delay, the college created a "Teachers' Department" that
required nine quarters of work. He later wrote:

Professor Sutherland had a great and good burden for our
church school work, and he was, of course, a tower of strength
in the work of this new normal department which had been set
under way before he came to the college from Walla Walla.

For the time being the plan to require nine quarters of classwork
was left intact. Sutherland, however, began talking and praying with
the faculty regarding the need to prepare students more rapidly, par­
ticularly in light of Ellen White's manuscript, "Speedy Preparation
for Work." By November 1897 Griggs was echoing Sutherland's sense
of urgency:

From week to week the work in the College is becoming stronger
in its interest in gospel work. Perhaps at no time in its
history has there been such an earnest class of students as
at present. This earnestness manifests itself in a willing­
ness to stay in the work of the school only so long as the
Lord shall direct. Students are already leaving for fields
of labor. The Lord is cutting short the work in righteous­
ness; and we are coming to realize that if we are to have a
part in the work, we must not delay. The Saviour, in the
miracle at Cana, taught that the Lord can do, in a short time,
what ordinarily takes much longer. . . . This is the spirit
which the faculty desire the entire school to possess,—a full
confidence that the Lord can and will do this mighty work,
and a willingness and gladness heartily to co-operate with

¹Ibid.

²F. Griggs quoted in May Cole Kuhn, "Frederick Griggs: Man
of Vision, Molder of Lives," n.d. (typewritten), Reye Coll, p. 62,
AUHR.
About twenty-five students are preparing to enter church and mission schools as teachers at the end of this term. The instruction which they are receiving is adapted to their needs in this short preparation.

Sutherland had strongly supported Griggs' plan for teacher training. Griggs, in turn, loyally supported accelerated teacher preparation and the establishing of church schools. Both men seemed willing to learn, and they were apparently experiencing increasing agreement as to how their goals might best be achieved. But they were not alone. A nucleus of the college personnel worked together on both goals: teacher training and the proliferation of church schools. It appears that DeGraw, Griggs, Magan, Sutherland, and Tenney were particularly active in travelling throughout the field to establish church schools. In fact, it was Griggs who had been personally responsible for visiting Alkire's widow and for making the arrangements for Maude Wolcott (later Spalding) to be the teacher of the first church school begun under the Sutherland administration. It was also Griggs who personally established one of the first schools in Indiana. The Battle Creek group was motivated by a strong conviction that they were doing the work that should be done. Tenney wrote:

It is gratifying to know that as advance steps are taken, the way seems to open up providentially, and the blessing of the Lord is coming in to sanction the work. Broad plans are being laid for such a remodeling of the work as will make it conform

---

1F. Griggs, "In the College," RH 74 (November 9, 1897):715.
E. A. Sutherland to Flora H. Williams, August 17, 1938, VFM 701-39, AUHR. "Teachers' Department," BCC Fall Announcement, 1897, p. 3.
to the needs of a people who are trying to carry on the greatest work ever committed to men.

Having been the designer of the teacher-training program at Battle Creek College, Griggs was made the "principal" of the "Teachers' Department," in addition to being principal of the "English Preparatory Department."

Even though Griggs was head of the teachers' department, Sutherland and DeGraw were also very active in the program. In the spring of 1899 Magan wrote to W. C. White:

Professor Sutherland is devoting a very large part of his time and attention to the matter of training teachers for church school work, and Miss DeGraw is his first assistant and constant helper in this line of labor. She understands his methods of work, the plans he has in mind to carry out, and when he is away, he can trust her to carry on the work during his absence.  

In addition to heading the teacher-training department, Griggs continued to teach the course in pedagogy, which was expanded to five hours a week and was offered twice a year. He also continued to be directly involved in establishing new schools, the vigorous recruitment of teachers, and the writing of numerous articles for church and educational journals. As the principal of the Battle Creek church school, he oversaw its enlargement from ten to twelve grades.  

In 1899 Griggs was asked to be the principal of the South Lancaster Academy in Massachusetts, leaving Sutherland and DeGraw in

---

2. P. T. Magan to W. C. White, March 31, 1899, PTM Misc Let, LLUAr.  
3. Ibid. BCC Cal, 1898, p. 50.
charge of teacher education. While Sutherland continued to help, Miss DeGraw took over as principal of the department.¹

Sutherland did not intend to offer substandard teacher training at Battle Creek College, even though he was less traditional in his approach than Griggs. During the years of Sutherland's presidency at Battle Creek College, curricular reform was in the experimental stage. It has often been assumed that the faculty sought to compress three or four years of instruction into a period of three to nine months. Such was not the case. The school's goal was that no "work done either for or by students will in any way fall below the true culture where degrees are given."²

The college attempted to achieve its goal by following several months of initial training with an organized program of continuing education. Before going out to head a church school, the student received, during his brief initial months of training, a basic practical and pedagogical orientation. A major emphasis involved giving instruction "in those subjects which will form character befitting citizenship with the Creator." In order to cover the fundamentals in that brief period of time, teachers purposely avoided "with scrupulous care those things of a doubtful or decidedly useless character." The teacher novitiate then received a credential which was renewable yearly, based on the completion of specified conditions, one of which required that the teacher successfully complete "at least one line of advanced study" yearly.³

¹BCC Cal, 1900, p. 6.
²TS Advocate 1 (June 1899):290.
³TS Advocate 1 (June 1899):290-91, 298-300.
In Sutherland's teacher-training program, teachers were expected to take advantage of the summers for intensive continuing education. During the summer of 1897, his first in Battle Creek, Sutherland held a very successful summer school with 400 attendees. Impressed with their dedication, he described them as "earnest people who are here for a speedy preparation to enter the work." He tried to provide a "large corps of instructors who are not giving out cold theory, but who are relating to the students' real experiences which they had in the work." It is not known how many of the 400 were teacher trainees and how many had come to prepare for other areas of church work, but specific "normal training"—particularly oriented to those intending to go to work as teachers in the South—was given.\(^1\)

In November 1897 Sutherland announced that there would be a "Winter School" as well. In the advertisement that appeared in the Review and Herald, he tried to evoke a favorable response by quoting from Ellen White:

There are many who are thirsting for the knowledge they could get in a few months. . . . Most earnest work should be given to advance those who are to be missionaries. Every effort should tell to their advantage so that they shall be sent forth as speedily as possible. They cannot afford to wait until their education is considered complete. This can never be attained; for there will be a constant course of education carried on throughout the ceaseless ages of eternity. . . . They cannot afford to wait to complete years of training; for the years before us are not many, and we need to work while the day lasts.

The winter school lasted twelve weeks and was offered for those who wanted to prepare "for the ministry, general missionary work, . . . .\(^1\)"

missionary teaching, bookkeeping, canvassing, etc."

Response from many regarding the intensive training program was very favorable. Following the "Summer School for Teachers" in 1898, one young woman wrote quite positively:

I came expecting to learn a great many facts that I could apply in my teaching, but the Lord had something better for me. I am sure that I had Christ for my teacher this summer; and that he has unfolded to me great principles, which lie at the very foundation of true education.

Aware that the greatest source of qualified teachers was the Adventists who were teaching in public schools, Sutherland, the college faculty, and the church school teachers continually urged their colleagues to come to the summer schools, get the needed reorientation, and teach in Adventist church schools. When some of the public-school teachers were willing to teach church school, but wanted to forego the teacher training at Battle Creek, Sutherland would not allow it. He wrote to one teacher, Ida Woodward, explaining:

As we are situated now, we cannot offer anyone a position unless [sic] we are acquainted with them, and are sure that [sic] they are in perfect harmony with Christian education, and also are able to teach properly according to this system; I mean to make the Bible, the very basis, ground [sic] work and subject matter of all the subjects that are taught. . . . If you could connecte [sic] with the school as a student, it would not be very long before you could grasp these principles, and learn how to use them.4

---

1E. A. Sutherland, "Battle Creek College Winter School," RH 74 (November 2, 1897):702.
3E. A. Sutherland, "A Call," RH 77 (June 12, 1900):380.
4[E. A. Sutherland] to Ida Woodward, September 6, 1898, RG 21: 1898-S, GCAr.
Active recruitment brought 150 to the summer school in 1899; 110 went out as school teachers. In 1900 the summer session was scheduled to run for ten weeks. The main speakers were Kellogg, Sutherland, and Jones, and the fundamental thought of the conference was that "true education is an education of faith." Two innovations were implemented: (1) the ten-week course was offered for novices, with a three-week course for those who were already teachers; (2) for the first time the educational workers were to join with the medical missionary workers--since "in the future teachers and nurses will often accompany each other into new fields." Thus, the concept of missionary teams was, for a time, explored. The session proved so helpful that those who attended requested that the presentations of the instructors be published. It made a 229-page book offered for sale at fifty cents.\(^1\)

Industrial schools

Often on the mind of Sutherland were Ellen White's counsels to decrease the size of the college in order to avoid attracting so many Adventist young people to Battle Creek. Part of this had been accomplished through the establishment of church schools, but high-school training had to be acquired either at Battle Creek or at local public high schools. To avoid either option, Sutherland had developed a plan to establish intermediate industrial schools. Designed to educate youth from ages fourteen to twenty, they were to provide work

opportunities for every student so that regardless of economic situa-
tion anyone could attend.

In the summer of 1898 Woodland Academy was established on two
hundred acres of timbered land, three miles from the town of Arpin,
Wisconsin. It had good water and excellent potential for farming. At
Cedar Lake, Michigan, a few months later, a group of Adventists and
their neighbors attended some meetings and were inspired by the sermon
of the Michigan conference president on the subject of practical
Christian education. Determined to have a school of their own, they
were able to acquire a $5,000 school building from the town elders.
It was located one-half mile outside the village, abandoned but in
excellent condition. The Michigan Conference bought it for one
dollar. By 1899 the small, original campus had been expanded to 120
acres of "tillable land."\(^1\)

At the same time the Cedar Lake school was acquired, plans
were being made to establish industrial schools in Illinois and
Indiana. Meanwhile, another school was established for the youth of
Battle Creek and its environs. It was located in a wooded area twenty
miles north of the city. These institutions were to serve as
preparatory schools--feeders for Battle Creek College.\(^2\)

Since the term "intermediate industrial schools" was cumber-
some, Sutherland and his colleagues unfortunately chose to refer to
these institutions as "State Schools." That term led Ellen White to

\(^1\)TS Advocate I (June 1899): 372-78. P. T. Magan to W. C. White
March 16, 1900, EGWRC-DC. Cf. BCC Bd Min, March 28, 1898.

\(^2\)TS Advocate 1 (June 1899): 373. E. A. Sutherland to E. G.
White, December 18, 1898, EGWRC-DC. Cf. E. A. Sutherland to E. G.
White, October 24, 1899; November 29, 1899, EGWRC-DC.
believe that it was the intention of each state to have one centrally located industrial school. She vigorously opposed such a plan. According to Sutherland's plan the schools were to be kept small, were to be located in several different areas throughout each state, and were not to be a financial drain on the local conference.¹

The industrial schools already established had been showing marked progress and were not encumbered with large debts. Nevertheless, some conference administrators gave them only grudging support. They therefore gladly took at face value the strong criticism Ellen White made regarding "state schools" in her August 1899 letter to Haskell. It read:

In regard to state schools, I know not what our brethren mean. If any such thing as state schools has come into my testimonies, I am in darkness as to how it came in. The subject of state schools as they now exist may be mentioned, but to create state schools is the farthest from any movement that should be made.²

Some administrators were perplexed and hesitant regarding the statement; others moved to totally withdraw their support of the industrial schools since they were "state schools." Wisconsin continued to support its school, but Michigan cut off assistance to Cedar Lake. Understandably, Magan was irate. He recognized that the term "state schools" was an "unfortunate one," but he felt that the conference administrators were "entirely at sea on principles." The


²E. G. White to S. N. Haskell, August 1, 1899, EGWRC-DC.
principal problem, he believed, was that the General Conference men had "not studied the educational question . . . as Sister White understands it, and that consequently they catch up sentences which meet their mind on things, and use them to the injury of the work." Their belief that the industrial schools were not "in harmony with the testimonies," he believed to be "a most extraordinary and insane idea."¹

By November 1899 Sutherland had come to realize that in spite of the hardship the misunderstanding had caused, good had come of it. He realized that the Cedar Lake and Woodland schools were, in fact, being thought of by many as state or "conference" schools and that the conferences were in danger of expending their "entire energy on them." White's testimony, in Sutherland's opinion, had stopped the "work of enlarging." He perceived that already "there was a tendency to make such an extensive outlay in these schools that it would hinder the rapid increase in number which we must see."²

Naturally, Sutherland was disappointed at the "very strong stand" the General Conference had taken against the creation of industrial schools when it maintained that "there should be nothing between the church school and the College." But he was gratified by a "recent communication," apparently written to rectify the General Conference position, and to recommend its acceptance of the "plan that was given in principle some time ago." Writing to Ellen White, Sutherland

¹P. T. Magan to W. C. White, November 24, 1899; March 16, 1900, EGWRC-DC. Cf. A. J. Breed to G. A. Irwin, September 5, 1899, RG 9: Irwin, G. A. -1, GCAr.

²E. A. Sutherland to E. G. White, November 29, 1899, EGWRC-DC.
rejoiced because he believed that she had "drawn it out in detail, so that now none can fail to understand what is meant." He thanked her and added:

I find that even though the testimonies reprove and condemn a course of action, when we yield to the Spirit of God, confess our weaknesses, he opens our souls to hear his voice, the severest rebukes become the greatest [sic] blessings. This to me is one of the strongest evidences that the testimonies are of the spirit of God.

Once it had become clear that White supported the formation of intermediate schools and the term "state school" was clarified, support began to increase among the church administrators, and the number of industrial schools began to grow.

In spite of the popularly held belief that "bigger is better," Ellen White urged Sutherland to purposely reduce the attendance at Battle Creek College. A study of enrollment figures shows that the administrators accomplished that goal. A reduction in attendance at the college was directly dependent on the success of the industrial schools to draw students away from Battle Creek. Little was achieved toward size reduction during Sutherland's first year at Battle Creek. In the summer of 1898, however, he wrote to Ellen White, informing her that he, with the faculty

had made some changes . . . which will enable us to start more schools outside and discourage many of the youth and children from coming here. . . . This will make the Battle Creek college [sic] considerably smaller and will enable us to do a much better grade of work."

On the other hand, there was considerable resistance against

1Ibid. A careful search failed to locate the "recent communication" to which Sutherland alludes.

2E. A. Sutherland to E. G. White, August 3, 1898, EGWRC-DC. Enrollment figures were: 1897-575; 1898-350; 1899-320; 1900-365.
any move to reduce the size of any part of the church organization in Battle Creek. Ellen White therefore wrote to the delegates assembled for the General Conference session in 1899:

The Lord has presented to us that the enemy is still seeking with all his power to center the work in Battle Creek, contrary to the word of God. A movement to erect more buildings there, and to gather in more people who might better never see Battle Creek, will bring results for evil that are not now foreseen.

A year later, when Ellen White's thirty-fourth testimony (volume 6 of Testimonies for the Church) was written to the church, some members of the General Conference committee, incredibly enough, were then inclined to advocate the closing of the college. They cited as their justification a portion of that testimony:

The gathering together of so many students in one school is not wise. If two thirds of the people in Battle Creek would become plants of the Lord in other localities, they would have a chance to grow. The time and energy bestowed upon the large school in Battle Creek to make a growth, would be far more favorable for a growth of the Lord's plants in other localities where there is room for agricultural pursuits to be carried on as a part of education. If there had been a willingness to follow the Lord's ways and his plans, there would have been light shining in other places.

In spite of the problems that arose from the unfortunate choice of the name "state" schools, their function was in harmony with Ellen White's counsels, and they proved successful in providing a practical education for Adventist adolescent youth. Having weathered the financial and organizational difficulties, the schools grew and


2E. G. White, Testimonies, 6:211-12.
prospered. Thus, the college, reduced in size, could operate exclusively for college-age youth.¹

Notwithstanding the problem of continued misunderstandings with church leaders, the challenges of running a school, and spearheading the development of church schools and teacher training, Sutherland also took time to write books.

**Sutherland as an Author**

In the course of Sutherland's professional lifetime, he authored scores of articles, booklets and pamphlets, three textbooks, and two books explaining his educational philosophy. Two, and possibly three, of the books were written during his tenure as president of Battle Creek College. His first book, published in 1900, was titled *Bible Reader Number One*. He intended it for use in the beginning grades of elementary school, choosing that level because "it stands at the gate of entry, and the unmistakable language tells of all future studies."² In 1904 he, with DeGraw, co-authored number two of the *Bible Reader* series.³

It is not known whether or not Sutherland's second textbook was published while he was at Battle Creek, but it was almost certainly written while he was there. Titled, *The Mental Arithmetic*,


²Sutherland, *Bible Reader Number One*, p. 4.

it contains "useful and scientific information treated arithmetically" and was prepared in response to a need expressed by The Conference on Mathematics, an outgrowth of a meeting of the National Educational Association held at Saratoga, New York, in July 1892.

The Conference had decried the use of mathematics texts that contained problems that "perplex and exhaust the pupils without affording any real valuable mental discipline," and made a general call for the preparation of textbooks enriched with "greater numbers of exercises in simple calculation" that involved "concrete problems." Sutherland took advantage of the opportunity to base the majority of the "concrete problems" in the context of the Bible.

The books presenting his educational philosophy are immersed contextually in his interpretation of the history of education. The largest volume, titled Living Fountains or Broken Cisterns, has 427 pages and was published in 1900. Perhaps its most salient message, one Sutherland greatly desired to convey, is that a religion (meaning also denomination), in order to succeed, must be upheld by a system of education. Without the supportive role of the religion's educational program, any church is doomed to fail.

Looking back to the Great Reformation, he found support for his assertion in D'Aubigne:

"The school was early placed beside the church; and these two great institutions, so powerful to regenerate the nations,

1E. A. Sutherland, The Mental Arithmetic (Battle Creek, MI: Review and Herald Pub. Assn., 1901), p. 3.
2E. A. Sutherland, Living Fountains, pp. 183, 229, 237, 247, 409-10.
were equally reanimated by it. It was by a close alliance with learning that the Reformation entered into the world."

Throughout the book Sutherland sought to draw his readers to the conclusion that

the hope of Protestantism and the hope of republicanism lies in the proper education of the youth; and that this true education is found in the principles delivered by Jehovah to his chosen people, the Jews; that it was afterward more fully demonstrated by the Master Teacher, Christ; that the Reformation witnessed a revival of these principles; and that Protestants today, if true to their faith, will educate their children in accordance with these same principles."

Wisdom and faith are crucial themes in Sutherland's philosophical view. He asserted that education consists of "dealing with wisdom," and if that wisdom is "of the world" that education is "worldly," but if it is a quest for the wisdom of God, that education is "Christian." In summary:

That education which links man with God, the source of wisdom, and the author and finisher of our faith, is a spiritual education, and prepares the heart for that kingdom which is within.

"Faith," he declared, lies at the basis of Christian education, while "reason" originated with Satan. Faith and reason are inimical and constitute the foundations of two opposing educational systems:

Those who before, inspired by love, took God at His word, and found their highest pleasure in watching the revealings of His love, now put their minds in place of God's word, and reasoned that all was wrong. . . . The principles of God's government were now laid bare: it was nothing but a great, broad system of educational development, and angelic hosts then and there decided whether faith in His word would be the standard of their obedience, or whether finite reason would bear sway.

1Quoted in Sutherland, Living Fountains, pp. 3-4.
2Sutherland, Living Fountains, pp. 4-5.
3Ibid., pp. 14, 37-41.
The "way of the cross" must come, he argued, to retrace "the mental degradation occasioned by the fall."\(^1\)

Satan's encounter with Eve in the garden was for the purpose of gaining control of the mind through "a process of reasoning." According to Sutherland, Adam and Eve used the mind "to decide the truth instead of taking a direct statement from the Author of wisdom." Crucial to his view, Sutherland maintained that the study of "dialectics" that is "so destructive to the Christian's faith" was born at that point. Dialectic, he explained, "exalts reason above faith and the result is spiritual death... Redemption comes through the adoption of the true system of education."\(^2\)

Contrasting false and true education as revealed in history, he concluded:

> Whether as Babylonish learning, Greek philosophy, Egyptian wisdom, the high glitter of papal pomp, or the more modest but no less subtle workings of modern science, the results always have been, and always will be, a savor of death unto death.\(^3\)

It was Plato, Sutherland asserted, who brought to its fullest flower the pagan philosophy of Egypt. Plato avowed: "'There is a science of sciences--I call it Dialectic--which is the intellect discriminating the false and true.'" Sutherland proclaimed a radically different "science of sciences"

> There is indeed a science of sciences--the science of salvation. There is verily a way of judging between the false and the true, for the Spirit of truth will guide you into all truth. But the human brain can never do this. It was this

\(^1\)Ibid., pp. 18, 19-21.  \(^2\)Ibid., pp. 32-33, 37.  \(^3\)Ibid., p. 40.
same logic, Plato's "science of sciences," which was given such prominence in the papal schools and all medieval education.

The Great Reformation, he predicated, revived Christian education and "contracted the obligation of placing everyone in a condition to save himself by reading and studying the Bible."2

Moving to the New World, Sutherland traced the development of Christian colleges and universities during the colonial period in America. Harvard, he asserted, was founded so that "the light of learning might not go out, nor the study of God's Word perish," but American church-related educational institutions eventually veered away from their biblical heritage. Because the church failed to educate, men turned to the state, and the government took over the education of the masses.3

Horace Mann, the father of the public-school system in the United States, claimed Sutherland, developed "the grandest system of schools ever organized." The problem, Sutherland contended, is that since republicanism rests in the bosom of Protestantism, and Protestantism is cradled in Christian education, the moment the feature of Christian education is laid aside, and the system purports to be civil (but in fact it is never really that), that moment it loses its real vitality and genuine strength.4

Comenius, Pestalozzi, and Froebel were praised as educators who "offered educational ideas in advance of the age," and Sutherland lauded Thomas Jefferson for his innovative work at the University of Virginia.5 All were reformers who contributed to educational

1Ibid., p. 107. 
2Ibid., p. 226. 
3Ibid., pp. 299, 314. 
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innovation but, by Sutherland's standard, all fell short of the mark. The last part of the book is a recital of the reforms in the modern educational world. It ends with a challenge to Protestants to eschew worldly wisdom and return to "the fountains of living waters."^1

The sequel to Living Fountains was written approximately fifteen years later. Studies in Christian Education, after briefly repeating the educational history of the first book, focuses on 1844. It is Sutherland's claim that the "spiritual downfall" of the Protestant denominations in 1844 resulted from their failure to understand "the true science of education." Their failure to "understand and practice Christian education" unfitted them to "proclaim to the world the message of Christ's coming."^2

At that point, Sutherland asserted, the Seventh-day Adventist Church was "called into existence" to "take up the work which the popular churches had failed to train their missionaries to do."^3 It is with this sense of apocalyptic mission that Sutherland viewed the role of Adventist schools. Faithfully practiced, Christian education would, he fervently believed, sustain the church and finish the preaching of God's message to the world.

**Plans for Leaving Battle Creek**

By the mid-1890s the leadership of the college at Battle Creek knew that the college should never have been built on seven acres in

^1Ibid., p. 415.


^3Ibid., p. 1.
the midst of large Adventist institutions. Consequently, from the
time Sutherland arrived in 1897 he had wondered how, when, and where
the college should be moved. Only five months after his arrival he
wrote to Ellen White mentioning that he had “read that it would be
better for the Battle Creek college [sic] to have been in some other
place, that it should be broken up.” Perhaps there was a hint of
query as he penned the words "broken up."¹

In 1899 the sale of the college, possibly to the sanitarium,
was being quietly discussed among administrators in Battle Creek, and
Magan wrote to W. C. White for advice. White replied that he did not
feel authorized to speak "very fully," but his response must have
shaken Magan and Sutherland considerably. His mother, White divulged,
had been restrained in her remarks about a transfer of property
because she feared not all would view it in "a right light" and deal
with it in an "unselfish manner." His mother, suggested White,
thought that

it would be an advantage to the educational work if the
college could be sold at its real value to the Sanitarium, and
the funds of the educational Society invested in several
country schools, where the youth who had outgrown the church
schools could be trained in agricultural and manufacturing
pursuits while completing their education.²

Purchasing the college would be beneficial to the sanitarium,
she believed. Some of its buildings could be used for "medical and
educational work" and others as a "local preparatory school." Reas­
suringly, White added: "Until some such arrangement is made, Mother
will encourage our Conferences, our institutions, and our brethren

¹E. A. Sutherland to E. G. White, October 28, 1897, EGWRC-DC.
²W. C. White to P. T. Magan, November 21, 1899, EGWRC-DC.
generally to give their moral and financial support to the school." Sutherland and Magan must have been left wondering if Ellen White and her son were considering not simply the relocation of the college, but its possible demise.¹

Apparently, W. C. White had not expressed his mother's precise intentions. On the same day that he wrote to Magan, his mother wrote to Irwin and Haskell and to the directors of the sanitarium. In her letter to Irwin and Haskell she asked:

Would it not be the best thing we could do to sell the large school building in Battle Creek, and take the money to establish a building free from debt where can be had the advantages of land for manual labor? Thus the students could work on the same plans that we are trying to work on here.²

She urged the sanitarium directors to "buy the college buildings," declaring it to be "the very best medical missionary work that could be done to advance the cause of God." They were to consider it a "privilege to take this sick child [the college buildings] off the hands of the school, to relieve it of this great burden," but they were not to try to pay a price "far below their value."³

Clearly, she believed that the college should be relocated. Not so clear was what she thought should be done with the money from the sale. In her letter to the sanitarium directors she had spoken of selling for the purpose of "establishing schools in other localities." Her son had perhaps been stating her mind after all, when

¹Ibid.
²E. G. White to G. A. Irwin and S. N. Haskell, November 21, 1899, EGWRC-DC.
³E. G. White, "To the Directors of the sanitarium," November 21, 1899, EGWRC-DC.
he said that she had considered breaking the college up into several smaller schools. Her counsels seemed ambiguous, possibly reflecting her feelings on the matter.

Anticipating that the sanitarium board might not decide to purchase the buildings, she noted that she would "feel sad ... but not discouraged." Undaunted, she then revealed an alternative plan: "I shall call upon all our institutions to share the burden and lift this debt by cooperating with me." ¹

Some of the denominational leaders were apprehensive as they considered relocating the college "out in the country." Haskell viewed it as "a large problem" which he had discussed with Sutherland months before. They had concluded that "if any such move was [sic] ever made it must come from the Lord for there are so many interests involved in the step." ²

The Lord now seemed to be indicating through Ellen White that they should wait no longer. Thus in March 1900 Magan wrote to W. C. White to assure him that he was working on the sale of the college to the sanitarium "as fast and carefully" as he could. They had to keep it very quiet, however, "until the reorganization is effected, or we will have trouble on our hands." At a meeting of the college trustees, Irwin confirmed that the sanitarium might at least be willing to buy the "North Annex" and the "South Hall." In August, Magan wrote to Ellen White to tell her that Haskell, a few days before, had told him that he believed the time had come to move the college away

¹ibid.

²S. N. Haskell to E. G. White, December 26, 1899, EGWRC-DC.
By September 9, 1900, negotiations, it appeared, had succeeded, as Kellogg announced his willingness to purchase the entire college property. Magan immediately wrote a quick note to W. C. White to share his joy: "Now we have a golden opportunity to accomplish what I believe we all heartily desire." Before anything could be finalized, however, Kellogg reversed his decision.\(^1\)

At the next meeting of the board, everyone but Kellogg voted in favor of the sale. He gave two major reasons why selling the college would be a mistake. First, if it were sold, the good work begun by Sutherland and Magan would come to nought. Second, the sanitarium was large already "and should not be larger." Apparently these reasons did not impress Sutherland, nor did he take Kellogg's new decision very seriously, since the day after the meeting he wrote to W. C. White, urging that this was their first opportunity to sell. Negotiations continued.\(^2\)

To everyone's surprise, Ellen White had also experienced a complete change in her thinking on the matter. Late in September she wrote in unmistakable language to Magan and Sutherland declaring that "nothing in regard to disposition of [the] school property should be engaged in--the matter of transferring the property, any part of it,

---

\(^1\)P. T. Magan to W. C. White, March 16, 1900, EGWRC-DC. BCC Bd Min, April 2, 1900. P. T. Magan to E. G. White, August 16, 1900, EGWRC-DC.

\(^2\)BCC Bd Min, September 9, 1900. P. T. Magan to W. C. White, September 11, 1900, EGWRC-DC.

\(^3\)BCC Bd Min, September 13, 1900. E. A. Sutherland to W. C. White, September 14, 1900, EGWRC-DC.
into other hands—at the present time." She added reassuringly that "the Lord has undertaken in your behalf" and counselled them to wait patiently for His leading.¹

Having personally talked the matter over with Ellen White, Irwin reported to Magan that she had given him a number of reasons for her decision not to sell the college at that time. They were: (1) the sanitarium was already large and "unwieldy;" (2) no more burden should be placed on the doctors; (3) the work was experiencing a crisis and every move must be considered from all standpoints, reasoning from "cause to effect;" (4) the Lord had given the debt liquidation plan and nothing must be allowed to deter it, especially at that early stage; (5) she was willing to donate other books if necessary; (6) the subject of true education needed to be "more fully and firmly implanted in the hearts and minds" of the church members before moving out; (7) and the college should not leave when it would appear that it had been allowed to "run down and kind of fizzle out," but was to go in the "flush of success."²

As soon as the counsel was received, all further negotiations with the sanitarium halted. Sutherland expressed his willingness to "carry out the instruction," and Magan acquiesced to it, but without conviction. Consequently, he must have been deeply moved upon receiving the following message from Ellen White:

¹E. G. White to P. T. Magan and E. A. Sutherland, September, 1900, EGWRC-DC. The letter does not bear a complete date. However, Ellen White arrived from Australia on September 21 and stayed at the St. Helena Sanitarium through the end of September while househunting. She sent the letter with Irwin who had been visiting her, thus it must have been written during the week of September 23-30.

²G. A. Irwin to P. T. Magan, September 23, 1900, EGWRC-DC.
I have been conversing with you in the night season. You seemed to be quite anxious to make changes now, and to give up the school in Battle Creek. Much has been said on this line, but for years nothing has been done. Had this movement been made when the Lord indicated that it was duty, the showing would be very different from what it is at the present time. But circumstances have changed, and the movements that might have been made with advantage in the past will not at this time be advisable. All the reasons I shall not attempt to lay before you. Many things will be revealed in the future that are not discerned now.

The letter to Magan did its intended work. He admitted having felt "terribly sad and downcast," but felt her letter had given him "new courage to battle on." He would not do a "single thing now towards the selling of the Battle Creek College property. My lips will be sealed in regard to this until the Lord sends further light." At the next meeting of the board of trustees, Kellogg spoke for "nearly an hour" praising the counsel of Ellen White and proposing ways the sanitarium would help the college, short of buying it.

The situation among Adventist church leaders and institutions in Battle Creek in early 1901 was strained, hence many were apprehensive as the time neared for the General Conference session. There were unresolved tensions and potentially serious rumors. Kellogg complained to Ellen White about Irwin, who was reporting that the location and time of the session had been changed because Kellogg had gone to California and influenced her to request it. Sutherland complained about the worsening situation of the college in Battle Creek. He was

---

1 E. A. Sutherland to G. A. Irwin, September 30, 1900, RG 9: Irwin, G.A. -2, GCAr. G. A. Irwin to E. G. White, October 8, 1900, EGWRC-DC. E. G. White to P. T. Magan, October 16, 1900, EGWRC-DC.

2 P. T. Magan to E. G. White, October 24, 1900, LLUAr. BCC Bd Min, October 19, 1900.
"coming daily to realize more and more what disadvantages we labor [under] on account of our location," and was "praying constantly for the removal of the College to a more favorable location." His prayers, along with those of many others, were to be answered very soon.

General Conference Session of 1901

The convention of denominational publishers began on March 25 as a pre-session of the General Conference. Curiously, Sutherland appears to have given his report on Battle Creek College during that pre-session. While reporting on the manual-training aspect of the college, he openly stated:

In view of the superior advantages of any school situated in the country, away from the artificial life of the city, the managers of Battle Creek College are looking forward to an opportune time to change the location of the school.  

On April 1, the day before the first full session of the General Conference was to convene, Ellen White spoke to a large crowd including the members of the General Conference Committee, the Foreign Mission Board, the conference presidents, and institutional administrators at a specially called meeting in the college library. Daniells and Kellogg brought secretaries to record what proved to be a no-nonsense, hard-hitting talk that undoubtedly contributed to the success of the 1901 session and the decision taken regarding Battle Creek College. White left no question in the minds of the listeners about their failures. "The work," she claimed

1 J. H. Kellogg to E. G. White, March 3, 1901, EGWRC-DC. BCC Fac Min, March 6, 1901.
2 E. A. Sutherland, "Battle Creek College Educational Report," GCB, April 2, 1901, p. 16.
should stand a hundred per cent higher than it stands to-day. The Satanic agencies are working with all their power to weaken and destroy us. . . . There are to be no kings in our work, no man who will put out his hand and say to God's workmen, "You cannot go there. We will not support you if you go there." What have they to do with the supporting? Is the means of support theirs? . . . I want to say to you, For [sic] Christ's sake, unify. . . . Do not any longer pick flaws in your brethren. I see enough vultures watching for dead bodies. Let us have nothing of this nature in our work.

The next morning the three-week official session began. Following Irwin's presidential address, Ellen White strongly rebuked the church leaders for vacillating on a variety of reforms and uttered a strong plea for church reorganization. That challenge to change, and how to implement it, dominated the meetings.2

At 5:30 a.m. on April 12, the tenth day of the session, Magan received a message that Ellen White needed to see him. At 6 a.m. he was entering her room. She greeted him with the following words:

You remember when you and Brother Sutherland talked to me about moving Battle Creek College out of Battle Creek. I told you at that time not to do it. Now I am ready to tell you to do it. What we will do with the old plant I do not know, I think possibly we may be able to sell it to the Sanitarium, I do not think even then that we will be able to realize enough to pay off anything on the principal. Perhaps we will get enough to pay its debts. We will have to go out single handed—empty handed. It is time to get out now, for great things will soon be happening in Battle Creek.3

One can easily imagine the deep sense of relief and anticipation that Magan must have felt. His and Sutherland's prayers had been answered.

1E. G. White, "Talk . . . in College Library," MS 43, April 1, 1901, EGWRC-DC.
At 9 a.m. that day, Magan gave his scheduled report to the session on "The Relief of the Schools" campaign. He included an encouraging financial statement. No doubt he felt pleased to announce that a fourth industrial school had recently been established at Sheridan, Illinois. As soon as he finished talking, Ellen White arose and said: "I want to read this morning from Testimony No. 34."

She spoke at length regarding the Lord's plan to eradicate the large debts, the need for dedicated workers, and the wonderful results that would come from wholehearted sacrifice. Then, without warning, she digressed:

The light that has been given me is that Battle Creek has not the best influence over the students in our school. There is altogether too congested a state of things. The school, although it will mean a fewer number of students, should be moved out of Battle Creek. Get an extensive tract of land, and there begin the work which I entreated should be commenced before our school was established here,—to get out of the cities. . . . Some may be stirred about the transfer of the school from Battle Creek. But they need not be. This move is in accordance with God's design for the school before the institution was established. But men could not see how this could be done. There were so many who said that the school must be in Battle Creek. Now we say that it must be somewhere else.

Reaction was immediate. Jones, president of the Seventh-day Adventist Educational Society, spoke at the 11 a.m. meeting and referred to Ellen White's words regarding the relocation of the college:

1GCB, April 14, 1901, pp. 209-16, 219. The backlash of sentiment against the relocation of the college referred to by Vande Vere is not supported by the evidence; at least during the remainder of the session. He erroneously stated that Ellen White spoke to the delegates a second time two days later regarding the move. She spoke only once, except at the very end of the session. The statements that he attributed to her second speech were in fact part of the first one. Emmett K. Vande Vere, The Wisdom Seekers (Nashville, TN: Southern Pub. Assn., 1972), pp. 90-91.
You heard the word directly, and which needs no explanation, and no sanction, that we should get the college out of Battle Creek, and that we should sell the buildings and grounds in Battle Creek just as soon as possible.

He proceeded to ask for a vote from the educational association stockholders who "favored the carrying out of the instruction." No stockholder dissented. Their response was followed by two other unanimously supportive votes—from the delegates and from the congregation. The decision had been made and ratified; the college would be moved.¹

Two days later the Michigan Sanitarium and Benevolent Association met to discuss the purchase of all or a part of the college. As chairman of the meeting, Kellogg moved that the trustees of the association negotiate for the purchase of "one or more" dormitories, but S. H. Lane moved that negotiations be entered into "to purchase the whole plant." The latter motion carried unanimously. The college now had a potential buyer. When both the Sanitarium and the Medical Missionary Board refused to buy it because they already had large debts, "The Training School Company" was formed. It took possession of the deed and assumed the debts. The corporation bought the plant from the college for $108,000, which covered the institution's remaining debt and left $26,000 to invest in the new school.²

As the session continued, other significant decisions were made. On April 21, Griggs, speaking for the education committee, submitted a request regarding the future Battle Creek College:

¹GCB, April 14, 1901, p. 219.
²GCB, April 18, 1901, pp. 312-14. Vande Vere and Spalding state that the Michigan Sanitarium and Benevolent Association voted on April 16 to purchase the college. To be precise, the vote was only an
We ask the General Conference Committee to establish a model missionary training school for the field at large, with such entrance restrictions regarding age, literary qualifications, and purposes in attending the school as to protect our other district schools.

It was voted and approved. Sutherland made it clear that he wanted it arranged "so that the General Conference will have immediate control of it [the school]." He explained:

In this way we hope to have a model school, so that all the schools can watch the work that will be done, and teachers and ministers will work to see this problem go, and in this way the schools all over the country can accept the light that is worked out and reject all the failures.

Following Sutherland's comments, Ellen White spoke feelingly regarding the school work that she wanted to see developed in the new college, emphasizing that it was "to be conducted as nearly as possible as we have conducted it in Australia."

Apparently determined to leave no doubt about her attitude toward the work of Sutherland and Magan, she declared:

I would say to Brother Magan and Brother Sutherland, You [sic] are not to think that you have made a failure in the school. Circumstances have been of a character to cause some misunderstanding. I wish now to present the matter as it was presented to me in my home at Crystal Springs, Cal. . . . The members of this faculty have been getting hold of right methods, and they are coming to see eye to eye. . . . Reformers of this age of the world must be resolute and unflinching, but never allow firmness to take the form of determined agreement to negotiate. Vande Vere, The Wisdom Seekers, p. 91. Spalding, Origin and History, 3:43-44. The Training School Company corporation was comprised of members of: "the General Conference Committee, the Lake Union Conference Committee, the Battle Creek Sanitarium Board, the Medical Missionary Board, the Review & Herald Board, and the Emmanuel Missionary College Board." They were empowered to choose six men to act as trustees to raise money to pay off the debts through the promotion of the Acre Fund, and handle the general business. P. T. Magan to E. G. White, October 7, 1903, DF 256, EGWRC-DC.

1GCC Min, April 21, 1901. GCB, April 23, 1901, pp. 418-19.
obstinacy. . . . I would say to Brother Sutherland and Brother, Magan, Go forward in the name of the Lord God of Israel.

The College Leaves the City

The weeks following the session were extremely busy. Sutherland immediately delegated all of his work for the duration of the school year to an executive committee, explaining that "the interests of the new school" would demand much of his time. A closing-exercises committee was named to take charge of the final activities and commencement. Though still heading the debt-relief campaign, Magan, as dean, would oversee the closing of the college.²

Without delay, a new location had to be found for the college, so Sutherland and his wife began hunting, returning to some of the places they had previously visited. Magan and DeGraw also found time to go along on some of the excursions. Crisscrossing southwestern Michigan by train and bicycle, they tried to find the ideal property at the right price. It was a faith venture, since they had virtually no money in hand. For nearly two years Sutherland had been attracted to the farm country around Berrien Springs. When he had learned that the Richardson farm, located two miles from the village, was for sale, he had taken his farm manager, Christiansen, to see the property.³

---

¹GCB, April 24, 1901, pp. 452-55.
³Sally Sutherland, Founders' Bulletin, p. 45. C. H. Christiansen, LU Herald, June 11, 1913, p. 2. Barbara Phipps, "They Did Us a Good Turn." Apparently it was Magan who convinced Edgar F. Garland, a civic leader and longtime resident of Berrien Springs, to
In the spring of 1901 Sutherland took Magan to look it over. Years later, Magan enjoyed recalling the occasion:

It was a lovely day in the month of May, 1901, when two tired men stacked their bicycles under the beautiful old maple trees lining that plot of land then known as the Garland farm. It was not far distant from the bluff which overlooked the dark waters of the St. Joseph River and the flat lands extending to the left, then classified as the Richardson farm. These men had ridden their bicycles from South Bend, Indiana, through deep sand and dust, on the narrow, hilly roads which connected South Bend with Niles and Berrien Springs. There was no pavement in those days. . . . Two more miles of sandy road before the travelers reached the Garland farm.

Sutherland's wife also cherished the memory of her first visit:

I will never forget the first time I stood out here on the bluff and looked across the river, and up and down this place. I never had for one moment questioned that the Lord himself selected this place for this school.

After twenty-six years, Battle Creek College was leaving the city. While the Sutherlands were viewing property, the faculty were laying careful plans to have a nostalgic farewell reception on the campus lawn on May 19. Because of inclement weather, however, it had to be held in the West Hall dining room, which, the newspaper reported, was "handsomely adorned with American flags and bunting in lavender and white with an abundance of purple lilacs." The Germania orchestra of Battle Creek played several numbers during the program, including "America" and "The Star Spangled Banner." Mary Steward, DeGraw, and Magan spoke about the college: past, present, and future. They proudly announced that since the initiation of the "present

sell his fruit farm and the Stevens Woods. Those properties were contiguous to the Richardson farm. The information was gathered in an interview with Edgar F. Garland, SM, May 6, 1938, p. 3.

2Sally Sutherland, Founders' Bulletin, p. 45.
system" nearly three years earlier, "almost 500 students, trained workers more properly speaking," had gone out to all parts of the world. The service ended with a "fervent prayer" by W. A. Spicer.

The next day, the college held its last official event, the commencement, which took place in the large Adventist tabernacle. With the city orchestra present again, Uriah Smith, Magan, Salisbury, Prescott, Daniells, and Sutherland shared the platform. Daniells gave the address and Sutherland presented the annual report. A newspaper reporter observed:

Instead of calling them graduates and giving diplomas [ , ] under the new regime the young people in training are simply a band of consecrated Christian workers who, having gained a sufficient training now go out into the world to minister unto others and to spread the gospel message.

Although the college had held its last official event, its doors could not close yet; the entire contents of the college had to be moved. The operation was financed by two of the teachers who borrowed $3,000 over their own signatures. Needing the help of everyone, the faculty and staff were assigned their responsibilities the week before commencement. Everything--"furniture, library, seats, beds, bedding, kitchen utensils, and the old bell"--were packed into sixteen freight cars to be taken to Berrien Springs. Magan later amusingly recalled that everything had been transported by the 

---

1 "Battle Creek College," BC Daily Moon, May 20, 1901. "The Advent College," BC Daily Moon, May 21, 1901. Vande Vere mistakenly stated that the commencement was held in the "old chapel" on the same day of the farewell reception. It was held in the tabernacle and took place the following day, May 20. Vande Vere, Wisdom Seekers, p. 91. Cf. "Battle Creek College," TS Advocate 3 (June/July 1901):204. The name of the Training School Advocate was changed in 1901. The April issue bore the new name, The Advocate, with the subtitle A Journal of Christian Education.
M. B. H. & C. Railroad, 'Many Bumps, Humps, and Curves' or the Milwaukee, Benton Harbor, and Columbus. It was never in Milwaukee in its life, and never was with Columbus. It was also known as the tri-weekly, as it went up one week and tried to get back the next.

Apparently forgetting the well-attended farewell reception, Magan later commented ruefully: "There was no kindly farewell for us when we left. There were no speeches, nor dinner, nor the like. Battle Creek . . . did not want to see the school moved." ²

**Perspective**

In 1897 Sutherland had come to Battle Creek College with a mandate for reform. Realizing that the college could accomplish very little change, given the restrictive legal infrastructure of the institution, he began a successful campaign to reorganize the legal makeup of the college.

Some rather startling curricular reforms were also instituted. Without delay Sutherland eradicated the classics and exalted the Bible as the supreme textbook. Equally important, a missionary orientation was actively encouraged in the institution. This brought in its train shortened courses, elimination of degree programs, flexibility of individual coursework, and increased emphasis on manual labor.

Sutherland found time during his four years at Battle Creek College to write *Living Fountains or Broken Cisterns* in which he expounded his philosophy on the history of education and the vital role that Christian education plays in the success of the church. It


was his perspective on the crucial role of Christian education that impelled him to aid decisively in the creation of the church school movement, which by 1901 had developed a network of elementary and secondary schools in large areas of the United States.

His years at Battle Creek tested Sutherland's mettle to the utmost. It was no easy task to try to innovate in the very presence, as it were, of the church leadership. The leaders held widely differing and strong opinions regarding what Sutherland should and should not do. Consequently, his role as a reformer was made more difficult. His position was not helped by his problem with extremes in reform and by some outright fanaticism on the part of a few members of his faculty. These problems brought accusations of extremism from both the church at large and the leadership of the denomination in Battle Creek. Added to his problems was the enormous debt which unavoidably impinged on both his long-range goals for the institution and his day-to-day decisions. Nevertheless, by 1901 he had proudly witnessed a substantial lowering of the debt through the "Relief of the Schools" campaign.

Feeling restricted by the location of the college on a small campus within the city, Sutherland had looked forward with keen anticipation to the time when the college could begin again in a rural setting that would be more conducive to the holistic reforms he envisioned. Thus he rejoiced when the time finally arrived to move to Berrien Springs in 1901.
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CHAPTER IV

THE BERRIEN SPRINGS YEARS, 1901-1904

An Overview

Edward Sutherland served as the founding president of Emmanuel Missionary College in Berrien Springs, Michigan, from June 1901 through the summer of 1904. Away from the Adventist center of population in Battle Creek, he had the opportunity during these three years to further experiment with the educational reform program he had begun at Walla Walla and continued at Battle Creek.

Sutherland and Magan described the Berrien Springs years as an "experiment in educational reform." They were correct. Most of the reforms, however, were not new. In accordance with its mandate from the General Conference and Ellen White, Emmanuel Missionary College followed a wholly missionary-oriented curriculum similar to the one developed at Battle Creek. Every student's program of study was tailored to his individual needs, with no degrees given and no prescribed period of time one must stay in school.

Study of the Bible lay at the heart of every subject; other textbooks, though used, were secondary in importance. Mission outreach by faculty and students continued, and virtually everyone took part.

1P. T. Magan to W. C. White, November 13, 1903, EGWRC-DC. E. A. Sutherland to E. G. White, November 23, 1903, EGWRC-DC. W. C. White to P. T. Magan, November 25, 1903, EGWRC-DC.
Church schools and industrial schools continued to multiply, and efforts were made to organize and finance them more efficiently. Financing and teacher remuneration constituted one of the most difficult and frustrating problems for the administration of Emmanuel Missionary College and the General Conference.

There were three essentially new reforms at Berrien Springs: the one-study plan, a cooperative plan, and a vigorous farm program. While the cooperative plan was quite successful, the one-study plan was markedly less so. The farm program proved eminently viable.

Student-teacher committees, the heart of the cooperative plan, were responsible for virtually every aspect of the school's operation. At the very time that some outsiders were accusing the school's administration of autocratic rule, those at the school knew that they were part of an unusually democratic school operation.

Had it been possible for the administration to dedicate itself exclusively to the running of the college, it almost certainly would have achieved more significant results. But the large Battle Creek College debt had moved to Berrien Springs with the school, and was an almost intolerable burden on Sutherland and Magan as they struggled to build a school from scratch. The challenge of building a college with unskilled student labor would have been daunting enough, but the continual lack of even minimal funds made the task nearly impossible.

While most of the faculty moved with the college to Berrien Springs, the administrators were forced continually to search for new faculty to replace those who were called to serve in other capacities and locations. Their ability to maintain any semblance of continuity in the academic program of the college is surprising.
Faculty, staff, and expenses were kept to a minimum as the college sought to be independently solvent while charging very low tuition. Free education for all Seventh-day Adventist children and youth was a goal Sutherland clung to tenaciously and one that he championed to the church administrators and all who would listen.

The Battle Creek years had brought their crises, but the difficulties that confronted Sutherland and Magan at Berrien Springs were so great that both men finally gave up in exasperation and resigned their positions in the spring of 1904. Illness and deaths plagued them from within, while from without, denominational administrative dissension proved too much to bear. Personal loyalties and Sutherland and Magan's ill-advised support of the reopening of the college in Battle Creek by Kellogg served to alienate them from the denominational leadership. The wounds eventually healed, but the scars never disappeared.

Emmanuel Missionary College
Pioneers the First Year

In early July 1901 the little village of Berrien Springs was inundated with sixteen freightcars of packing boxes, loaded with the possessions of an entire college. Years later Sutherland described the situation: "There were no buildings ready for its reception and these belongings were stord [sic] in every available barn and building in the town."

Berrien Springs had once been an important town in southwestern Michigan as the seat of Berrien County and a popular health

---

1E. A. Sutherland, "From Infancy to Youth," Founders' Bulletin, p. 22. For additional details regarding the beginnings at Berrien Springs, see Spalding, Origin and History, 3:47-54.
resort. Years earlier, to accommodate the summer tourists, the large Oronoko Hotel had been built. The fine old courthouse, brick jail, sheriff's residence and barn, and county office building—built in 1839 and abandoned in 1894 when the county seat was moved to St. Joseph—sat empty, providentially available for occupancy by a college without a campus.

After safely storing the belongings of the school in various buildings throughout the town, a large committee of church and educational leaders set out to buy property on which to build the school. They visited Edgar F. Garland, owner of the large well-kept Garland farm. Finding him ready to sell, they immediately paid five dollars down to "bind the deal." Magan later commented: "I have often thought that he must have had a great deal of faith in Seventh-day Adventists to accept so little to bind the bargain for this place."¹

Before the contracts for the purchase of the property could be signed, two hundred Adventists converged on Berrien Springs for an educational conference to be held from July 10 to 18. Scheduled for Gull Lake, Michigan, the location was changed at the last moment because of the decision to buy the property at Berrien Springs. The Michigan Conference furnished tents which were erected in a grove of oaks along the banks of the St. Joseph River to the south of the village.² Concurrent with the educational conference, the Lake Union


Conference council was held. Consequently, twenty-five administrators and other representatives from the Lake Union Conference, almost the full membership of the college board, and "a number of other leading brethren" met with the teachers.

Everyone apparently met together for much of the time. A. G. Daniells, chairman of the General Conference Committee and newly elected president of the Lake Union Conference, met each day "from an early hour in the morning until late at night" with those present. All were "deeply absorbed in the study of the principles and methods underlying the successful management of evangelical and educational work." Their conclusion was "that the church and conference school work has only begun." Daniells was convinced that the school work was soon destined to become one of the "largest and most important departments of the cause." Surely no comment could have brought more joy to Sutherland's heart.  

On July 14 Magan met with the leaders and the decision was made to purchase the "Garland property, and unimproved farm, viz., the Richardson property, and the piece of woods." Though the sanitarium had not yet paid them anything, Magan had received $7,000 in private donations. This enabled them to purchase 272 acres for a total price of $18,000. Magan declared that the Lord had "surely prepared a table in the wilderness." The board of trustees also decided to christen the new institution with a distinctive biblical name, "Emmanuel Missionary College." The same day the decision was taken.

to purchase the property, a letter arrived from Ellen White, urging them "by all means to buy the very place we had decided to purchase." Everything seemed to be working out beautifully. Wanting to be close to the action, Sutherland had already moved to Berrien Springs, and Magan was planning to do so shortly.¹

The task of building a college from nothing would have been a formidable task by itself, but Sutherland and Magan carried other responsibilities as well. Sutherland was a member of the General Conference Committee, the Mission Board, the General Conference Educational Department, the Religious Liberty Department, the Sabbath School Department, the Auditing Committee, and trustee of the legal corporation of the Foreign Mission Board. By December, Sutherland had also been appointed general educational secretary of the Lake Union Conference. Magan was the secretary of the General Conference Educational Department (J. H. Kellogg was chairman), member of the Committee on Relief of Schools, and a member of the legal corporation of the General Conference Association.² The excess of responsibilities would take its inevitable toll on both men.

The first order of business facing the administrators was to move the college into the available buildings. They rented the two-story courthouse, the sheriff's residence and adjoining jail, and


the two-story county office building. The courthouse, which for years
had been a dance hall, provided four ample classrooms and a chapel
and assembly room with a seating capacity for three hundred. More
classrooms were arranged for in the sheriff's house and jail, while
the office building provided office space and rooms for laboratories.
A prompt vote was taken by the college board to appropriate $910 for
the purchase of chemistry and physics equipment. Of course, a major
concern was how to provide a dormitory and dining room. For only $40
a month the school acquired over fifty bedrooms, a large dining hall,
plenty of kitchen space, and several parlors by renting the vacant
Oronoko Hotel. The administration also purchased twenty stoves to
provide heat during the winter, the hotel being designed for summer
use.1

Though the school personnel were busy installing the college
in its temporary quarters, everyone pitched in and helped with the
yearly summer school for teacher training. Young people 125 strong,
had come to prepare for the "church school work." The summer session
had begun as soon as the educational convention ended on July 18.
It continued until September 3.2

On October 30 Emmanuel Missionary College began its fall term
with forty students present on opening day. The number was small,
Sutherland admitted, but, he added, "the class of students we have
leads us to think that God himself has made the selection, and that

1P. T. Magan to E. G. White, July 19, 1901, Neff Coll, LLUAr.
"Progress Department," TS Advocate 3 (November 1901):299-300. E. A.
Sutherland, "Emmanuel Missionary College," RH 78 (October 22, 1901):
691. EMC Bd Min, Oct. 15, 1901; October 26, 1901.
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most of them will enter the work after a speedy preparation." Joining
with friends from the village, faculty and students took part in a
simple opening service. The speaker was a Miss Orcutt, who had been
one of the teachers in the "People's University," a socialistic move­
ment that had tried to establish itself in Berrien Springs. They had
purchased the courthouse buildings and the hotel, she related, but
were unable to complete their plans for a settlement and a university.
As a result, the movement had died out. She expressed her pleasure
that the Seventh-day Adventists had come to occupy the same buildings.
Success would attend their efforts, she believed, because "they are
working on a higher plane than we did, by recognizing the spiritual
side of education."

The next day Sutherland talked to the students about the need
of "developing systematically" and explained the plan of the institu­
tion to prepare "thorough students." Every student was then required
to take an entrance exam which "opened the eyes of some to their own
need." Having completed the exam, one student commented: "This is
something new; I have studied Greek and Latin, and have taken other
advanced work, but I never saw a school open like this."2

Believing that a work-study program was the best way to pro­
duce well-balanced students, the administrators required every student
to do manual labor for two hours each day. M. B. DeGraw was proud
to announce in the Review that on the second Sunday of the school term

---
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the "gentlemen teachers" and "nearly every boy" had worked half a day on the farm. When a wood shed was needed at the hotel-dormitory, "Professor Haughey and some of the boys" had built one.¹

Although the students had to work hard, they had opportunity to take part in light-hearted activities as well. Reminiscing on that first year, Elmer L. Cardey, one of the students, commented that "the young people were quite satisfied then with the simpler things of life." He remembered that they had had a glee club, "Saturday night parties at the hotel, one or two sleigh rides with teams," and "skating to some extent, although it was not good skating on the river."²

Glad for the opportunity to lend support to the struggling enterprise, W. C. White spent a day at the college and farm in early November. In his talk to the students he tried to impress on them the need to "make friends with the neighbors, to hold meetings, and in every way possible let the light of truth shine." Already prompted by a sense of mission, public meetings had been held twice a week throughout the summer, and several people had been "reached."³

By mid-November attendance had increased to fifty and they anticipated more students by December 3 when the second half of the Fall term would begin and several new courses would be initiated. DeGraw exulted:

¹Ibid.
²E. L. Cardey to E. K. Vande Vere, July 30, 1956, Vande Vere Coll, AUHR.
Doubtless we have reached an era in the educational work. The exodus from the cities has begun. The freedom of the country breathes a spirit of strength into the work; and as a happy family, students and teachers look upon this as the beginning of a great work in the cause of Christ.

Personnel Problems

General Personnel Problems

From the beginning at Berrien Springs the personnel situation was critical. Not the least of the problems was the overworked condition of Sutherland and Magan.

On September 12, 1901, Magan wrote to W. C. White: "I cannot tell you the desperate straits we are in in regard to our force of workers for Emmanuel Missionary College." He claimed he was "doing five men's work." A week later, totally exhausted, he contracted typhoid fever. For a while it was feared he would die, but with total rest he began, very slowly, to recover. As a result of his own illness, Magan, in turn, was greatly concerned about Sutherland's health:

I cannot bear the thought of leaving the work at Berrien Springs so long. Professor Sutherland cannot, I fear, stand the strain much longer. He is working far beyond his strength. Now that I am gone there is no one to plan for the buildings; to see to getting the money, or to look after their erection. Professor Salisbury has gone to England and there is no history or Bible teacher.

Critically complicating the situation was the inability of the church leaders to fulfill their initial pledges of support to the

1Ibid.

2P. T. Magan to W. C. White, December 5, 1901, Neff Coll, LLUAr. A. G. Daniells to W. T. Knox, September 27, 1901, EGWRC-DC. E. A. Sutherland to W. C. White, February 11, 28, 1902, EGWRC-DC. A. G. Daniells to E. A. Sutherland, March 6, 1902, RG 11: Bk 26, p. 314, GCAr. E. A. Sutherland to E. G. White, April 13, 1902, EGWRC-DC.
college. At the Lake Union Conference council in July, the leadership of the denomination had seemed to be willing to help the new college in any way possible. With the assurances of help that he had received, Sutherland had felt confident in declaring to the church at large: "The time has fully come for a training school which will be such in the truest sense of the term." Then, quoting Ellen White, he had said:

"It should be the aim of our schools to provide the best instruction and training for Bible workers. Our Conferences should see that the schools are provided with teachers who are thorough Bible teachers, and who have a deep Christian experience. The best ministerial talent should be brought into our schools."\(^1\)

Having secured the promise of help from some outstanding individuals, he had rejoiced that Ellen White's counsel was being followed. In the Review he had announced that W. W. Prescott, Daniells, W. A. Spicer, and S. N. Haskell and his wife would "spend some time in the school, giving regular instruction to ministers and other evangelical workers."\(^2\) The problem was that all of those individuals, though well-intentioned, were already carrying heavy responsibilities in the denomination. When the time came for them to teach, not one was able to fulfill his promise.

Magan, as a result of overwork, came down with typhoid in the fall of 1901. Sutherland took over the responsibility of heading the campaign to sell Christ's Object Lessons for the eradication of the school debt. Because of this he had to be away from Berrien Springs during the winter months of early 1902. Vande Vere attributes Magan's bout with typhoid to mosquito bites, but typhoid is contracted through contamination. Magan's was the only reported case of typhoid there that summer. He no doubt succumbed because of debilitation.

Wisdom Seekers, p. 98.

\(^1\)E. A. Sutherland, "Emmanuel Missionary College," RH 78 (October 22, 1901):691.
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While Sutherland and Magan were agonizing over the dearth of teachers, their own competency to lead was called into question. An unfortunate situation developed between the denominational leadership and the leadership of the college which possibly hurt Sutherland and Magan more than they ever revealed. It may help to explain the defensive attitude assumed by the two men in some later situations.¹

In June 1902 Magan divulged to Ellen White that just before the start of the fall term in October 1901 the "leading brethren" of the General Conference had suggested that Prescott replace Sutherland as president. According to Magan, they apparently believed that Prescott's "age, experience, and general bearing would give him a standing and a dignity which would help bring Emmanuel College into favor more than anything that might be done by Brother Sutherland or myself." Magan believed that Daniells, Spicer, and Prescott were the main proponents of the idea. When the matter was brought before the board, however, some of its members, including Kellogg, as chairman of the education committee, opposed it "very strongly." They had been "so emphatic" that the matter was dropped. Kellogg occasionally traced the initiation of his estrangement with Prescott and Daniells to that meeting. He claimed: "I discovered the thing and took such a strong stand against it that I broke it up . . . . They have been after me every since."²

¹P. T. Magan to E. G. White, June 23, 1902, EGWRC-DC. Though Magan alludes to an October 1901 board meeting, no minutes are extant to confirm it.

Though Sutherland's attitude is not known, Magan claimed that from the beginning of Sutherland's presidency they had not had the wholehearted support of Prescott. It might be "somewhat hard," Magan felt, for Prescott to see young men "who were his own students now standing at the head of the Educational [sic] work." While Prescott had been "kind and brotherly" to them, Magan sensed from Prescott's "outward actions" that he had never seemed to "realize at all" that "God was working a reform through Prof. Sutherland, and those now associated with him in this school." Moreover, in Magan's estimation, Prescott had "never taken an enthusiastic part" in their work or shown "in any specific way that he really had strong confidence in it." 1

A major problem facing Sutherland at Emmanuel Missionary College was the need for a Bible teacher. During the summer of 1901 urgent efforts had been made to secure a competent Bible teacher, but to no avail. Prescott and E. J. Waggoner were men whom Daniels strongly recommended, and Ellen White had specifically declared her support for Prescott. Before he knew of her opinion, however, Magan had expressed to Haskell his concern regarding both Prescott and Waggoner. While he conceded that Prescott "might come in and carry on a certain line of work which would be very useful and beneficial to our students," he felt that that would not be enough. The leaders of the college, according to Magan, wanted men who were not only "competent and consecrated Bible students," but who also had demonstrated that they are "genuine fighters for God, that they actually can and actually have gotten out onto the firing line at the front, and

1P. T. Magan to E. G. White, June 23, 1902, EGWRC-DC.
captured souls for Jesus Christ." He ungraciously added that he believed that the men in question (Waggoner and Prescott) had never "actually caught fish" for Christ the way Haskell and some of the "older pioneers" had. Magan felt that Daniells would be much better as a teacher than either of those men, but, of course, Daniells was unavailable.¹

The search for a Bible teacher eventually involved invitations and counterinvitations to four men: Haskell, J. A. Brunson, H. R. Salisbury, and Waggoner. During the summer prior to the opening of Emmanuel Missionary College, Magan had tried very hard to get Haskell, who was engaged in evangelism in New York City, to come to teach Bible. Ellen and W. C. White supported the plan, if only for a stay of one to three months. They assumed, of course, that Prescott, Daniells, and Spicer would be lending the major classroom support. Haskell, however, felt he could not leave the work in New York, even for a short period of time.²

Feeling the pressures of overwork, the men who had first promised to help teach began to demur on their commitment to the school. That left the college in a very critical situation; one of which Daniells was cognizant. In a letter to W. C. White, Daniells expressed sympathy for the administrators: "Brother Magan is swamped with the general work placed upon him, and Professor Sutherland has

¹P. T. Magan to S. N. Haskell, August 6, 1901, RG 9: Misc Rec, Daniells, A. G. -4, GCAR. E. G. White to P. T. Magan and E. A. Sutherland, November 5, 1901, EGWRC-DC.

²W. C. White to P. T. Magan, September 13, 1901, RG 9: Misc Rec, White, W. C. -4, GCAR. W. C. White to P. T. Magan, September 24, 1901, EGWRC-DC.
all that he can possibly attend to in working up an attendance for the school, and organizing the same." Indeed, he added, "unless we have help we can not proceed, and what we have will soon be in a chaotic state."

In spite of the serious problem at the college, Daniells, Prescott, and Kellogg had the temerity to pressure Sutherland and Magan to release their teacher of history and biblical Hebrew, Salisbury, to fill an urgent need in England. Surely it was only their overriding concern for the advancement of overseas missions that could have prompted them to do that. Sutherland and Magan, in spite of their lack of teachers, felt morally obligated to let their colleague go; after all, they too wanted the gospel to go to all the world. But they only agreed to it on the condition that Prescott would teach during the winter term (to which he consented), and a call be made to Brunson who was assisting Haskell in New York. Ellen White opposed Salisbury's departure, but the letter had arrived too late. She had asked: "Did not the Lord discern what should be done in reference to this school question, when He so graciously instructed you not to allow your school faculty to be broken up?"

When the call for Brunson was received, Haskell refused to let him go, feeling that he was too urgently needed in New York. To make matters worse, W. C. White wrote to say that his mother had said

1A. G. Daniells to W. C. White, September 27, 1901, EGWRC-DC.
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E. G. White to P. T. Magan and E. A. Sutherland, November 5, 1901, EGWRC-DC. Cf. A. G. Daniells to E. G. White, October 16, 1901, EGWRC-DC.
"No, no, no," to calling Brunson to Berrien Springs. At the same time Mrs. White wrote Sutherland a letter of counsel: "We do not blame you for being anxious to secure the very best help for the school," but, she warned, "there is a vast vineyard to be worked, and the number of workers in one place must not be disproportionate to the needs . . . of other places." While she felt very strongly that Brunson should stay in New York, she recognized that "Brother Brunson should take the matter to the Lord, and then decide for himself what the Lord says to his servant." She continued with some advice against the college having "a long list of salaried instructors." She added: "It is to be as the schools of the prophets. It is to have a sufficient number of teachers, but not too many." The solution, she explained, lay in the use of individual students as part-time teachers. Such a student, she explained, "should not feel that he is losing time, because he is not. In imparting to others what he has received, he is preparing his mind to receive more."  

Sutherland felt misunderstood and frustrated. Insisting to Ellen White that he "never wanted to draw men away from important places to fill vacancies in other lines of work," he explained that her son had written to Salisbury encouraging him to "make England his field of labor." He felt that as a faculty they were standing between "two fires": those with whom they were "obliged to work," who wanted a faculty that could "command the respect of the masses"; and those

---
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who "had seen greater light" and wanted them to "imitate the simplicity of the schools of the prophets."¹

As 1901 ended, Sutherland and Magan were both quite discouraged, and Magan was still very weak from typhoid fever. To Ellen White, Magan lamented: "It may be urged that the school is small. But how will it ever be built up when the competent help that we train is dragged off for other fields?" Regarding her writings, he sighed: "Oh Sister White it distresses me, the lack of real confidence in the message so manifest everywhere." The whole letter was doleful. To W. C. White, Sutherland added his complaint: he felt he needed to be filling in for Salisbury in the classroom, but he also needed to do Magan's work "in a general way." There was nobody to look after the books and the construction of the buildings, and someone should be out in the field "getting money."²

From South Lancaster, Massachusetts, in response to their recitals of discouragement, came a letter that must have made the men both weep yet feel buoyed with hope. Ellen White gently chided:

Bro. Sutherland and yourself have done bravely and well, and why will you worry yourself out of the arms of your precious Saviour? Has the bank of heaven failed? Have you overdrawn the resources? Is Christ, the Light of the World in Joseph's new tomb? . . . Now look away from every discouraging presentation, because we have a living Christ, to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by Him. . . . I cannot tell you what you should do, but I can tell you what not to do: do not worry, be not unbelieving, and do not think that you can blossom into a perfect school in its very planting on new soil. You must remember that it takes time to plant, and to

¹E. A. Sutherland to E. G. White, November 6, 1901, EGWRC-DC.
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When they received word in December that Brunson was coming after all, they no doubt felt reassured that God was still in control.\(^2\)

During the first half of 1902 the personnel situation improved and problems in that area were quiescent. G. A. Nichols had arrived to be the business manager, A. S. Baird was on campus as superintendent of construction, and Mrs. Nellie Helen Druillard--Sutherland's aunt--and her husband had finally come to lend financial expertise and help in campus maintenance. A "junior faculty" plan was also beginning to be implemented by Sutherland in compliance with the counsel he had received from Ellen White to involve the students in part-time teaching.\(^3\)

Problems Related to E. J. Waggoner

At the time that Emmanuel Missionary College opened in 1901, church leaders strongly favored inviting Waggoner to teach Bible there. In 1902 Daniells, as General Conference president, took the prerogative of personally asking Waggoner to accept a teaching position. The invitation, however, was blocked by the Emmanuel Missionary College administrators and faculty. Nevertheless, one year later, they hired him.

Prior to the college's first term in 1901, Sutherland had agreed with Daniells and Prescott that it would be a great blessing

\(^1\) E. G. White to P. T. Magan, December 7, 1901, EGWRC-DC.
\(^2\) W. C. White to E. A. Sutherland, December 18, 1901, EGWRC-DC.
\(^3\) EMC Fac Min, April 16, 1902.
to have E. J. Waggoner come to teach. It had been assumed, however, that acquiring him would be "altogether impossible."\(^1\)

In the imbroglio that developed, there were seven salient factors that (1) prevented Waggoner's employment as a Bible teacher in 1902; (2) precipitated an unpleasant and divisive period of relations between the college board and the church leaders that culminated in the resignation of Prescott as chairman of the college board; and (3) badly strained the relations between Sutherland and Magan as the administrators of the college and Prescott and Daniells as the foremost men at the General Conference.

The first problem concerning Waggoner was Daniells' neglect to consult Sutherland before personally inviting Waggoner. Since Daniells was going to be in London in May 1902, he decided to personally urge Waggoner to accept a position in the fledgling school. From London, Daniells wrote to Jones, who was in Oakland, California, asking him to solicit "Brother and Sister White's support" in behalf of a call to Waggoner. Reflecting on the serious dearth of qualified Bible instruction at Berrien Springs, Daniells explained: "We must not go through another winter as we did last winter."\(^2\)

A second issue aggravating the Waggoner situation was Daniells' letter to Sutherland which belittled the college and Sutherland's accomplishments there. An initial letter had simply informed Sutherland of Daniells' proposition to Waggoner. Daniells' second

\(^1\)A. G. Daniells to W. W. Prescott and E. A. Sutherland, May 15, 1902, RG 11: Bx 56, Lb 28, GCAr.

\(^2\)A. G. Daniells to A. T. Jones, May 15, 1902, FGWRC-AU. A. G. Daniells to W. C. White, May 15, 1902, EGWRC-AU.
letter, however, must have rankled Sutherland to the core. In it he spoke of the great mission "for" the college; then added: "I am just as confident that the only hope there is of that school doing this work is to make it a Bible school such as has never existed in this denomination." Adding insult to injury, Daniells clarified: "I know of no school in the United States in which this can be done, unless it be Emmanuel Missionary College." Sutherland must have wondered whether the years of earnest Bible-centered reform at the Battle Creek and Emmanuel Missionary colleges were counted as nothing. Surely Daniells had not intended to imply that nothing had been done, but he seemed to give no credit where credit was due. It was tactless, and possibly helped predispose Sutherland and Magan to a defensive posture in the Waggoner affair that followed.¹

In the same letter, Daniells expressed disappointment that Sutherland had not immediately written to him authorizing him to continue with the negotiations.² Daniells sounded out of breath with excitement as he stressed how imperative it was to get the word out to the people "at an early date" that Waggoner was coming, so that everyone could make the necessary arrangements to attend the college in the fall. Daniells anticipated that as soon as people heard that Waggoner was coming, the college would be deluged with applications from "the very best young men and women, of good age and attainments,

¹A. G. Daniells to E. A. Sutherland, June 9, 1902, RG 11: Bk 28, p. 202, GCAr.

²Ibid. Sutherland had, in fact, written without delay to Daniells giving his assent, but the letter had not arrived quite as quickly as Daniells expected. E. A. Sutherland to A. G. Daniells, June 24, 1902, RG 9: Misc Rec, Daniells, A. G. -6, GCAr.
among our people in the United States. I believe that we shall be crowded to the utmost of our capacity this year for students."\(^1\)

The third problem related to Waggoner was that he communicated only with Prescott when he decided he was willing to go to the college. At the same time that Daniells was corresponding with Sutherland, Waggoner, on June 1, wrote a description of the reform he believed the college needed. He included considerable detail as to how he intended to achieve it. Committing a serious slight, though perhaps unintentionally, Waggoner sent his letter to Prescott alone. Had he at least sent a copy to Sutherland, some of the problems would have been avoided. After reading the lengthy letter, Prescott telephoned Sutherland to tell him that Waggoner had written of his willingness to come. He also read to him the portion of Waggoner's letter that pertained to the work at the college. According to Prescott, Sutherland had "said in a general way he thought he would favor" Waggoner's coming. At Sutherland's request, Prescott immediately sent him a copy of the pertinent portion of Waggoner's letter. Meanwhile, Prescott, on the basis of Sutherland's verbal assent, hastened to notify Waggoner that he should plan to come to Berrien Springs.\(^2\)

A fourth problem in the hiring of Waggoner was revealed in his ill-advised letter which hinted that he was a man with emerging

\(^1\)A. G. Daniells to E. A. Sutherland, June 9, 1902, RG 11: Bk 28, p. 202, GCAr.

emotional and spiritual problems. He wrote that he would be willing to help out for six months to a year in order to "make the school in reality a Bible school." Present Truth, which he edited, would not suffer, Waggoner suggested, because he planned to continue the editorial work in addition to his work at the college. Admitting that "it would mean really [doing] two men's work," he felt, nevertheless, that he could manage because he was "learning more and more how to live." He claimed to know "something of the infinite possibilities in the human body with the Lord as the motive power." Having suggested that he was learning how to sustain life, he then spoke of death: "I should be perfectly willing to die at the end of the year, if it were necessary; but I should not expect to." His expressions were unusual to say the least, and they alone might have caused some to question the wisdom of bringing him to the college.

But there was more. He wrote: "The ideas that I have in mind are so revolutionary that I fear they would hardly be received, and they almost frighten me." Explaining, he noted: "No teacher is fit to teach anything for which he is dependent on a so-called text book . . . whether it be the Bible or anything else." The "perfect school" would, in his estimation, need "no special Bible teacher, as such, but every teacher will be a teacher of the Bible." His assertion that "it seems to me that the time has come for us to make a decided change, and to cease to teach as the world teaches" must have forced the leadership at Berrien Springs to conclude that in Waggoner's view, they had accomplished essentially nothing.

To introduce the "new order of things" that would bring the "decided change," Waggoner suggested that he—or whoever led out--
would have to be allowed for at least "a very few weeks" to have "complete control of the school, that is, of the teaching." His explanation, however, seemed contradictory and muddled: "I do not mean that he [the one in charge] must direct the teaching, but that he must for a time be the sole teacher, and there must be no other book than the Bible."¹

A fifth difficulty with the Waggoner situation arose when Sutherland and the faculty at Berrien Springs misinterpreted Waggoner's intentions. Sutherland had already been through the "no other book than the Bible" extreme at Battle Creek, and surely he was not eager to experience a similar problem again. Though he interpreted Waggoner's words, "complete control of the school," to mean that he was wanting to take over the entire school, a careful reading of the letter makes it clear that Waggoner did not want to take over the administrative responsibilities, rather he wanted to be the "sole teacher" of all the students and teachers. Magan felt, however, that if Waggoner were going to take that much control, he ought to take responsibility for the entire school operation. Predictably, the plan, when laid before the faculty, met with opposition from the majority.²

The circumstances surrounding the June 19 college board meeting provided a sixth point of friction in the Waggoner case. The

¹E. J. Waggoner to W. W. Prescott, June 1, 1902, RG 11: Bx 46, Misc Let (1893-1902), GCAr.
²E. A. Sutherland to A. G. Daniells, June 24, 1902, RG 9: Misc Rec, Daniells, A. G. -6, GCAr. E. A. Sutherland to E. G. White, June 24, 1902, EGWRC-DC. P. T. Magan to E. G. White, June 23, 1902, EGWRC-DC. EMC Bd Min, June 19, 1902.
board meeting at which Prescott had presided had such a full agenda that the members had not even recessed for lunch. Wanting to take the 4:30 p.m. train to Battle Creek, Prescott, a short time earlier, had adjourned the meeting for the day, though the Waggoner issue had not been discussed.1

Following Prescott's departure, J. D. Gowell, the Michigan conference president, reported that "Prof. W. W. Prescott had told him that it was his mind that the Board should continue its session, and should not adjourn without date, as with Elder Gowell present there would be a quorum." Thus, Sutherland, as vice president of the board, reconvened the members in Prescott's absence. Concerned that the Waggoner matter be discussed without delay so that he could report to Daniells, Sutherland read to the board members the extract from Waggoner's letter. On the basis of the views expressed in the letter, they discussed "the advisability of concurring with Dr. Waggoner and of having him come to carry out his plans." As a result, two motions were introduced and subsequently voted. William Covert, president of the Indiana Conference, moved that the board vote approval of the reforms already being implemented at Emmanuel Missionary College. As a part of the motion he included two points of clarification: (1) that they were "endeavoring to reach the same object which Dr. Waggoner has in mind"; and (2) that they did not "deem it wisdom to endeavor to go faster in our reform than we can carry the people with us." Allen Moon, the Lake Union Conference president, then moved that Magan, as secretary of the college board, present their position to

1W. W. Prescott to E. J. Waggoner, July 3, 1902, RG 11: Box 52, Misc Let (1893-1902), GCAr. EMC Bd Min, June 19, 1902.
Sometime between June 19 and June 24, when Sutherland wrote to Daniells informing him of the consensus of the board, a vote must have been taken. Sutherland claimed: "The majority of the Board were not in favor of inviting him [Waggoner] to come to undertake the work he has outlined, and they took action to that effect." Although there is no way that the school's leaders could have received counsel from Ellen White so quickly, they apparently had taken the decision against his coming anyway, on the basis of his letter.²

Knowing that the matter needed urgent attention, and strongly desiring that Waggoner come, it is inexplicable why Prescott did not bring up the question while he was still presiding as chairman at the meeting on June 19. His subsequent letter to Waggoner, written on

¹EMC Bd Min, June 19, 1902. There is a contradiction between what Gowell said that he had been told by Prescott, and Prescott's recollection of the events in a letter to Waggoner written July 3. In the letter, Prescott claimed: "I just learned now for the first time that after I left they continued the Trustees meeting, took up the questions of your connecting with the College, and passed the following action[s]." He wrote out the actions verbatim, then added: "I am considerably disturbed at the course which these young men are taking; and if this is a sample of the way the thing is going, I shall certainly withdraw from any connection with the Board of Trustees." In placing the blame on Sutherland and Magan for the negative action, Prescott ignored the fact that (1) the motions had been introduced by two of the conference presidents who were present, and (2) the decisions were made by a quorum of the board members. W. W. Prescott to E. J. Waggoner, July 3, 1902, RG 11: Bx 52, Misc Let (1893-1902), GCAR.

²E. A. Sutherland to A. G. Daniells, June 24, 1902, RG 9: Misc Rec, Daniells, A. G. -6, GCAR. Cf. E. A. Sutherland to E. G. White, June 24, 1902, EGWRC-DC. EMC Bd Min, June 19, 1902. There is no way to document the board members' decision. With the exception of the minutes of the next morning's meeting which did not deal with the matter, no other minutes for June are extant.
July 3, betrayed an unhealthful resentment toward the position taken by the board members and the resolution that Covert had introduced. Prescott considered the resolution a "very silly" one. His not having personally dealt with the matter only served to distance him further from the board and the school that it was his responsibility to serve.1

When Daniells received Sutherland's long letter of June 24, informing him of the faculty opposition to Waggoner's hiring, he admitted that he felt "terribly." In a letter to W. C. White, written two months later, Daniells insisted that on the basis of his conversation with Waggoner he was "thoroughly satisfied that his [Waggoner's] position and motives" had been "entirely misunderstood by our brethren at Berrien Springs." The explanation, he was certain, lay in the fact that Waggoner's letter, which had been hastily written after a "heavy day's work, was not intended in any way to be a clear, logical statement of his plan."2 If that be true, then why had he written it? Were misunderstandings not virtually certain?

Daniells' explanation that Waggoner had written a careless letter appears to be an unfounded judgment. Considering the

1 W. W. Prescott to E. J. Waggoner, July 3, 1902, RG 11: Bx 52, Misc Let (1893-1902), GCAR. In his dissertation, Valentine writes that the school board passed a resolution "affirming that they thought they were reforming satisfactorily." He omits, however, the crux of the resolution, which was that they did not want to advance in reform more quickly than the people could be carried along. Valentine, like Prescott, overlooked that important detail. Valentine, "W. W. Prescott," p. 291, footnote 2.

2 A. G. Daniells to W. C. White, August 22, 1902, RG 11: Bx 56, Lb 27, GCAR. Daniells appears to have reacted peevishly when his plan was thwarted. "I have been led," he claimed, "to feel that personally I was not giving the attention to our other schools that it was my duty. I was very much wrapped up in the Berrien Springs enterprise."
revolutionary nature of the plan Waggoner was describing, and his inability to discuss it with the interested parties in person, he should have been extremely careful in his choice of words and statements. Furthermore, that portion of his letter was detailed and specific—three and a half single-spaced, typewritten pages, with very narrow margins. If Daniells knew that it was written in haste by a tired mind, he would have done Waggoner a real service by advising him not to send it. The faculty of the college and Ellen and W. C. White had been given no other document on which to base their judgments.¹

A seventh and final complicating factor in the hiring of Waggoner was that Prescott, Waggoner, and Daniells² apparently lacked confidence in Sutherland's leadership ability. Ellen White wrote letters to Prescott and Waggoner on June 30, gently rebuking them for that. In her letter to Prescott she asserted that Sutherland and Magan "would be making a mistake to give up the work God has entrusted to them, either to Brother Waggoner or to yourself." While they might not believe that the leaders at the college were capable of doing a competent job, she did not agree with them. To leave no room for doubt, Mrs. White was very pointed:

¹E. J. Waggoner to W. W. Prescott, June 1, 1902, RG 11: Bx 46, Misc Let (1893-1902), GCAr. A. G. Daniells to W. C. White, August 22, 1902, RG 22: Bx 56, Lb 27, GCAr.

²Daniells, in a letter to W. C. White, insisted that neither he nor Waggoner had ever suggested between them that Sutherland was "not doing a good work." He was doing "all that any man could in his place." Later in the letter, however, he asserted: "The Bible will never do that work in our schools until it is taught by men who are acquainted with it; and from my observation, I want to say that very few of our preachers or teachers to-day [sic] have that knowledge of the scriptures necessary to enable them to do the work they should in our schools." A. G. Daniells to W. C. White, August 22, 1902, RG 22: Bx 56, Lb 27, GCAr.
As to Brother Sutherland's age, true, he is young; but this is in his favor; for he feels that he is a child, dependent on God for wisdom. In some respects, youthful Christians have not so much to battle with as older Christians. . . . The spirit of self-sufficiency is a great hindrance to the working of the spirit of God in the heart. . . . Let the older workers encourage the younger ones, never speaking lightly or disparagingly of them. . . . My brother, let nothing you do or say weaken the hands of men who are doing their best, and who have succeeded in gaining success.

In an attempt to encourage Prescott, she explained: "Your work is not in the schoolroom, but before the gatherings of God's people."\(^1\)

In her letter to Waggoner, Mrs. White referred to the letters that had come to her that left no doubt that some were placing "a low estimate" on the work of Sutherland and his associates. She encouraged Waggoner to go to Berrien Springs only if he could take his place with the "brethren, having confidence in them, believing that God has been leading them in their work," just as He had been leading Waggoner in his work. If he came, he was to take his place with them "as a learner."\(^2\)

Unfortunately, Waggoner had other problems besides his superior attitude toward Sutherland and Magan. As early as 1899 it had become apparent that Waggoner, as well as some other prominent men in the denomination, were expressing strange views regarding the presence of God, health, and living forever. Given his quasi-pantheistic views, it was undoubtedly best for the college that Waggoner did not go there to teach Bible.\(^3\)

\(^1\)E. G. White to W. W. Prescott, June 30; July 7, 1902, EGWRC-DC.
\(^2\)E. G. White to "Brother and Sister Prescott," July 7, 1902, EGWRC-DC.
\(^3\)E. G. White to E. J. Waggoner, June 30, 1902, EGWRC-DC.

Regarding Waggoner's views, see A. L. White, Ellen G. White: The Early Elmshaven Years, pp. 283-85.
The strained relations between Prescott and the other members of the college board continued during the summer and fall of 1902. Still offended that the administrators had held such an important board meeting without his knowledge, and dissatisfied yet with the work at Berrien Springs, Prescott resigned as chairman of the board on November 17.¹

Taken as a whole these seven problems eroded the confidence and respect between Prescott and Daniells on the one hand and Sutherland and Magan on the other. Without a mutually supportive relationship with these principal church leaders, Sutherland and Magan could not successfully administer Emmanuel Missionary College. Prescott's subsequent resignation as chairman of the college board also served notice that he was displeased with Sutherland's administrative procedures and decisions, and deprived the institution of his needed counsel.

The 1902 affair was over, but Waggoner was to become an issue again in 1903. By the middle of that year, Waggoner was in a period of uncertainty, and the General Conference leaders were apprehensive that he was no longer preaching "the truth." At that juncture he wrote again from England, this time requesting that he be given a position as a Bible teacher at Emmanuel Missionary College. Naturally, Sutherland and Magan consulted with Ellen White. Daniells strongly opposed Waggoner's coming, not for theological reasons, but because

¹EMC Bd Min, November 17, 1902. Cf. W. W. Prescott to P. T. Magan, July 3, 1902, RG 11: Bx 52, Misc Let (1893-1902), GCAR. Prescott, in his letter to Waggoner in July had already said he was planning to resign. W. W. Prescott to A. G. Daniells, July 16, 1902, RG 11: Bx 46, Misc Let (1893-1902), GCAR. W. W. Prescott to A. G. Daniells, October 13, 1902, Bx 46, Misc Let (1893-1902), GCAR.
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of a letter he had written "criticizing the General Conference." On Waggoner's arrival in Washington, D. C., in early October, however, Daniells had talked at length with him and reported that they were of one accord. Thus, on October 16 at the educational society board meeting, Jones moved that Waggoner be accepted to teach at the college. Daniells seconded the motion, and it was approved. Everyone seemed particularly sympathetic, especially since Waggoner had confessed his awareness that he was in a confused state of mind and needed help. Prescott, Daniells, W. C. White, Magan, and Sutherland all spoke kindly of him, while Ellen White wrote: "Take him into the school at Berrien Springs. My counsel regarding his work is that you help him to place his feet on solid ground, even the Rock of Ages."^1

When Waggoner arrived on the Berrien Springs campus in late October 1903, he was a confused and discouraged man. Nevertheless, he immediately began to teach a class of twenty-two students. The number was expected to increase to about forty. Waggoner had brought his wife, their two daughters, a little niece who lived with them, and an English boy that they had "practically adopted."^2

^1N. H. Druillard to E. G. White, August 17, 1903, EGWRC-DC. EMC Bd Min, October 18, 1903. P. T. Magan to E. G. White, October 28, 1903, EGWRC-DC. E. G. White to "My dear friends at Berrien Springs," October 9, 1903, EGWRC-DC. Cf. P. T. Magan to E. G. White, October 12, 1903, EGWRC-DC. A. G. Daniells to W. C. White, October 23, 1903, EGWRC-DC. W. W. Prescott to J. H. Kellogg, October 25, 1903, EGWRC-AU. E. A. Sutherland to E. G. White, November 5, 1903, EGWRC-DC. Valentine says that Vande Vere is incorrect in assuming that Waggoner taught at the college. Vande Vere is correct in that assumption. His error, however, is in incorrectly attributing Waggoner's 1902 statements to his 1903 employment in Berrien Springs. By the time Waggoner came to teach in the fall of 1903 he was a humbled man. "W. W. Prescott," p. 292; The Wisdom Seekers, p. 114.

^2P. T. Magan to E. G. White, October 28, 1903, EGWRC-DC.
Unfortunately, living accommodations were inadequate. After staying with the Sutherlands, then being moved to a large room in the domestic arts building, the Waggoners finally ended up living in "a very poor and dilapidated" cottage that had been occupied by the college printer. Magan claimed that they seemed "perfectly contented," but it could not have done much to lift their spirits; particularly with a Michigan winter on the way.

In addition to inadequate housing, Waggoner confronted a difficult financial problem. He had been obliged to borrow money to pay the expenses of moving back to the United States. While the college was willing to pay his salary, the college leadership hoped the General Conference would reimburse him for his moving costs. Though Magan wrote to Daniells regarding the matter, reporting that Waggoner felt "very much crushed and saddened," Daniells chose not to authorize repayment to Waggoner.¹

Waggoner appears to have fared well in the classroom and on the farm. When asked by the administration to head the "Missionary Council," however, he resisted, and even seemed unwilling to participate in the mission outreach program of the college. Following a brief period of teaching at Berrien Springs, he apparently accepted an invitation to teach at the newly reopened Battle Creek College.²


²Magan diary, November 21, 1903. P. T. Magan to E. G. White, November 5, 15, 1903, EGWRC-DC. Cf. EMC Fac Min, November 9, 11, 1903. Apparently, Waggoner stayed at Emmanuel Missionary College for only one or two terms. He completed the fall term, taught the winter and possibly the spring terms. His name appears with the Berrien Springs faculty in 1904, but not in 1905. It is possible that he
The personnel problems that Sutherland had to confront during his three years at Emmanuel Missionary College affected him most notably in three areas: overwork, deterrence from achievement of his institutional goals, and strained relations with the denominational leaders. It should be noted that many of the faculty, including Magan, Sally Sutherland, DeGraw, J. H. Haughey, Dr. and Mrs. S. P. S. Edwards, and C. M. Christiansen, had worked with Sutherland at Battle Creek. Joining forces with new faculty members, such as the Uruillards, Nichols, and Baird, they worked in a spirit of self-sacrifice and commendable harmony with Sutherland as they continued to experiment with educational reform. It is to the philosophy of that reform that attention is now given.

Educational Philosophy and Goals

General Principles

Emmanuel Missionary College, some fervently believed, was an idea whose time had come; in the image of Avondale, it would be the model school for North America. Sutherland envisioned it as the top level in a three-tiered system--dependent on the elementary church


schools and intermediate industrial schools. Whereas Battle Creek College had from its inception included all three levels, the new college was to be exclusively a "training school." The elementary and secondary schools, established during the last years at Battle Creek, would act as feeders to provide for the training school students who were already devoted Christians, ambitious to enter missionary work and proficient in at least one trade.¹

By the turn of the century, Sutherland's philosophy had begun to impact significantly on the Adventist Church, increasing its awareness that every effort should be exerted to make the church a "purely missionary denomination." Sutherland urged that its church-related school system must not be satisfied simply to make every child born to Adventist parents an Adventist, but must seek to get every Seventh-day Adventist child and youth "to give his or her heart to God for service as a missionary in an active way, wherever the needs of humanity and the Church may demand." Therefore, one supreme goal inspired the existence of the school at Berrien Springs; it would prepare missionaries—for ministry, medical work, teaching, canvassing, and business. Sutherland expected the school to be the "recruiting station to which the Mission Board should look for volunteers."²

In harmony with its goal, the school would have a restrictive admissions policy: no children or teenagers, no one who needed


disciplining, and none who lacked a clear calling to mission service would be accepted. Having chosen their lifework, students would come for "specific instruction." They would not expect to spend years attaining it, but would come prepared to do "intensive work for a brief period, hoping to return for short courses as a respite from service in the field." Instead of needing discipline, those who were admitted would become part of a "co-operative association" with self-governed students, and gain experience "in the things which they will encounter when they leave the school." No student would be considered ready to leave school until he had shown a proficiency in agriculture, basic health-care training, construction, and, in the case of the young women, a thorough acquaintance with the "art of hygienic cookery." These skills were held to be of utmost value since "it is the practical everyday worker that can best proclaim the gospel."¹

Harmonizing with the counsels Sutherland had received from Ellen White, all classroom instruction would be correlated with the Bible. Classes would be conducted with a view to making "not reciters of lessons, but students." They would take up "one study after another" until "many subjects" were mastered. Based on the rationale that "the church should educate its children and its workers as freely as the state educates its children and its soldiers," tuition was to be kept as low as possible.

Expressing a philosophy and a goal, of course, is considerably

¹E. A. Sutherland, "Demands for a Training School," TS Advocate 5 (June 1903):162-64. EMC Cal, 1902, p. 8.
easier than implementing it, and the work and methods pursued at Berrien Springs were largely experimental. Near the end of the first school year, Sutherland wrote to W. C. White:

You know the educational reform has in the past necessarily been largely destructive in its nature; that is, an immense structure had been reared, and before anything new could be done, there had to be a good deal of tearing down and moving out. But that work has now been done; foundations have been laid, and the structure has been begun.

With his colleagues, Sutherland sought to grapple with the issues and seek positive, practical solutions. An agenda distributed to all the personnel in preparation for a ten-day retreat held in the summer of 1903 is illustrative:

1. What should constitute a true training school for Christian workers?
2. How can the closest co-operation between the workers in the school and the students in the school, be brought about?
3. What place does country life, the small farm, occupy among the great reforms embraced in the Third Angel's Message?
4. Give careful thought to the subject matter that should be taught in a training school for Christian workers. . . .
5. Are there methods of teaching lessons to students which will develop the right character. . . ?
6. How can we divide our school work so that we can devote one-third of the time to manual training, one-third of the time to intellectual training or class recitation, and one-third of the time to spiritual and missionary training?
7. What can be done to make the chapel hour strong in cementing together the entire school?
8. How can we make our home life more in harmony with what we feel should exist?

1E. A. Sutherland to W. C. White, April 15, 1902, EGWRC-DC.
2E. A. Sutherland, "To the Workers of Emmanuel Missionary College," EMC Fac Min, August 19, 1903.
Under each of the eight points Sutherland included many sub-questions. In a final paragraph he said that "the farm, the kitchen, the printing office, the carpentry, the law-and-order, etc., will come up for careful study." The Emmanuel Missionary College experiment was a major undertaking, and the personnel and students, almost without exception, were dedicated to making it work. ¹

Someone must lead and set a good example. Apparently Sutherland was able to do that effectively. His aunt Nellie Druillard, "Mother D" as she was affectionately called, could certainly not have been impartial in her attitude toward her nephew, but she was a hard-headed businesswoman not noted for flattery. To the Whites she wrote: "Prof. Sutherland has surely a gift in teaching. He takes the Bible as the great text-book, and I can see as never before what it means to teach according to the testimonies." She had been deeply touched to see "a class of students in the recitation of any study melted to tears as they find God in that study! This work is not fanaticism, but cool consecration, or so it seems to me." Describing the atmosphere she said: "Prayer and praise are heard all day, and as they study their lessons they see the love and wisdom of God in all things."

Her praise was not confined to her nephew; she wrote glowingly of white-haired "Eld. Covert" too. While many of the ministers have "much theory," and though they "preach good sermons," she lamented that "they stop there." Instead, Covert, head of the industrial school at Bethel, Wisconsin, took the students out into the groves,

¹Ibid.
and while "trimming the trees and cutting out the dead branches, they learn from God's work in nature how to co-operate with Him." She felt that such a teaching method "takes away all the old idea of drudgery and makes work grand—a real delight."¹

Though Sutherland enjoyed the support of his colleagues, there were those outside the institution who believed that he was dictatorial. Some of the rumors that wafted around were uncharitable, even unchristian. After the General Conference session in the spring of 1903, there were those who claimed that since the college had gone to Berrien Springs "its course had been crooked and wrong"; while the other Adventist colleges enjoyed God's blessing, Berrien Springs had suffered "only defeat and trials." The reason given was that those who managed Emmanuel Missionary College "were so cranky and crooked that God could not bless their work; and that there was a harsh, one man power used to crush every one who did not turn a crank." When Sutherland's aunt, "Mother D," learned of that rumor she retorted: "God... knows that there is not an institution among us where there is so little of the one man crushing power as here."²

In addition, it was rumored that Kellogg was running things at the college "as he pleases." Again Druillard responded, insisting that Kellogg had not tried to "influence the work of this school the weight of a feather."³

¹N. H. Druillard to E. G. White, June 22, 1902, EGWRC-DC.
²N. H. Druillard to W. C. White, June 7, 1903, EGWRC-DC. Where Mrs. Druillard had observed Covert's instructional methodology is not clear. She may have visited the industrial school at Bethel, though it is also possible that Covert had taught a class in the summer school at Berrien Springs.
³Ibid.
Like others, Druillard had not been very favorably impressed when she first arrived on the Berrien Springs campus in 1902. She admitted that Sutherland and Magan had ideas that "some others do not see," but, she hastened to add, "the more I let go of prejudice and candidly consider what seems to them to be Bible and Testimony doctrine, the more I see they have the truth."\(^1\)

Though Sutherland and Magan were firm, even stubborn, on matters which they felt involved principle, they maintained an enviable rapport with their institutional colleagues. C. M. Christiansen, who had managed the school farm from its beginning, left his job over a disagreement regarding the farm operation. In spite of that, he claimed before leaving that "he [had] never worked with any one that he loved to work with as well as with Sutherland and Magan." While J. H. Haughey and W. E. Howell--two faculty members--had seriously doubted that the Emmanuel Missionary College experiment would work, they were pleased that it was not only working but was doing so "smoothly." When given the opportunity to leave the college, Howell had chosen to stay, declaring that he had "learned more lessons than the students."\(^2\)

The Cooperative Plan

As a result of Sutherland's desire to foster self-government and run the college on democratic principles, he cautiously developed the "cooperative plan," which involved the sharing of administrative responsibility and the development of practical expertise in leadership. At the time of his resignation in the spring of 1904,\(^1\)

\(^1\)Ibid. \(^2\)Ibid.
Sutherland stated that it had taken "three years to get this plan started."¹

First attempted on the college farm, the plan was eventually broadened to include every aspect of the institution's operation.²

According to the basic concept, every student, staff, and faculty member would play a direct role in the running of the college through membership in one or more "committees." There were at least nine different committees to choose from: Law and Order, Boarding Club, Fuel and Light, Laundry, Printing, Farm, Building, Finance, and Moderators. Each committee bore full responsibility for a specific aspect of the school operation.³ For example, the purchase of coal was entirely in the hands of the Fuel and Light Committee. When six women students wanted practice in home economics they joined the Boarding Club. After dividing up, three provided breakfast, while the other three prepared dinner. They had to figure out not only how to prepare "palatable food," but whether or not it was economically wise to use certain "food materials."⁴

Christiansen, as farm manager, was asked to relinquish his position so that the farm could be run collectively. The faculty divided up the responsibility, and each faculty member taught the students in the fields as well as in the classroom. The buildings

¹EMC Bd Min, May 24, 1904.
²For further discussion see pp. 283-87.
³EMC Fac Min, June 24; July 2, 3, 10; November 20, 1903.
were also built primarily by students; members of the "Building" committee.¹

In addition, Sutherland proposed to the faculty committee a revolutionary "Rotation in Office" plan whereby the faculty would elect their own chairman, who would "virtually be the head of the school." Magan, explaining the value of rotation in office, claimed that "strong men would be trained for service" through the plan. Mrs. Druillard said that an added advantage would be the elimination of criticism regarding the school management. While the rotation-in-office plan was voted, evidence is lacking as to how fully and effectively it was implemented.²

Each year the cooperative plan grew in popularity. David Paulson, in the summer of 1903, wrote that as a result of involvement in the cooperative plan, "every student seems to be as conversant with every feature of the management of this great enterprise as he is with the problems presented in his textbook."³ Mrs. Druillard contended that every single person connected with the school would admit that "in the development of character, from an educational standpoint, the co-operative system does more for the student than any other plan ever tried in any educational institution."⁴ Writing to Daniells in November 1903, Magan claimed that "the students are taking vastly more interest in them [the committees] than they did last year, and our

¹Ibid.
²EMC Fac Min, July 3, 1903.
⁴N. H. Druillard to W. C. White, March 17, 1903, EGWRC-DC.
union meetings are attended by every man and woman in the school without any urging whatsoever.

In December 1903 a chapel period was dedicated to an assessment of the cooperative plan. Teachers, their spouses, and students concurred with Magan in giving unqualified praise to the plan. Among those who spoke, Howell, the teacher responsible for the Law and Order committee, explained how his committee functioned. All of the rules and regulations governing every aspect of the school were voted on by the faculty and student body together. Every student and faculty member kept a record, on special slips, of his or her "irregularities" whether social, work-related, or academic; then, once a week, the slips were given to the committee. The committee studied each report of a student's irregularity and decided whether it was serious enough "to deprive him of the privileges of the school." If a student was found guilty of such a serious breach, the faculty gave opportunity to the offender's student friends to do what they could "to win him back." During the current school year, Howell reported, there had been "five or six cases . . . but through proper labor for those, they have all been restored." E. L. Cardey, a student who attended the college the first three years that it was in Berrien Springs, recalled many years later that they enjoyed excellent student morale and

1P. T. Magan to A. G. Daniells, November 26, 1903, RG 11: 1903-M, GCAr. Union meetings were weekly organizational sessions attended by the students and the respective faculty.

not one had been sent home in those three years.¹

Linked with the concept of shared responsibility was that of shared ownership. Sutherland "felt very strongly that the school belonged to everybody"; it was the students' "school and their farm." Appealing as that concept was, it created some novel problems.² For example, one season the trees yielded a very large cherry crop, and the students began to eat them as soon as they ripened. Determined to stop the eating, Sutherland called the students together at an evening meeting and told them that the "fruit we have here is for sale and you are not to consider it as belonging to you. It really is stealing to pick this fruit and eat it yourselves." Naturally, everyone felt embarrassed and ashamed. Cardey recalled, years later, that he then raised his hand and, given permission to speak, told a story:

I heard of a man who gave his little boy a pig in the spring, and he told the little boy to raise the pig as it was his pig. When the fall came the pig had grown, then the father sold it and kept the money. The boy said, "I thought that was my pig." "Yes," he said, "It was your little pig, but when the fall came it was my hog, so I'll keep the money."

The story caused the students to clap and cheer, and "Professor Sutherland and Professor Magan just began to laugh and closed the meeting right there." Still laughing, they asked him to come to the office, where they admitted that he had "won the point. We will say no more about it." When Cardey returned years later from mission service in Africa, he said that Sutherland remembered that story and "still had a good laugh over it."³

¹E. L. Cardey to E. K. Vande Vere, July 17, 1956, Vande Vere Coll, AUHR.
²Ibid.
³Ibid.
Another incident involving the cooperative plan was probably not considered humorous at the time it happened. Without permission or chaperon, a young man had taken a young lady out for a ride. When called to task, the student replied: "Are we not taught that all this property here is our property?" The answer was "yes." "Then," he said, "I do not see how you can discipline me[,] for all I did was take 'my horse' and hitch him to 'my buggy' and take 'my girl' out for a ride."

In addition to the plan of every student and faculty member belonging to a work committee, another related requirement bears mentioning. Every student had to maintain a book containing his personal financial account with the institution. The aim of this requirement was to develop more fully in each student a sense of business management and self-government.

Creating a mentality of self-government, cooperative ownership, and collective responsibility for the operation of the college, became an integral part of Sutherland's educational philosophy and goals. While the plan of cooperation does not appear to have been fully implemented until his last year at Berrien Springs, it may have been one of Sutherland's most beneficial reforms. Unfortunately, no student reaction has been found to ascertain the popularity of the cooperative plan. Nonetheless, it enabled students to leave the institution to go into all areas of church work with the major advantage of having had hands-on administrative experience.


Curricular Modifications

The curriculum at Emmanuel Missionary College had three notable characteristics: (1) it was exclusively missionary oriented, (2) it was holistic, and (3) it was Bible-centered. While the curricular modifications during the last years at Battle Creek College and the first years at Emmanuel Missionary College were markedly less radical than the changes between the Caviness and Sutherland eras at Battle Creek, refinements of existing reforms continued.

The new name, Emmanuel Missionary College, was indicative of the single-minded goal of Sutherland for the institution—every student a missionary. Because of inadequate accommodations in 1901, the departments of instruction were reduced to three: Ministers and Bible Workers, Evangelistic Canvassers and Colporteurs, and Missionary Teachers. As soon as the college moved onto the farm in 1902, however, four more departments were added: Preparatory Medical Missionary, Christian Business, Music, and Manual Training.¹

A comparison of the course listings for the last year at Battle Creek and the first year at Berrien Springs reveals few modifications. Medical Latin, business correspondence, and commercial law were dropped, while "Principles of Christian Education and Bible Finance," history of missions, and sacred music were added. Recognizing the importance of world missions, the school continued to offer German, French, and Spanish, in addition to Hebrew, biblical Greek, and ecclesiastical Latin. With a complete institution to be built, construction constituted a vital part of the curriculum. Since the

¹EMC Cal, 1901, pp. 35-52; 1902, pp. 36-45.
administrators considered all present to be owners of the 272 acres and believed that a knowledge of farming would be essential for effective missionary work, they gave agriculture a central curricular role. Due to their holistic understanding of the term "curriculum," Sutherland and the faculty considered virtually everything, from digging sewer ditches to biblical Latin, to be within its scope.¹

Musical training was given special emphasis at Emmanuel Missionary College. From the time the school opened in 1901, Ellen White had urged the critical importance of instruction in music. It was to be under the guidance of a man of "wisdom" and "piety"; one who had experience as an evangelist and could train the students to be "singing evangelists." He must also be willing to take the students out "into the field and show them how to work." Consequently, in 1902 the administrators created a department of music for the purpose of training "missionary musicians." The two-manual pipe organ that had been in the college at Battle Creek was installed at Berrien Springs and all of the music students were encouraged to take both piano and organ.²

Convinced that none should be deprived of the opportunity to learn to sing, tuition for singing classes and participation in the "College Choral Society" was free for all "regular" students. The Calendar claimed that "the use of small instruments is an important factor in missionary work." To provide opportunity for practice, a

¹BCC Cal, 1900, p. 50; EMC Cal, 1901, pp. 52, 62-63.
²W. C. White to P. T. Magan, September 13, 1901, RG 9: Misc Rec, Fld 2, White, W. C., GCAr. EMC Cal, 1902, pp. 40-41.
college orchestra was organized in which "a high degree of proficiency" was not necessary for membership. It was also free.¹

Continuing the reform initiated at Battle Creek, the Berrien Springs faculty tried to teach every subject from "the standpoint of the Bible." Moreover, they declared that "a truth is not learned until it is lived." Thus the biblical principles taught in the classroom were to be practiced in their daily living.²

Regarding required coursework, the college provided a "schedule of studies" for each department of instruction, but no student was expected to complete all of the courses that were offered. Nor were students required to follow the "schedule." The Calendar declared: "The College does not offer set courses of instruction. In spirit it is decidedly democratic, offering work to meet individual needs." Each incoming student was assisted by the faculty in selecting "such subjects as are necessary to fit him for his calling."³

Wishing to emphasize the importance of a knowledge of the "common branches," every prospective student had to successfully complete an entrance examination. The subjects covered were: reading, spelling, penmanship, English, arithmetic and bookkeeping, geography, history of the United States, and elementary physiology and hygiene. If one failed to pass any area of the exam, he was required to take intensive remedial work before being allowed to continue as a regular student.⁴

Though it is unclear as to how it operated in practice,

accelerated study was permitted. "The length of time required for each study," claimed the bulletin, was to "depend upon the ability and application of the student."¹

As a natural consequence of such a program, flexible in both academic time required and course work taken, degrees and diplomas were not granted. Instead, the college issued "certificates of scholarship showing the real work done." In addition, every student, regardless of his academic discipline, was tested by carefully supervised "actual field labor." Only when one had satisfactorily passed a final examination and proven his ability to apply the knowledge practically in a real-life context was he "recommended to the proper persons as competent to fill calls in needy fields." Another condition for recommendation was a demonstrated ability to utilize one's chosen trade to "support himself independently of any conference or mission board."²

Unfortunately, no 1903 school calendar is extant if one was issued. Thus it is impossible to determine precisely what curricular innovations continued to be introduced. If, however, the preceding years are any indication, it can be assumed that the Emmanuel Missionary College faculty continued to experiment in curricular reform, seeking to approximate their elusive ideal.

The One-Study Plan

Among the reforms practiced at Berrien Springs, the most controversial was the "one-study plan." The 1901 Calendar announced to

¹Ibid., p. 25.
²Ibid., pp. 13, 15; 1901, pp. 17-18.
prospective students that "class work will be given in a way decidedly
different from previous plans." It explained that a student would
carry "one main line of work at a time, devoting his entire energy to
the subject in hand until he has a working knowledge of that
subject."^1

Lest some should question the wisdom of such a radical innova­
tion, an enumeration of the supposed advantages claimed: (1) "more
time is, in the aggregate, devoted to each subject"; (2) students thus
have the "personal supervision of one teacher until a subject is com­
pleted, whose duty it is to teach how to study, instead of merely
hearing recitations"; (3) "laboratory, experimental, or field work
becomes a part of the class exercise in all departments"; (4) "manual
training is associated with what are often considered purely mental
subjects"; (5) "each teacher is master of a group of students, and may
employ all their time without interfering with the work of any other
class"; and (6) the student would not have to remain in each class for
a whole school year. Since an entire course was completed each term,
students could leave school between terms with their coursework
finished. Ostensibly, it would also allow a person to prepare for
"actual field work in the shortest time." Since some of the subjects
required less time, the Calendar listed half-term subjects which
allowed a person to complete a maximum of two subjects a quarter.2

After a year's trial, Sutherland considered the experiment

^1Ibid., p. 16.

2Ibid., pp. 16-17; 1902, pp. 12, 34-35.
a success: "We find that one study mastered—one study put into practice—is worth more than any number of studies learned in a superficial way; in fact, there is no comparison in value." He also asserted that "one study well mastered enables the student to master another study more easily." Because the faculty supported the innovation, it appeared again in the 1902 Calendar with the comment: "This method has been proved by the Faculty to be well adapted to students who are mature in mind and judgment,—the only class of students eligible to a place in this institution."¹

According to Mrs. Druillard, many of the universities in the United States had been discussing the one-study plan for years. She claimed that wherever it had been put into effect it had given "the best results." Having already used the plan herself while teaching in the public-school system, she declared that on arriving at Emmanuel Missionary College she was pleased to find it also using the one-study plan. The plan was indispensable at Emmanuel Missionary College, she claimed, because it was "so woven into the co-operative system upon which the School is working that there is a principle at stake, and if we tare [sic] it from its place, the whole fabric will be injured." Though her reasoning is rather inscrutable, she, being a shrewd businesswoman, probably recognized that with the small student body and the one-study plan they did not need as many teachers to cover the course offerings in any one term. As a result, the school could get by with fewer faculty members. Also, more teachers were

¹E. A. Sutherland to E. G. White, May 27, 1902, EGWRC-DC. EMC Cal, 1902, p. 11.
available to supervise the manual labor programs. The school, therefore, stood to benefit financially.¹

Perhaps the most glaring fault of the plan was pointed out by Cardey who studied under the plan. "One became too one-sided in his studies and his thinking," he claimed. "If he was studying languages he studied nothing but language, with possibly an additional study in Bible." Subjects such as history and mathematics were studied exclusively for an entire term. To study in such a manner, Cardey complained, was to take a major subject and follow it through "to the bitter end." Consequently, he believed, it was never "very popular with the student body."²

His comments become particularly significant when one discovers that Ellen White, addressing the issue, albeit in a different context, spoke pointedly against concentrating on one study alone. She urged that "change in lines of study in the schools is essential," and gave five reasons: (1) "the mind must not be overtaxed with long application in one special lesson"; (2) "it is not beneficial to the teacher, neither is it beneficial to the student"; (3) "it becomes monotonous"; (4) "some can bear this concentrated effort; others become nervous"; (5) "variety in daily studies is more restful to the brain than one monotonous line of study."³

¹N. H. Druillard to W. C. White, March 17, 1903, EGWRC-DC. No evidence was found to corroborate Mrs. Druillard's statement that other educational institutions were using the one-study plan.

²E. L. Cardey to E. K. Vande Vere, July 17, 1956, Vande Vere Coll, AUHR.

³E. G. White, "Individuality in Educational Work," MS 170, May 1901, EGWRC-DC.
As is evident from the study of Sutherland's work at Walla Walla and Battle Creek, he normally sought to follow Ellen White's counsels assiduously. Consequently, if he had access to her admonition, it remains a conundrum why he persisted in practicing the one-study plan. Perhaps a more likely possibility is that, since her counsel on the topic was written in an unpublished manuscript, he was ignorant of its existence. The one-study plan was apparently continued until Sutherland left Emmanuel Missionary College in 1904.¹

Special Study Programs

For the purpose of serving those who could not attend the college, a correspondence-study department was opened January 1, 1902. Parents with family obligations and only "an hour or so daily" could use the courses for "self-improvement" and also to improve their ability to teach their children about the Bible. Ministers could also broaden their expertise in educating the laity. But of particular concern to the college was the utilization of the correspondence courses by teachers of the church and public schools. In the school Calendar teachers were encouraged to complete "one or more subjects" by correspondence each year.²

The night school was a second special program of Emmanuel Missionary College. It was designed to accommodate students who, though able to come to Berrien Springs, could not afford even the $1

¹EMC Cal, 1901, p. 16; 1902, pp. 11, 12. Cf. E. L. Cardey to Vande Vere, July 17, 1956, Vande Vere Coll, AUHR.

²EMC Cal, 1901, pp. 31-33. "School of Correspondence," TS Advocate 5 (September 1903):266-67; "Correspondence School," TS Advocate 5 (October 1903):299-300; "Study by Correspondence," TS Advocate 5 (December 1903):363.
per week tuition charge for the regular course of study. Needy students were provided with full-time employment while they attended classes two hours each evening. To facilitate the transfer of the night-school students into the regular program of study, course work was identical with the daytime program.

Designed for those with limited time available, the college also offered specialized intensive seminars and institutes such as the five-day "Christian Farmers' Institute" to study "gospel farming." Farmers, ministers, and teachers were encouraged to attend in order to study principles regarding soil cultivation. They were also to be instilled with greater missionary zeal, which would "lead them into other countries." Another special course was a summer "training school" to prepare Christian businesspersons. This course was added at the request of the Lake Union Conference.

The ever-increasing need for Christian teachers led to further developments in the summer-school program. At the 1901 General Conference, the delegates had passed a resolution recommending that Adventist ministers were "not to consider their work for churches complete" until they organized church schools wherever possible. As a result, the number of church schools continued to rise. Consequently, the need for qualified Christian teachers rose also. To accommodate the needs of the growing number of teachers in continuing education,

---

1 EMC Cal, 1902, pp. 15-17. EMC Bd Min, May 6, 1903.
2 EMC Cal, 1901, p. 34.
3 LUC Min, April 1, 1902.
each summer the college held a teachers' institute lasting from five

to ten days, and a summer school which lasted from eight to ten weeks.
Beginning with an attendance of 150 students in the summer of 1902,
the number increased to 200 in 1903, and to 350 in 1904. While the
steady growth was encouraging, Sutherland claimed that 2,000 teachers
were currently needed in the United States, and "hundreds" more to
work in "foreign fields."^1

Special programs were also offered in the winter term. Ministeri-
terial institutes, developed at the request of the state conferences,
were for active pastors who could only devote a "few weeks during the
year to progressive study."^2

Nor were the colporteurs forgotten at Berrien Springs. There
were two canvassers' institutes annually--one during the fall term
and one in the spring. They devoted the first five weeks of each
institute to class work, and the second five weeks to "practical field
experience."^3

Early in 1904 the innovativeness of the school's personnel
was put to the test in the creation of a specialized course of
instruction for new Adventists. As the result of very successful
evangelistic work by Luther Warren in Battle Creek, forty young people
had been converted and had decided to attend Emmanuel Missionary

---

^1 EMC Cal, 1901, p. 44; 1902, p. 30. E. A. Sutherland, "Summer
Schools and Teachers' Institutes," TS Advocate 4 (October 1902):311-
12. [E. A. Sutherland], "Educational Conference and Summer School,"
RH (June 11, 1901):384. E. A. Sutherland, "Problems before Teachers,"
RH 79 (March 27, 1902):21.

^2 EMC Cal, 1902, p. 27.

^3 Ibid.
College to prepare for canvassing and city evangelism. The college tailored a curriculum to fit their special needs.\(^1\)

Through the special study programs, many more students were exposed to the Emmanuel Missionary College philosophy and ideals than would otherwise have been possible. As a result, the influence of the college was felt due to the church workers who left the institution with a more positive attitude toward the school and the educational reforms being experimented with there.

**Problems Relating to Ministerial Training**

While Sutherland felt a deep concern for the training of Christian teachers, he also had an intense desire to train a new breed of ministers through a curriculum that challenged the whole person—the hand as well as the mind and the heart. Had he been allowed to do so, he would have felt justified in making Berrien Springs the center for all denominational ministerial training, for he believed wholeheartedly in the superiority of the school's program.\(^2\)

The ministerial program offered six advantages which Sutherland and the faculty considered of major importance: (1) unusual flexibility in the choice of individual academic programs; (2) the possibility of the accelerated termination of each course; (3) the

---

\(^1\) P. T. Magan to W. C. White, February 9, 1904, EGWRC-DC. EMC Fac Min, February 10, 1904.

completion of a course each term through the one-study plan; (4) monitored field experience; (5) a basic knowledge of agriculture; and (6) the acquisition of a practical trade.¹

Sutherland, therefore, was especially desirous that dedicated young theology students receive their training at Emmanuel Missionary College. The school, however, was impeded in accomplishing all that it might have because of widespread prejudice against Sutherland and his alleged criticisms of the clergy.²

At the turn of the century the spirit and commitment of the Adventist clergy apparently stood at a low ebb. Both Sutherland and Magan had become personally aware of the magnitude of the problem as a result of their involvement in the debt-eradication campaign. As they visited the ministers they had come away distressed over the marked clerical apathy.³

The church and institutional leaders appear to have commented on the lack of ministerial commitment quite frankly among themselves. To the elderly S. N. Haskell, Magan confided that "a large number" of the Adventist ministers were "bearing no fruit." Few, he claimed, "can long be used unless there is a radical change." Daniells and Prescott were reported to hold a similar view: "Both of them," Magan declared, "are firmly of the opinion that a large number of men now in the ministry can never really carry this truth in power. They have

¹EMC Cal, 1901, pp. 35-39; 1902, pp. 24-29.
²W. C. White to P. T. Magan, May 5, 1903, EGWRC-DC.
³P. T. Magan to S. N. Haskell, August 6, 1901, RG 9: Misc Rec, Daniells, A. G. -4, GCAR. A. G. Daniells to E. A. Sutherland, December 20, 1901, RG 11: Bk 25, p. 406, GCAR.
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lost their life and lost their magnetism." When Sutherland wrote to Daniells expressing the need for "earnest, wide-awake, consecrated helpers in our pull against the tide," Daniells admitted: "Sometimes I feel as though I cannot endure the situation, so few are awake."1

Not one to keep silent, Mrs. Druillard was also sharply critical of the Adventist clergy, but she felt that she was only echoing Ellen White, who in the recently published volume 6 of Testimonies for the Church, had done likewise. Mrs. White had written: "How many of our young men will enter the service of God, not to be served, but to serve?" In the past, she claimed, ministers had really struggled for souls, "but now such instances are rare. How many act as if they realized the peril of sinners?" Provoked by the lack of enthusiasm with which some of the leaders and workers shouldered their responsibilities in the debt eradication campaign, W. C. White added his pointed criticisms: "This whole series of wails reflects infidelity and laziness. . . . They were drones before, but we did not recognize the fact so clearly."2

Without a doubt the leadership of the church was concerned over the dearth of consecrated clergy, but it seems they exercised discretion regarding those to whom they spoke or wrote about the matter. Sutherland, apparently, was not sufficiently prudent. Though

1P. T. Magan to S. N. Haskell, August 6, 1901, RG 9: Misc Rec; Daniells, A. G. -4, GCAr.  P. T. Magan to E. G. White, December 5, 1901, EGWRC-DC.  P. T. Magan to W. C. White, September 19, 1901, EGWRC-DC.  A. G. Daniells to E. G. White, October 16, 1901, EGWRC-DC.  A. G. Daniells to E. A. Sutherland, December 20, 1901, RG 11: Bk 25, p. 406, GCAr.

it is not possible to determine how much of the criticism he actually authored and how much was gratuituously attributed to him, his reputation deterred ministerial students from studying at Berrien Springs. In May 1903 W. C. White wrote Magan referring to "Sutherland's ill-advised utterances regarding the ministry." White believed that such criticisms were making it much harder for Sutherland "to secure co-operation in any work which is done under his hand."¹

As W. C. White feared, it was difficult for Sutherland to secure the large response he longed for from potential ministerial students. In the 1902 Calendar Sutherland wrote: "God is at work. One hundred men are wanted to prepare for the ministry,—men who have been called, and who are willing to be tested."² In spite of the earnest appeal, at the beginning of the 1903 fall term, Emmanuel Missionary College had only 70 students in all of the courses. Though attendance later rose to 110, one can easily imagine Sutherland's keen disappointment. While there were a number of other factors that contributed to that low attendance, his perceived attitude toward the ministers certainly hurt the school and kept many from exposure to the reform curriculum of the school. At least somewhat consoling was the fact that those who did attend in 1903-1904 were considered exceptionally fine students. To Daniells, Magan wrote: "We have as fine a class of young ministers, who are also capable, self-reliant, common sense men, as I have ever seen anywhere in my life."³

¹W. C. White to P. T. Magan, May 5, 1903, EGWRC-DC.
²EMC Cal, 1902, p. 24.
³Attendance peaked at 103 during the 1901-1902 year; the figure is not known for 1902-1903; it peaked at 110 during 1903-1904. E. A. Sutherland to W. C. White, February 11, 1902, EGWRC-DC. E. A.
In spite of the rumors and problems Sutherland confronted regarding the Adventist clergy, those who studied for the ministry at Berrien Springs experienced the advantages of the holistic curriculum. In addition, they enjoyed the benefit of a heightened sense of self-government, the training needed to be financially self-supporting and a strengthened commitment to world missions. Sutherland's educational reforms were aimed at creating eminently practical, self-sufficient ministers; well-prepared to work for the church anywhere in the world.

Mission Outreach and Developments in the Church School Movement

Absent in the new school were the thrilling revivals of Battle Creek College, when scores of students were converted and reconverted. The reason was simple: unless one was already an active Christian and felt a strong call of the Lord to mission service, he was not even accepted as a student at Berrien Springs. Consequently, every student and faculty member was expected to continually participate in mission outreach.

There are numerous examples of this. During the summer before the school opened for classes, for instance, students were already helping with biweekly meetings in the village. Admitting a change of attitude as a result of attending those meetings, one local resident said: "At first I was full of prejudice, and did not care to know them [the Adventists]; finally, I attended some of their meetings in

Sutherland to E. G. White, November 5, 1903, EGWRC-DC. P. T. Magan to W. C. White, February 9, 1904, EGWRC-DC. P. T. Magan to A. G. Daniells, November 26, 1903, RG 11: 1903-M, GCAR.
the grove, and I found that my prejudice was without foundation.\(^1\)

A second example involved the local chapter of the Women's Christian Temperance Union. When they requested assistance, Sutherland encouraged the women faculty members to volunteer. Their participation in turn created an interest in Adventist "principles of dress and diet."\(^2\) A third example took place on the day the college opened. Faculty members, Dr. and Mrs. S. P. S. Edwards—medical doctors on loan from the Battle Creek Sanitarium, who would be teaching the natural sciences, physiology, and hygiene—attended patients from the village who needed care. To the Edwards the patients even expressed the hope that "a sanitarium might be established at Berrien Springs."\(^3\)

Concern for student outreach in the large cities prompted Sutherland to encourage the organization of a special "Missionary Society." Among other things, it was to oversee arrangements for students' travel to Chicago and Milwaukee to receive training in big-city evangelism. Classes were scheduled so that the teachers could accompany the students and spend time together with them "in the field." In their determination to produce well-rounded, practical missionaries, every member of the "Missionary Society" was to "have a drill in the actual things needed for field service," whether it be canvassing, house-to-house Bible work, or bookkeeping.\(^4\)


\(^2\) Ibid.


\(^4\) EMC Cal, 1901, p. 18; 1902, p. 15.
Along with his colleagues, Sutherland continually stressed the importance of thinking globally—missions at home and overseas. The thrill of missionary work intensified on the campus when it became known at commencement in 1902 that a student, W. E. Floding, was leaving for Samoa as a missionary under the auspices of the Foreign Mission Board. Supporting the global missions concept, Sutherland and DeGraw, the co-editors of The Advocate, also included frequent articles on mission schools and the need for workers throughout the United States and overseas.

By 1903, in a move to coordinate more effectively the various mission outreaches of the college, the faculty recommended to the students that they add a "Missionary Work Committee" to the nine existing committees in the cooperative plan. In harmony with the counsels of Ellen White, Sutherland also approved the designation of Sundays as a special time for missionary work. All who could participated in Sunday outreach as well as that on Saturdays.

Magan, in a letter to Daniells, described the resultant spirit in the college:

God came very near to us at our faculty meeting last night. The meeting had been called to consider our missionary plans for work with our students in the neighboring towns and villages and country school houses. Many of those present seemed to experience an unutterable longing for more of the simple power of God in order to do this work. Quite a number of people, not of our faith, are even now attending our meetings,

2See January, April, and June 1903 issues of TS Advocate.
3EMC Fac Min, July 5; November 9, 1903. P. T. Magan to E. G. White, November 15, 1903, EGWRC-DC.
which are still held in the College dining room. They come from miles around.

Later he wrote that they had started public meetings in several places; were using five hundred copies a month of "Elder Haskell's little paper"; and intended to "put a copy of the special 'Signs' in every house in this end of Berrien County."\(^2\) In addition to that, Mrs. Druillard reported that students were not only going out and selling books and papers; they also "help the poor and sick."\(^3\)

Not only were both faculty and students directly involved in missionary activities, but they most often worked together. In December 1903 Druillard wrote: "Prof. Sutherland and several of the boys are out today[,] they will take in the country for about six miles." Surely the fact that the college president engaged in missionary work with the students must have made a very favorable impression on both the students and the people they visited.\(^4\)

It was, of course, eminently logical that Sutherland should be directly involved with the students in mission outreach, for that was the very raison d'etre of the college. Undoubtedly, such mission activity proved to be a major unifying factor between administrators, teachers, students, and the people they sought to help. It must also have been a great source of encouragement, which was particularly

\(^1\)P. T. Magan to A. G. Daniells, November 15, 1903, RG 11: 1903-M, GCAR.

\(^2\)P. T. Magan to A. G. Daniells and W. C. White, November 24, 1903, EGWRC-DC.

\(^3\)N. H. Druillard to E. G. White, December 13, 1903, EGWRC-DC.

\(^4\)Ibid.
needed in view of the problems facing the college.

By the time the college moved to Berrien Springs, Sutherland had come to view the establishment of church and industrial schools as one of the most urgent missions of the church. He felt genuine concern as he realized what a small percentage of Adventist children were attending the church schools. In 1903 Sutherland estimated that of the 35,000 school-age children in the Adventist Church, only 5,000 were attending Christian schools.¹

Having realized the need for General Conference support, the church leaders appointed a standing committee in 1901 to oversee the newly created Educational Department of the General Conference. Kellogg became its chairman, and Magan the secretary. Men were also appointed to serve as general educational superintendents for the union conferences throughout the United States. Assisting them were local conference superintendents, whose duty it was to (1) help local churches organize schools, (2) locate teachers, (3) give instruction on educational matters, and (4) search out those who demonstrated ability to teach, encouraging them with financial aid if necessary to acquire the needed teacher training. Thus, the organizational support system for Seventh-day Adventist schools was in place. Sutherland encouraged its full implementation.²

There were three notable developments in the church-school movement introduced by Sutherland during his years at Berrien Springs. They were the unification of the Sabbath schools with the church

¹E. A. Sutherland, "Christian Education," GCB, April 8, 1903, pp. 109-12.
²EMC Cal, 1902, pp. 44-45.
schools, an increased amount of time for teacher training, and the standardization of church-school instruction and testing.

In his search for ways to improve the evangelizing impact of the church schools, Sutherland sought to unite them with the denomination's Sabbath schools. By the time the college had opened at Berrien Springs in 1901, he was advocating a reform in the Adventist Sabbath schools through two means: (1) more adequate preparation of the Sabbath school teachers and (2) the unification of the goals and instruction of the Sabbath schools with those of the church schools.¹

Since the children were in "worldly schools" five days a week, Sutherland reasoned, it was virtually impossible for them to internalize Christian principles with only an hour's instruction on Saturday mornings. In order to increase the potential of both the church-schools and Sabbath schools, he believed it would be necessary, wherever possible, for the superintendent of church schools, to also be in charge of the Sabbath schools to coordinate and strengthen the instruction in both. In addition, the one in charge of the local church school should instruct the Sabbath school teachers in correct teaching methods. Sutherland, of course, perceived that coordinating the two schools would also heighten the parents' interest in sending their children to the church schools, a result he fervently desired.²

Taking advantage of the fact that he was editor of the Advocate, Sutherland published frequent articles emphasizing the need

¹EMC Cal, 1901, pp. 45-46; 1902, p. 32.
²E. A. Sutherland to E. G. White, July 31, 1901, EGWRC-DC.
to closely link the church and Sabbath schools. Consequently, he was gratified when, by action of the General Conference committee, the Sabbath School Worker was merged into the Advocate. Beginning with the January 1902 issue, about a third of every copy of the Advocate was dedicated to the Sabbath school. Particular emphasis was placed on the need of Sabbath school teachers to receive proper teacher training and on the role of the Sabbath school in Christian education. The Advocate had a circulation of 1,500; that of the Sabbath School Worker had reached 5,000. Thus the Advocate would now reach a much greater number of church members.\footnote{GCC Min, October 24, 1901. Prescott presented the idea to the committee. Typical articles were titled "Educated Sabbath School Teachers," TS Advocate 3 (November 1901):284; "Church School and Sabbath School Conventions," (December 1901):328-29.}

While Sutherland could not urge extensive training for Sabbath school teachers, by 1902 he had altered his position regarding the optimum amount of time needed for adequate church-school teacher training. Whereas he had formerly advocated a few months of classroom instruction, followed by actual teaching experience coupled with continuing education, he now recommended a successive three-year curriculum where possible. Since many students did not stay for the three years, however, the school continued to provide intensive summer sessions and correspondence courses.\footnote{EMC Cal, 1902, p. 33.}

At the 1903 General Conference session, changes were made which the church leaders hoped would strengthen the impact of the General Conference Department of Education. In addition, Prescott replaced Kellogg as chairman, and Sutherland took Magan's place as
secretary. Without delay, the new education department leadership made a number of recommendations important to the future of the church school work: (1) the establishment of teachers' institutes to be held at the local conference level; (2) the creation of intermediate schools by local conferences where practicable; (3) the reaffirmation that all schools were to be industrial in character, with particular emphasis on agriculture and the domestic arts, and (4) the suggestion that "church school teachers receive their support from the Conference, the same as other Conference laborers." Unfortunately, as Sutherland and Prescott undoubtedly already knew, the difficulty was not in formulating recommendations, but in getting them voted and carried out by the local conferences. Still the two educational leaders were doing what they could.¹

In an effort to better organize and standardize the quality of church-school instruction, the Lake Union Conference in May 1904 created a board to control the examining, grading, and classifying of teachers. It also passed a resolution urging the local conferences, as far as possible, to pay the travel expenses for church-school teachers attending summer schools and institutes.²

Though some aspects of the church-school movement had not improved as quickly as others, Sutherland must have felt justifiably proud of the fact that by the time he resigned the presidency of Emmanuel Missionary College in May 1904, there were one hundred church schools and five industrial schools in the Lake Union Conference

¹GCC Min, April 8, 1903.
alone. He continued to be concerned, however, for the large majority of Adventist school-age children who were not attending church schools. Remaining in the public schools meant that the children were not being trained from childhood to be missionaries, and that to Sutherland was unconscionable.¹

Medical Work

A medical facility came close to being established at Berrien Springs, but the church failed to act decisively on it. At the opening exercises of the new college in October 1901, the villagers requested that the Adventists build a sanitarium in Berrien Springs.² Receiving the petitioners graciously, the school administrators, nevertheless, tabled the idea since they felt they had all they could do to establish a new college. When the two main buildings of the Battle Creek Sanitarium burned to the ground on February 18, 1902, however, their thoughts turned again to the requested sanitarium.

Following the destruction of the Battle Creek medical facility, Ellen White envisioned the erection of several "smaller institutions" outside Battle Creek. She stated categorically: "In due course of time, a sanitarium will be erected at Berrien Springs." It was "not to compete with any other sanitarium," but was to give the students "an opportunity of learning how to care for the sick."³

³E. G. White to David Paulson, July 22, 1902, EGWRC-DC. For details on Ellen White's reaction to the Battle Creek sanitarium fire, see A. White, E. G. White: The Early Elmshaven Years, pp. 148-63.
Consequently, when W. C. White visited Berrien Springs in the early winter of 1902-1903, he selected a ten-acre sanitarium site within a ten-minute walk of the college buildings. The Lake Union Conference officers agreed to spend December 13-14 on the property to discuss details. While there, they voted that architectural plans be drawn up. They also urged that financial contributions be given in time to begin construction by March 1, 1903. For their part, the school administrators would donate the selected ten acres to the "Berrien Springs Medical Missionary and Sanitarium Association." In a united effort, the local church and village citizens would raise $1,500, the West Michigan Conference would allot $3,000, and the Lake Union Conference would show support with $3,000. Plans were to be drawn for a two-and-one-half story frame building that, with "bathrooms equipped," would cost no more than $5,000. Since the students at Emmanuel Missionary College could not be expected to donate money they were asked to provide free labor for room and board.¹

On December 14, 1902, the full report was ready, and the local Adventists filled the church to hear it read. Slips were passed out with the request that everyone subscribe money and labor "as they felt it their privilege to contribute." Naturally, they were greatly encouraged when, at the end of the meeting, the leaders announced that $1,132 in money and $261 in labor had been pledged. The church members promptly volunteered to canvass the community to ask for their support as well.²

¹W. C. White to E. G. White, December 7, 15, 1902, EGWRC-DC.
²W. C. White to E. G. White, December 15, 1902, EGWRC-DC.
In spite of the initial enthusiasm, by June 1903 the entire project had ground to a halt. W. C. White, in a letter to Mrs. Druillard, wondered if Magan or Sutherland were at fault, but she assured him that they were "more anxious for it than any one else." The "Conference men," she explained, had decided that it was too big a project to undertake until the school worked free of its financial pressure. As far as Druillard was concerned, the conference had made a right decision to postpone the project. Well acquainted with the dire financial situation in the Lake Union Conference, she said her only fear was that "they might again revive this Sanitarium enterprise before they can properly care for it." Everyone, she claimed, seemed agreed that it was "God's plan that the Sanitarium should wait."  

Again, in May 1904, Ellen White pricked the consciences of the church leaders as she spoke of the "many, many souls" who needed to be "helped into the way by being brought into connection with our sanitariums." She added emphatically: "These sanitariums should be established in such places as Hinsdale, Takoma Park, and Berrien Springs. This is the light that the Lord has given."  

Many years later S. P. S. Edwards, a physician who had been an Emmanuel Missionary College faculty member at the time, recalled that

Kellogg and the Gen. Conf. men all oposed [sic] it [the Berrien Springs sanitarium] because B. C. Was [sic] so big

---

1 N. H. Druillard to W. C. White, June 7, 1903, EGWRC-DC. W. C. White to E. A. Sutherland, April 28, 1902, EGWRC-DC.

2 E. G. White to L. M. Hall, May 26, 1904, EGWRC-DC.
it needed all the patients in Michigan and they did not want us to raise $40,000 [he must have meant $4,000] to help pay for a building.

The circumstances made it very difficult for the leaders at Berrien Springs. At the very time that the Lake Union Conference was trying to carry forward the Berrien Springs sanitarium project, Kellogg and the hapless General Conference men were desperately trying to raise money to pay for the rebuilding of the Battle Creek facility. Thus it appears that the contravention of the counsels of Ellen White against the rebuilding of the sanitarium at Battle Creek played a major role in the demise of the plans for a sanitarium in Berrien Springs.

Vital to Sutherland's concept of adequate training for teachers, ministers, and all other students was participation in the school's program of manual labor. Without a doubt Sutherland would have liked to be able to offer the Emmanuel Missionary College students opportunities for the medical missionary training that a campus sanitarium would have provided. But it was not to be. A variety of other areas of manual training, however, were readily available.

Manual Labor

By the time the college was moved to Berrien Springs, Sutherland had believed in the work-study concept for nearly ten years. Certain that the counsels of Ellen White urged the inclusion of manual labor as an indispensable part of a balanced education, he had begun to emphasize the importance of physical labor in connection with

---

1S. P. S. Edwards to E. K. Vande Vere, December 5, 1957, Vande Vere Coll, AUHR.
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academic studies while still at Walla Walla. In Battle Creek Sutherland annoyed some who felt he was pushing the labor idea too quickly, while at the same time he was chastened by Ellen White for not being bolder in carrying out manual-labor reform. Berrien Springs, however, offered unparalleled opportunities for the development of manual labor: an entire school needed to be built, much of the 272 acres needed to be farmed, and the denomination's educational journal and new textbooks needed to be printed.

One of the major barriers to a successful work-study program that Sutherland had encountered at Walla Walla and Battle Creek was that of convincing the faculty not only to accept the importance of manual labor but to be willing to get their own hands dirty. Until the faculty were willing to participate personally in manual labor themselves, they could scarcely expect enthusiastic student involvement. It was a problem that Ellen White addressed in 1901. "Because the teachers may never have been trained to physical, manual labor," she penned, "they are not easily persuaded in regard to the very best methods to secure for the youth an all-around education."^1

At Berrien Springs the college personnel were willing to be involved in manual labor, partly because they had been impressed with its value while still at Battle Creek. Not all who came to Berrien Springs to study, however, were favorable to obligatory participation in physical work as a part of education. Some, having already worked as teachers in other schools, came to Emmanuel Missionary College for additional training. Regarding the attitude of a few of these, Mrs.

^1E. G. White, "To the Ministers and Other Friends of the Berrien Springs School," December 27, 1901, EGWRC-DC.
Druillard wrote: "Sometimes it seemed as if some of the real good teachers[,] those who had the best education[,] would leave the school rather than work." The same was true of some of the younger, inexperienced students. Though they were a carefully selected group, Druillard lamented, "many of the students did not want to work, [but] wanted to pay money and not do any physical labor."¹

Notwithstanding the resistance of some students, the 1901 school Calendar announced: "Every student should, during his stay in College, become master of some trade." Everyone must spend "a portion of each day in some one of the various departments of manual training." Continuing the practice begun at Battle Creek, once a student reached an acceptable degree of proficiency in his work, he was credited with payment toward his school expenses. But for the first time, students at Berrien Springs, wherever feasible, "worked by the piece." This was done to compensate the "rapid and faithful workmen" justly, and to encourage change in the "slow and careless student."²

The question of how many hours of daily work should be required was an issue. Magan had been of the opinion, before the college opened in 1901, that there should be a three-hour-a-day minimum. During most of the three-year period that Sutherland was at Berrien Springs, however, the school appears to have required two hours of physical work daily. Lights went out at 9:30 p.m. and the

¹N. H. Druillard to E. G. White, August 5, 1902, EGWRC-DC. Cf. E. A. Sutherland to E. G. White, November 25, 1902, EGWRC-DC.
rising bell rang at 5:30 a.m. Manual labor was scheduled from 7:30 to 9:30 a.m.; study and homework 9:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. and from 2 p.m. to 7 p.m. There was daily chapel from 7:30 to 8:15 p.m. and "open time" until lights went out. The dining room served two meals a day for everyone, and supper for those who desired it. Friday mornings were called "Administration Day." In the forenoon students attended classes dedicated to the study of all phases of the work encompassed in the cooperative plan. Sundays were spent doing mission outreach. The areas of manual labor available at Berrien Springs were similar to those at Battle Creek: agriculture, carpentry, printing, sewing, baking, cooking, bee culture, laundry, and tailoring. Opportunities were greatest within agriculture and carpentry.¹

¹P. T. Magan to S. N. Haskell, August 6, 1901, RG 9: Misc Rec, Daniels, A. G. –4, GCAR. EMC Fac Min, July 1, September 2, October 1, 19, 1903; March 16, 1904. EMC Fall Announcement, 1903, p. 6. Vande Vere stated that the students worked eight hours a day and attended classes three hours each evening. That schedule, however, was followed only by the industrial students who attended night school while trying to accumulate enough savings to enroll in the standard academic program. The regular students worked a very reasonable two hours a day. Also, during the first school year at Berrien Springs, a two-meal-a-day plan was apparently followed as Vande Vere claims. From July 1902, however, supper was also served from 6:00 to 6:30 p.m. to those students who ordered it. Though Vande Vere intimates that "Fletcherizing—thoroughly masticating the food to facilitate digestion" was practiced at Berrien Springs, virtually no evidence has been found to substantiate that it was advocated or practiced. Nor would the practice of it have "contributed to the universal hunger" on campus as Vande Vere asserts. His single cited source regarding the fletcherizing is a statement found in the diary of a 17-year-old student, Mae McChesney—"'Do not have time to talk at the tables as we are fletcherizing.'" Mae McChesney diary, January 12, 1904, Vande Vere Coll, AUHR. Vande Vere, Wisdom Seekers, pp. 108, 110. EMC Fac Min, July 2, 1903. S. N. Haskell, "A Modern Prophets' School," RH 80 (August 20, 1903):13. For a daily schedule of the summer school, see M. B. DeGraw, "Happenings at Summer Assembly," RH 79 (July 1, 1902):24. Richard W. Schwarz repeats the Vande Vere errors of long hours of work and two meals a day in his Light Bearers to the Remnant, pp. 303-4. The same two errors are repeated by George R. Knight in his Myths in Adventism (Washington, DC: Review and Herald Pub. Assn., 1985), p. 33.
Construction

Building an entire college from scratch was the most sobering, yet exciting challenge that faced the administrators at Berrien Springs. They were determined to prove, to their own satisfaction and to everyone who was interested, that an entire school could be built primarily by student/faculty labor.¹

During the three years of the Sutherland administration at Berrien Springs, the student/faculty labor force successfully erected four major buildings: "Manual Arts," "Advocate," "Domestic Arts," and "Study." They also built "Memorial Hall," a church-school building, a small canning factory, several faculty houses, about twenty-five cottages for summer-school use, and sundry utility buildings.²

The three principal decisions confronting the administrators as they prepared for construction were the location of the buildings, their design, and the choice of building materials. While those decisions were difficult ones, other problems made progress on construction difficult; sometimes nearly impossible. For example, they had to build an institution without adequate money, without incurring debt, without skilled labor, and without plentiful potable water.³

¹E. A. Sutherland to E. G. White, May 27, 1902; November 5, 1903, EGWRC-DC.
³EMC Bd Min, September 24, 1901.
Making preparations for the first school year at Berrien Springs, Sutherland issued a recruitment call in the Review and Herald for three groups of worker/students: (1) "competent carpenters, masons, and mechanics" who were willing to donate labor in exchange for room, board, and "evening studies"; (2) "men who are good workmen, but who do not feel able to donate their labor" (these workers would attend the regular classes and their wages would be applied on college tuition); and (3) "young men and women who desire to learn a trade with the view of becoming self-supporting missionaries." As soon as this last group became proficient enough at their chosen trade, they would also be paid a wage which would be applied on their college bill.  

Though the worker/student response was not large--103 students matriculated by December 1901--the school now had a nucleus to begin its experiment in building with student labor. It would be some months, however, before materials and plans would be ready for actual construction. The situation was further complicated that fall by Magan's nearly fatal bout with typhoid fever. His illness left the school without a business manager, fund raiser, and general overseer of the building program. 

Encouragingly, the school administrators received generous offers of support from unexpected quarters. At the time the purchase

\(^1\)E. A. Sutherland, "Emmanuel Missionary College," RH 78 (August 13, 1901):530.

\(^2\)P. T. Magan to E. G. White, December 5, 1901, EGWRC-DC. E. A. Sutherland to W. C. White, December 13, 1901, EGWRC-DC. W. C. White to E. A. Sutherland, February 18, 1902, EGWRC-DC.
of the property was being finalized in Berrien Springs, the architectural firm of W. H. Parsons & Son (apparently Seventh-day Adventists), of Des Moines, Iowa, offered to furnish plans for the new college free of cost. Their offer was gratefully accepted by the college board. In addition, the president of the Milwaukee, Benton Harbor, and Columbus Railroad, which connected the college with the Michigan Central Line on the east and the lake shore and steamers on the west, offered to haul all of the brick and lumber for the building construction "free of charge for four years," and give annual passes to "every member of the college staff." The steamboat companies also offered generous "favors." To Sutherland and Magan it all seemed providential.1

On January 29, 1902, the college board named Sutherland, Prescott, and S. H. Lane (president of the Southern Illinois Conference) as the building-plans committee. To establish guidelines, the members of the board also voted that the school be built to accommodate a maximum of two hundred students; the buildings should not be "over two stories in height, plus attic space"; and they should erect the dining hall first. In addition, they voted to erect a "permanent work-shop immediately." Hard-pressed for funds to initiate construction, Daniells moved that sixty to one hundred acres of the recently purchased college land be sold "to proper parties on proper terms." That Daniells would move to sell some of the acreage reveals his

1The Parsons' contribution was valued at from $500 to $1,000. EMC Bd Min, July 12, 14, 1901. [E. A. Sutherland], "Emmanuel Missionary College," RH 78 (September 10, 1901):596. P. T. Magan to E. G. White, July 19, 1901, EGWRC-DC.
distress over the critical lack of needed funds, because it was he
who had urged the purchase of the entire 272 acres for the college
when the board of trustees had considered buying less. His rationale
at the time was that in Australia, "Sr. White had counselled the buy­ing of plenty of land, so as to be well protected from having others
crowd in upon the school." In spite of their financial distress,
there is no evidence that the land was offered for sale.¹

Sutherland and Magan had determined from the beginning to keep
the buildings small and simple so unskilled laborers could more easily
construct them. Moreover, small buildings, they reasoned, would avoid
an undesirably "strong institutional spirit and the idea of centrali­
zation." When word reached them that fire had destroyed the two main
buildings of the Battle Creek Sanitarium in December 1901, they per­
ceived another good reason for not centralizing the entire operation
in one or two large buildings. Writing helpful details following the
fire, W. C. White counselled that: (1) the buildings should not stand
"too close together"; (2) the school should have "an ample water
supply"; and (3) facilities "for fighting fire" should be provided.
All agreed that the potential for disaster by fire would be much
greater if the school were housed in large four- to five-story
buildings--a plan which would have been in harmony with traditional
Adventist collegiate architecture.²

¹EMC Bd Min, July 12, 1901; January 29, 1902.
²P. T. Magan to S. N. Haskell, August 6, 1901, RG 9: Misc Rec,
Daniells, A. G. -4, GCAr. W. C. White to E. A. Sutherland, February
18, 1902, EGWRC-DC. EMC Cal, 1902, pp. 7, 8. In 1904 W. C. White
wrote that his mother had not approved of the large single building
at Walla Walla College. She recommended that the "cottage plan" be
followed as much as possible. W. C. White to M. B. Van Kirk, January
8, 1904, EGWRC-DC.
Both Prescott and W. C. White submitted detailed campus-layout plans, but the college board, because of the lay of the land, modified their plans and changed the suggested location of the buildings. Instead of following a diamond-shaped layout of the main structures, as recommended by White, the buildings were placed in a non-traditional informal arrangement.¹

Brick and wood were the two materials considered for construction. The architect urged the use of brick, and the board members agreed. Magan pointed out that they could utilize the "excellent brick clay" that was available next to their property and bake their own bricks. Sutherland and the college board supported the idea. W. C. White, however, just returned from Australia where he had been directly involved in the initial construction of Avondale College, wrote to Magan in September suggesting that the buildings could be built "much more quickly and easily and with less expense, if built of wood." The architect argued that brick has a "more substantial appearance," is more permanent, and over the years proves cheaper than wood. These arguments were appealing, but the immediate finances were lacking. Thus the factors of cost and time made it expedient to follow W. C. White's counsel. Consequently, all of the earliest buildings were constructed of hemlock, a wood inferior to but cheaper than yellow pine.²

¹W. C. White to P. T. Magan, September 13, 1901, RG 9: Misc Rec, Fld 2, White, W. C. GCAR. EMC Bd Min, April 23, 1902. W. C. White to E. G. White, December 7, 1902, EGWRC-DC.

²P. T. Magan to S. N. Haskell, August 6, 1901, RG 9: Misc Rec, Daniells, A. G. -4, GCAR. EMC Bd Min, January 29; April 23, 1902. W. C. White to P. T. Magan, September 13, 1901, RG 9: Misc Rec, Fld 2, White, W. C., GCAR. P. T. Magan to E. G. White, August 2, 1903, EGWRC-DC.
By the spring of 1902 the personnel who would direct construction were on campus, ready to begin the needed preparations. Also, Magan was fast regaining his health and able to work again, George Nichols had been hired to serve as business manager, and, most important, A. S. Baird—a very capable builder—had come to oversee the construction. Baird initially was very dubious about the feasibility of building using unskilled help for the building project. Thus he, with the student laborers, built a house first rather than a large building. Completed by the end of May, it was rented to Sutherland.¹

While the students did reasonably acceptable work, Baird expressed concern that their involvement would increase building costs, at least until they learned the trade. Nevertheless, though some of their colleagues urged that the construction be contracted out to save money, Sutherland and Magan were unflinching in their

¹E. A. Sutherland to E. G. White, April 13; May 27, 1902, EGWRC-DC. Cf. W. C. White to A. S. Baird, March 17, 1902, EGWRC-DC. E. A. Sutherland to W. C. White, February 28, 1902, EGWRC-DC. Baird was a brick maker, stone mason, carpenter, and cabinet maker, who was earning $10 a day when he had become an Adventist fifteen years earlier. At the time he was asked to head construction at Emmanuel Missionary College, he was in charge of the "Helping Hands Mission" for the Nebraska Adventist conference. The "Mission" was paying its way by conducting a woodyard for the benefit of derelicts from the slums. They worked to help Baird supply wood, charcoal, and coal to hotels, bakeries, and restaurants in Omaha. He would testify later that he had hesitated "for some time" to accept the position at Berrien Springs—partly because he was loathe to give up his mission work in Omaha, and partly because he had "but little confidence" in the plan to build with unskilled student help. He wrote, however, that circumstances had "almost forced" him to take the position, implying that the call was providential. Baird proved to be a great asset to the school in its building program and practical instruction in several construction-related trades. E. A. Sutherland to W. C. White, February 28, 1902, EGWRC-DC. A. S. Baird, "The Spirit of a Training School," TS Advocate 5 (March 1903):91. Faculty members were allowed up to one acre on which to build their own homes. If they financed it they were not charged "ground rent." EMC Bd Min, January 29, 1902.
conviction to use student labor. If the buildings were put up "by teachers and students," they reasoned, it would in the long run generate such an enthusiasm "among the students and teachers everywhere that thousands and thousands of dollars [would] be saved to the cause." Sutherland was determined to "set before the teachers and students the idea that it is possible for them to go into new places and start schools, without taking men a long distance to do the work" of construction.1

Pleased with Baird's work, the only complaint the school administrators made against him was that "he is inclined to use better material than is sometimes required." They evidently saw this as a serious problem because of their perennial shortage of funds. Evaluating the erection of Sutherland's house, Baird admitted that simply by "using student help, and not fully understanding the price of material and the cheapest methods of putting up the basement wall, etc.," the house had cost several hundred dollars more than it would have otherwise. On the other hand, he insisted that he was learning, and that if he were to build it again, he could do so for $300 less.2

Apparently, the houses of Sutherland and Magan, when completed, looked too nice in the estimation of some church members. According to S. P. S. Edwards, reminiscing years later, it was Sally Sutherland who had thought of building the house. Edwards ungraciously claimed that she "loved the outdoors and to play with flowers and draw pictures and dress prettily and have nice things[,] including nice homes." While those are not objectionable interests under normal

---

1EMC Bd Min, January 29, 1902. 2Ibid.
circumstances, the situation at Berrien Springs was not "normal" in terms of finances and living accommodations. Consequently, criticism arose regarding the size of Sutherland's house, named "Brooknook," and also of Magan's, called "Shamrock Place." Sensitive to such criticisms, Sutherland and Magan offered to give up their homes at a college board meeting in June 1902. The board members, however, rejected their offer.¹

In spite of the board's decision, criticism continued to circulate regarding the excessive amounts that had been invested and against the "fine and showy" appearance of the houses. Thus at a board meeting on October 2, 1902, Sutherland felt constrained to raise the issue again. He explained that when he and Magan had submitted their plans to the architects in the early spring, they had been assured that neither house would cost over $1,500. Because of "inexperienced help" and the "unorganized condition of the work," the actual cost, he admitted, had "far exceeded that." The houses looked so attractive that Sutherland, speaking for himself and Magan, explained that they feared to live in them lest it "might injure the work"—specifically the sale of Christ's Object Lessons. Therefore, they had decided to offer the houses for use as girls' dormitories. Sutherland and Magan insisted that they would build "two cottages that would be in keeping with the humble and simple plan of work which should be established at Berrien Springs." Though Christiansen, the farm manager, urged that the board members accede to the men's wishes,

¹S. P. S. Edwards to E. K. Vande Vere, February 3, 1958, Vande Vere Coll, AUHR. EMC Bd Min, June 20, 1902. Magan's house was not completed until approximately September 1902. P. T. Magan to W. C. White, August 6, 1902, EGWRC-DC.
their offer was again rejected. The matter, apparently, was not brought up again. Thus the college administrators were able to provide their families with comfortable living quarters in their relatively spacious homes, and to provide needed lodging for many of the visitors who frequented the campus.\(^1\)

By the spring of 1902 the school administrators were particularly anxious to begin construction of the major buildings. In April Sutherland reported that the weather was favorable. Since a large influx of students would arrive for summer school in early June, he felt it was urgent that they immediately build dining-room and kitchen accommodations for 150 to 200 people. He was also anxious to have a new building for the printing office because it was housed in "poor quarters." To expedite matters, a commissary department was organized to handle all building supplies and materials, a "responsible man" was selected to run it, teams and wagons and any other needed "conveyances" were voted immediate purchase, and the location of a permanent well was to be decided at once.\(^2\)

In the early summer of 1902, construction began on the four major buildings destined to house the principal operations of Emmanuel

---

\(^1\) EMC Bd Min, October 2, 1902. The construction funds for the Sutherland and Magan houses were not "'Christ's Object Lessons' money nor school money." The board reasoned, therefore, that they should stay in the houses built for them. No indication is given, however, as to the source of the money. It is unlikely that either man could have paid for his own construction. Furthermore, Sutherland says he "rented" the house, which, according to the policy, he would not have had to do if he were the owner. Cf. EMC Bd Min, January 29, 1902. E. A. Sutherland to E. G. White, May 27, 1902, EGWRC-DC.

\(^2\)E. A. Sutherland to E. G. White, April 13, 1902, EGWRC-DC. EMC Bd Min, April 16, 1902.
Missionary College. In answer to Sutherland's call for students who wanted to earn their school year's expenses by working in construction, fifty to sixty young men were available to work. The administrators planned to complete essentially the four buildings by late fall.¹

The manual arts building was the first major structure erected on the campus at Berrien Springs. Completed by the end of July 1902, it measured 34 by 62 feet, had a "fine basement," two stories, and a "garret." The basement temporarily housed the dining room and kitchen needed to feed approximately 200 people--residents on the campus and those attending summer school. The store and carpenter shop occupied the first floor, and young men liyed on the second floor.² They possibly occupied the attic as well, since living quarters were at a premium.

Because the administrators were anxious to get the printing operation out of "poor quarters," Advocate Hall was erected concurrently with the manual arts building. Its external appearance was very similar to the manual arts structure and it was "about the same size." Though it apparently was still under construction when the manual arts building was finished, Advocate Hall must have been ready for occupancy sometime during the summer of 1902. Its basement served for storage; the first floor housed the printing office. The plan

¹ E. A. Sutherland to E. G. White, October 5, 1902, EGWRC-DC. P. T. Magan to W. C. White, August 6, 1902, EGWRC-DC.

was eventually to locate the bindery and folding room on the second floor, but for the time being it was divided in two—the south room serving as general business office for the college, and the north room "ingeniously divided off by movable wardrobes and curtains, and occupied by twelve young men as a dormitory."^1

During the summer of 1902, rain fell nearly every day throughout May and June and most of July. In spite of that, the campus was a beehive of activity. While erecting the manual arts and Advocate Hall structures as rapidly as possible, the crew also completed the "large brick basement" and the framing of the domestic arts building. In addition, they laid "the stone foundations" for the study hall building. Magan, in a letter to W. C. White, lamented: "If our money was [sic] only coming faster than it is, we could push things more rapidly, but with our law that we will not go in debt a penny, we are sometimes delayed on account of means." During the construction that summer, occasionally a halt was called because of a lack of material and no money to buy more. On these occasions teachers and students held special sessions of prayer. Students offered to donate their labor rather than have the work stop. Later, recounting the experience, DeGraw wrote: "At such times it seemed that the Spirit moved

---

^1E. A. Sutherland to E. G. White, April 13, 1902, EGWRC-DC. EMC Bd Min, June 19, 1902. P. T. Magan to W. C. White, August 6, 1902, EGWRC-DC. W. C. White to Mae [White], November 30, 1902, EGWRC-DC. Vande Vere described dimensions of both buildings as 32 by 64 feet, while Magan said the manual arts building was 34 by 62 feet. Vande Vere apparently used Haskell as his source. Vande Vere also claimed that Advocate Hall was the "first structure erected in 1902 for educational purposes." The evidence, however, does not support that conclusion. Vande Vere, Wisdom Seekers, p. 106. S. N. Haskell, "A Modern Prophets' School," RH 80 (August 20, 1903):13. Cf. P. T. Magan to W. C. White, August 6, 1902, EGWRC-DC. EMC Bd Min, June 19; July 2, 1902.
Upon other hearts also, and the situation was relieved. ¹

When W. C. White visited the campus on Sabbath, November 29, 1902, he was pleased to find the domestic arts building in use. Increasingly proficient at their work, the students had succeeded in helping to build the largest campus structure to date—38 by 95 feet, with an annex 37 by 38 feet. The stone basement housed the "furnaces, store-rooms, grocery store, etc." Now able to place it in its permanent location, they moved the dining room and kitchen out of the basement of the manual arts building and installed them on the first floor of the new edifice. Lacking a more adequate place, the dining room also served as general assembly room and Sabbath school quarters. The women's dormitory would eventually occupy the second floor, but for the time being the space was needed for "recitation rooms," so the young women lived on the third floor. ²

In addition to the three major buildings erected in 1902, the hard-working construction crew managed to erect a church-school building by fall. W. C. White described it as "a neat little building


²W. C. White to Mae [White], November 30, 1902, EGWRC-DC. S. N. Haskell, "A Modern Prophets' School," RH 80 (August 20, 1903): 13. Describing the domestic arts building, Vande Vere states that because of "semi-skilled carpenters" it ended up "twenty-two inches narrower" at one end. His source, however, was E. L. Cardey, who wrote of incidents that had transpired fifty-four years earlier. While the size discrepancy may be true, the context of Cardey's letter contains other identifiable errors of memory, thus casting doubt on the accuracy of that detail. In any case, based on Cardey's recollection, the size discrepancy in the building was reputedly discovered and reported to Baird by Cardey, himself a "semi-skilled carpenter." No other corroborative evidence has been found. Vande Vere, Wisdom Seekers, p. 106. E. L. Cardey to E. K. Vande Vere, July 17, 1956, Vande Vere Coll, AUHR.
costing about five hundred or six hundred dollars, and having accommodations for between thirty and forty students.¹

During 1903 a number of buildings were erected on the campus, but three are particularly noteworthy. Two of them were Small--Memorial Hall and the canning factory, but the study-hall building was the largest building they had erected to that time.

Unable to garner adequate funds to complete more than the foundation wall of the study hall building before winter 1902, the college administrators had it tarpapered to await the next spring and, hopefully, the needed money to continue construction. Sutherland and Magan were no doubt sorely disappointed when the board of trustees decided in May 1903 that the modified plans for the study hall were still "too elaborate, and too expensive."²

The architect's original plan had called for a very large building which included a central chapel with an organ loft and gallery. Because that plan had been considered too costly, Baird, with several students to help him, had worked all winter modifying the plans, though he had followed the architect's basic layout. When the board rejected Baird's plans, he apparently worked intensively, and by early June he presented "new plans" that were designed to follow the "plainest possible style." The new plans suggested the use of hemlock, except for the long rafters which had to be of yellow pine, "cast iron builders' hardware" instead of bronze, rough plaster finishing, and the elimination of all the window casings. Stoves

¹W. C. White to Mae [White], November 30, 1902, EGWRC-DC.

would be used for heating because there was no prospect of funds for a furnace. In spite of incorporating what he considered to be every economizing measure, Baird doubted the entire building, exclusive of the basement and heating, could be built for $8,500, but he and his crew would try.¹

Money was so scarce by September 1903, the administration had been forced to borrow $7,700 against promised funds from the sale of Christ's Object Lessons. By October Ellen White wrote to Prescott and Daniells tactfully urging them to do more to help the school.

I hope that Brethren Magan and Sutherland can be relieved of the strain under which they have been laboring. . . . I hope that the teachers and students there will be provided with comfortable quarters in which to pass the winter. I wish I had more means: for I should be so glad to help our brethren at Berrien Springs in this their time of need.²

Throughout the summer and fall of 1903, the construction crew worked tirelessly on the study hall. Part of the original foundation, the "octagons," had to be destroyed and rebuilt to make a "plain, rectangular foundation." The completed structure measured 60 by 110 feet, only about half the size called for in the original plan. It contained a two-story chapel with a balcony, organ, and choir lofts; a study hall; library; reading room; president's office; science rooms; laboratory; a "large committee assembly room"; and eight classrooms. Still lacking cottages or dormitories, male students lived in the "large open room at the top." Somehow they had found funds for the purchase of a furnace, which was installed in the basement

¹EMC Bd Min, May 6; September 8, 1903. P. T. Magan to A. G. Daniells, June 9, 1903, RG 11: 1903 -M, GCAr.

²E. G. White to W. W. Prescott and A. G. Daniells, October 14, 1903, EGWRC-DC. EMC Bd Min, September 8, 1903.
entirely by student labor at an estimated savings of $400 to $500. Finally, just weeks before the end of 1903, Sutherland gratefully watched faculty and students move into their long-awaited study-hall building.¹

Memorial Hall, one of the smallest buildings built in 1903, was a summer pavilion built to replace the main tent that was used for the annual teachers' institutes and summer schools that met on the Emmanuel Missionary College campus. At those summer convocations, mosquitoes made life quite unpleasant for everyone. Weather was also unpredictable. Wanting to help to solve the problem, Ida Magan, Percy's wife, together with an anonymous donor, gave a total of $500 toward the erection of a simple structure to be centrally located in the beautiful area of trees that was called "Memorial Grove." Octagonal in shape, the pavilion had a solid wall three feet high around the base with a gently sloping, shingle roof. The rest of the walls were screened all the way around. Sutherland explained that it was named "Memorial" Hall "as a remembrance of God's goodness in bringing us out into the country, and into the woods, where we can be alone with Him, and the things of nature." Located in a meandering circle around the pavilion were about twenty-five cottages built with funds donated specifically for the summer-school cottages. Because of a

chronic lack of money, Sutherland was unable to erect other cottages which he had planned to use as homelike living quarters for the regular students.¹

The most speculative enterprise constructed during the spring of 1903 was a fledgling canning factory. A group of the teachers, at their own expense, put up a small building—16 by 32 feet. In it they placed a "little simple machinery, in which to do some canning of fruit in glass, and also in which to put up some fruit juices in bottles for the market." Their plan, if the project succeeded, was to turn it over to the school. If it failed they would bear the loss. The details of the construction of the little building demonstrate how successfully the students were learning the skills of the carpenter. The foundation had been put in and one thousand feet of lumber were located at the site. Promptly at 7:30 a.m., twelve students began to build. By the end of the day the building was up and shingled, the doors were ready to hang, and the first coat of paint was on.²

Though one Adventist historian stated that, by design, the college leaders did not heat the buildings, heated buildings were not a luxury but an absolute necessity, given the temperatures of Michigan winters. Most of the buildings on the campus were heated by central


furnaces. Where furnaces had not yet been installed, stoves were used.¹

The most potentially dangerous problem that continually confronted the Sutherland administration was the scarcity of adequate potable water. It was not until after Sutherland had gone to Tennessee that pure, abundant water was finally found at the college.

A water supply committee, appointed in January 1902, ordered the drilling of several wells, but by October it reported "very little success." Some of the board members thought the solution might be the use of a larger bore. Consequently, in November a committee arranged to put down a four-inch well and install a pumping plant. By June 1903, however, Magan admitted that the well, located by the manual arts building, was too shallow. A water analysis had proven it unfit as drinking water unless boiled. The only solution lay in

¹Vande Vere claimed that by 1902 a "true concept" of a "correct" college plant had evolved in Sutherland's mind. It was to be a place "without heat and electricity," as in the mission field. He based his fallacious claim on a statement that was made not by Sutherland but by Magan in the Advocate. There is, however, no evidence of a developed "true concept" even in Magan's thinking. The evidence supports the fact that Sutherland and Magan (the Advocate article not withstanding), from early 1902, fully intended to heat the buildings. In fact, in October 1903 the complaint was that the dining room was sometimes "overheated." It is true that in November 1903, to economize during the winter, the faculty voted that students study in the "reading room" during the day instead of their individual rooms. Nonetheless, in December 1903, a Dr. Christmann was asked to recommend proper temperatures for the rooms. His recommendation of "68 degrees Fr. for living rooms, and 60 degrees Fr. for sleeping rooms," would be considered reasonable even today. Electricity was added as they could afford it. Vande Vere, Wisdom Seekers, pp. 106-7. P. T. Magan, "Emmanuel Missionary College," TS Advocate 4 (May 1902):156. EMC Fac Min, October 15, 22; November 14, 27; December 18, 1903. EMC Bd Min, January 29, 1902. Cf. P. T. Magan to A. G. Daniells, November 26, 1903, RG 11: 1903 -M, GCAr. P. T. Magan, "From Book to Building," RH 80 (December 31, 1903):19.
sinking a deep well, but it was a prohibitive expense, given their shortage of money. Magan estimated that a deep well and pumping plant would cost at least $2,000. In October he lamented to Mrs. White: "No one knows how much we are suffering for facilities yet at Berrien Springs. We have no well at all at present." Having suffered through the illness himself, and with two students ill with an undiagnosed fever, Magan dreaded that typhoid fever might hit the campus.¹

Writing to Ellen White in December 1903, Mrs. Druillard described an unpleasant winter scene: "We have very cold weather and much snow. We have not the water plant in yet, and it is very inconvenient drawing water in barrels [in] this cold weather." Prompted by the urgency of the situation, at one of the cooperative plan meetings during January, a number of the male students offered to help Baird dig a well. They began the following day, but apparently the results once again were unsatisfactory.²

It was not until ten months later at a college board meeting on November 29, 1904, that N. W. Kauble, Sutherland's replacement as president, was finally able to announce that by sinking the shaft "a little further" in the well that had been dug by the manual arts building in 1903, they had "found an abundant supply of water, which promised to be permanent." What a lot of problems would have been avoided had the Sutherland administration only known the solution to its water problem.³

¹EMC Bd Min, January 29; October 2; November 18, 1902. P. T. Magan to A. G. Daniells, June 9, 1903, RG 11: 1903 -M, GCAr. P. T. Magan to E. G. White, October 7, 1903, DF 256, EGWRC-DC.

²N. H. Druillard to E. G. White, December 13, 1903, EGWRC-DC. EMC Fac Min, January 30, 1904.

³EMC Bd. Min, November 29, 1904.
Sutherland, Magan, and Baird, with a hard-working group of faculty and students, had succeeded in building an entire college. No small task under favorable conditions, it was made especially difficult given their circumstances. Nor were the buildings excessively small or overly plain. In fact, the domestic arts and study-hall structures were gratifyingly attractive. Most of the money for construction had come from the sluggish sales of Christ's Object Lessons. Magan also collected considerable funds through private solicitation. At a chapel service he reported to the students that he had enjoyed "fairly good success" at gathering funds the week before, but that "some brother" had told him that he had already selected a text for Magan's funeral—"And the poor beggar died."¹

The efficient construction work carried on seemed to confirm the wisdom of Sutherland's determination to build with student/faculty labor. By mid-summer of 1902 Magan was already reporting his pleasure at Baird's ability to teach and the students' readiness to learn. He reported that a few students were already doing well as stone and brick masons, and some who had "hardly [known] a saw from a hammer" were now "very fair carpenters." Sutherland spoke of one young man who had become the main plasterer. Since the young man had discovered that he could do the work successfully, "his very disposition" seemed to "have changed." In a letter to Ellen White, Sutherland exulted:

We have had no serious accidents. . . . The erection of our buildings by students has developed an excellent spirit in

our school, and has been the means of educating a strong class of workers. We now have a company of boys who are able to do everything about a building.

Baird admitted that initially the outlook had been terribly "discouraging"; so much so that if it had not been for his firm conviction that "duty called" him to the school, he would have left. Following the early period of experimentation with unskilled student labor, however, his approval of the experiment was unequivocal. As the summer passed "those boys," he observed, had become "proficient workmen. They were intensely interested in their work; they developed wonderfully in character." As Sutherland had dearly hoped, the Berrien Springs experiment in construction was a curricular success—hands, head, and character developing together.

Agriculture

In Sutherland's estimation, one of the major reasons for leaving Battle Creek and moving to a rural area was the opportunity it would afford to instruct the college students in agriculture. Sutherland had purchased a farm for college use while still at Battle Creek, but its effectiveness had been hampered by the spurious stories that circulated regarding Sutherland's teachings on insects and the use of fertilizers. By the time the college was moved to Berrien Springs, Sutherland had apparently grown much more cautious about making any statements that could be labelled extreme or that lent themselves to misinterpretation, for he suffered none of the criticisms there that

---

1 P. T. Magan to W. C. White, August 6, 1902, EGWRC-DC. E. A. Sutherland to E. G. White, October 5; November 5, 1902, EGWRC-DC.
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had assailed him in Battle Creek. In addition, the idea of requiring agricultural training for all students was an idea which took time to gain acceptance with Adventist young people.

Those, however, who read the school Calendar for 1901 could have no doubt about the importance that Sutherland and the faculty of Emmanuel Missionary College placed on learning to work the soil. The manual-training section declared: "The study of agriculture will be made the A B C of the educational work." "Gospel farming" would be taught. "Students, by caring for the trees, by planting and sowing, and by the ingathering of the harvests" were to learn "the most valuable lessons concerning work for souls." The fruits, grains, and vegetables needed by the college kitchen would also be supplied. An additional benefit to the students was the possibility of earning expenses for their education. Not only were the male students to work the farm; the "lady students" would receive instruction in "vegetable, fruit, and flower gardening." For instructional and labor purposes, the agricultural program of the college was divided into six areas: grape culture, berry culture, fruit trees, nursery, general farming, and gardening.¹

Directly linked to the emphasis on the development of farming skills was the call, urged by Ellen White, to "come out of the cities." Sutherland argued the uselessness of calling families "into the country" unless they could be taught "how to get a living from the soil." In emphasizing agricultural instruction, he perceived the

¹EMC Cal, 1901, pp. 62-63. EMC Fac Min, Març 16, 1904. Precisely when the agricultural program was first organized so thoroughly is not known.
college as playing a role in the solution "of great social problems." He believed such instruction would "go far in turning the tide of migration which now sets so strongly toward the great cities."^1

C. M. Christiansen, teacher of industrial education at Battle Creek College, took over as farm manager at Berrien Springs as soon as the purchase of the property was finalized. During the first winter, however, the college board named a committee comprised of Prescott, Daniells, Sutherland, and E. R. Palmer to discuss whether the farm should be managed by "one instructor or superintendent" or given into the hands of several persons.2

Sutherland's goal was to "bring together the toilers of the classroom with the toilers of the farm." "It is not best," he reasoned,

for one class of laborers to work all the time in the classroom with their minds, and have another class work all the time in the fields with their hands. The duty and responsibility of the two great divisions of the school should be shared by all alike.

Consequently, by late June 1902 a five-member committee was named to "apportion parts of the farm to the different teachers." For example, Sutherland was placed in charge of the vineyard, Magan the vegetables, W. E. Howell the berries, O. A. Morse (the music teacher) the landscape gardening, and DeGraw the flowers. Unfortunately, the summer

1EMC Fac Min, March 16, 1904. EMC Fall Announcement, 1903, p. 5. For Sutherland as author of the calendars and fall announcements, see EMC Bd Min, April 16, 1902. J. H. Haughey to H. A. Washburn, August 7, 1904, J. H. Haughey Papers, AUHR.

2EMC Bd Min, January 29, 1902.

3EMC Bd Min, June 30, 1902.
of 1902 was the rainiest in twenty years. The heavy rains, intermingled with hot sun, caused most of the fruit to rot and mildew. The peaches had already been lost due to severe frosts that spring. Only Sutherland's grapes were predicted to do well.¹

That fall, as teachers and students worked together on the farm—the first area of experimentation in the development of the "Cooperative Plan"—Sutherland observed three positive results: (1) it tended to "elevate manual work," (2) it placed teachers in "direct contact with the students outside the classroom," and (3) the "industrial work" was developing "much more thoroughly" than could be achieved "when one individual carried the entire burden."² Increasingly, teachers and students worked together on whatever projects needed to be done. In the spring of 1903, when the winter corn needed husking, "the whole force of students [including the girls] and teachers joined in a campaign" to husk it. Magan recorded in his diary that he had helped carry water, dig in the sewer ditch, and that he and Sutherland helped chop wood. Apparently Sutherland and his crew had taken adequate care of the vineyards. That fall they yielded about 16,000 baskets of grapes—4,000 were converted into grape juice for campus consumption, and 12,000 were sold to Chicago firms. Not only did the collective labor reap financial dividends for the school, but during the 1902-1903 school year twenty students were able to pay

¹Ibid. N. H. Druillard to E. G. White, August 5, 1902, EGWRC-DC. P. T. Magan to W. C. White, August 6, 1902, EGWRC-DC.

²E. A. Sutherland to E. G. White, November 25, 1902, EGWRC-DC. N. H. Druillard to W. C. White, March 17, 1903, EGWRC-DC.

Though not all of the teachers were as enthusiastic at the start of the experiment of cooperative student/teacher labor as were Sutherland and Magan, a positive change in attitude was developing. In May, Magan exulted:

> Our plan of co-operation upon the farm is working splendidly. ... Our farm looks about fifty per cent better this year than it did at this time last year, and the teachers are all enthusiastic in the work. I never could have believed that such transformations as this method of work has worked in Professors Howell and Haughey could have been brought about by any means.

\footnote{N. H. Druillard to W. C. White, May 17, 1903, EGWRC-DC. Cf. N. H. Druillard to W. C. White, June 7, 1903, EGWRC-DC. Christiansen, the farm manager and industrial education teacher, apparently left the school over a disagreement as to whether the farm should be used to produce grains or primarily fruit. Mrs. Druillard, it seems, was mistaken regarding the reason for his departure. On June 7, in a letter to W. C. White, she spoke very highly of Christiansen, but explained that he had "resigned" because "he dared not risk his reputation by being connected with the work, if it was divided into departments with no general head man. ... He was honest in his belief, that if he or some one man did not have complete control or charge of the farm and each head of department receive orders from him that a failure would be the result." Her reason, however, does not square with the following facts: (1) he had been directly involved in the initial development of the cooperative idea as an active and vocal member of the board of trustees some fifteen months earlier and voiced no recorded opposition; (2) he continued as a teacher and board member for fifteen months after the initial implementation of the cooperative management of the farm, until the May 6, 1903 board meeting; (3) after that date his name no longer appears in the minutes, but there is no record of his resignation. While he favored planting the farm in wheat and oats, as opposed to Sutherland and Magan's plan to put almost all the acreage in fruit, the precise reasons for, and details of, his departure may remain an enigma. EMC Bd Min, May 6, 8, 1903. N. H. Druillard to W. C. White, June 7, 1903, EGWRC-DC. E. L. Cardey to E. K. Vande Vere, July 30, 1956, Vande Vere Coll, AUHR. Cf. W. Covert, A. Moon, D. Paulsen to "Brethren,"}
In his enthusiasm to help, J. H. Haughey personally provided the funding to establish and maintain a nursery garden. As in the case of the teachers who financed the canning factory, his plan was to try to develop it into a source of income. If he succeeded, he intended to turn it over to the school without charge. If it failed, he was personally prepared to bear the loss. Magan, describing the teachers' generosity to Daniells, wrote: "This loyalty and devotion upon the part of our teachers is something which I believe will make us all feel very happy."¹

The summer of 1903 was as notably dry as the previous summer had been wet. In spite of the consequent loss of the berry and peach crops, the farm, "with no chief farmer," provided most of the food needed on campus, income for students, and a small monetary profit as well. Wanting to strengthen the finances of the farm, the administrators considered putting the monetary aspect of the farm "entirely upon a co-operative basis" in imitation of the plan in vogue at Park University in Missouri. Whether Sutherland implemented that prospective plan, however, is not known.²

Of all the areas of manual labor available at Emmanuel Missionary College, none was stressed more than agriculture. Instruction in it was divided into thirty-one subsections, while the next largest study was carpentry with only five.³

---

¹ P. T. Magan to A. G. Daniells, June 9, 1903, RG 11: 1903-M, GCAr.
² P. T. Magan to E. G. White, December 10, 1903, EGWRC-DC.
³ EMC Fac Min, March 16, 1904.
The growing awareness of the value of agriculture within Adventist education was reflected in the fact that the education department of the General Conference sponsored a series of nine articles on agriculture by H. A. Washburn in the "Christian Education" section of the Review and Herald from March 10 through May 26, 1904. Those articles explored extensively the very values that Emmanuel Missionary College believed and taught: namely, that agricultural education (1) is an effective means of teaching spiritual truth, (2) increases the student's and the school's potential for self-support, (3) makes more viable the exodus of people from the urban centers, and (4) prepares workers for increased effectiveness as worldwide missionaries.\(^1\) In 1894 Ellen White had claimed:

> Men are wanted to educate others how to plow, and how to use the implements of agriculture. Who will be missionaries to do this work, to teach proper methods to the youth, and to all who feel willing and humble enough to learn? If any do not want you to give them improved ideas, let the lessons be given silently, showing what can be done in setting out orchards and planting corn; let the harvest be eloquent in favor of right methods of labor.

Sutherland and the Emmanuel Missionary College faculty sought to be that kind of missionary faculty, producing the practical kind of missionaries that could teach silent lessons through agriculture.

Publishing and its problems

Even before Battle Creek College moved to Berrien Springs, the General Conference committee had adopted a recommendation "that

\(^1\)H. A. Washburn, a series of nine articles on "Agricultural Education," RH 81 (March 10, 17, 24, 31; April 14; May 5, 12, 19, 26, 1904).

our leading training-schools be encouraged to carry on small printing departments, in which they should produce our smaller school textbooks and other educational literature, gospel tracts and pamphlets."

This recommendation constituted a ratification of the printing work Sutherland had already established at Battle Creek, and provided added incentive to continue and enlarge the publishing effort at Emmanuel Missionary College.¹

Legally constituted as the Training School Publishing Association, the printing enterprise at Berrien Springs was purchased from the college in January 1902 by the Seventh-day Adventist Central Educational Association. This was done in order to reimburse the college for its $1,000 investment in the plant, and the $442 cumulative loss to date, resulting from the publication of the Advocate. Renamed the Advocate Publishing Company, by late summer it occupied spacious quarters in the newly constructed Advocate Hall.²

Sutherland was determined to utilize the printing facility not only for the continued publication of the Advocate, but for the publication of urgently needed Adventist educational textbooks and related literature. Along with others, he had begun to realize that while the Review and Herald wanted no one else to publish Adventist educational materials, the books they published were expensively priced. In addition, because of the relatively small demand, they showed little interest in promoting educational literature. The

¹GCC Min, April 30, 1901.

²EMC Bd Min, January 29, 1902. P. T. Magan to W.C. White, August 6, 1902, EGWRC-DC. W. C. White to Mae [White], November 30, 1902, EGWRC-DC.
monopolizing attitude of the publishing house had Edson White so upset that in October 1901 he complained to his mother that "the idea that the Review and Herald owns the denomination has had about all the swing that it ought to have."¹

In the same letter, White urged his mother to express her opinion on the topic of Emmanuel Missionary College and the printing business. "If you believe that" Sutherland and his colleagues "should have the opportunity to publish these books [locally authored educational books] and circulate them themselves," Edson wrote, "I wish you would write a word of encouragement to Brother Sutherland." Without delay, she wrote a pointed letter to Sutherland and Magan:

There is much to be done. You now need to educate, educate[,] educate. Let no one take away your needed facilities. Have you a printing outfit? This you must have, if you do not have it; for you will want to do much of your own printing, issuing the books and other publications which you need in your work. You need the very best educator to teach typesetting and presswork to the students, giving them the education essential for this class of work.²

Encouraged by Ellen White’s evident support, in the early months of 1902 Sutherland and Magan acquired some major additions to the printing equipment the college already owned. They bought about $40 worth of type, but the largest acquisitions came through donations. Two Adventist businessmen from Chicago, with the help of another man, donated a new paper cutter and a new #1 Miehle press worth $3,000. In addition, with a gift of $400 from some other

¹GCC Min, October 24, 1901. J. E. White to E. G. White, October 29, 1901, EGWRC-DC. GCED Min, May 20, 1901, RG 11: 1901-M, GCAr.

²J. E. White to E. G. White, October 29, 1901, EGWRC-DC. E. G. White to P. T. Magan and E. A. Sutherland, November 5, 1901, EGWRC-DC.
non-Adventist friends the school was able to buy a ten-horsepower gasoline engine to run the printing equipment.¹

Beginning in 1902 and continuing through much of 1903, Sutherland and Magan suffered through extremely strained relations with the Review and Herald Publishing Company. The problem arose principally over who would publish and distribute Ellen White's new book, Education. Sutherland had read the manuscript in the spring of 1901 and had been so impressed that he promised to "put forth every energy to get out this excellent book."²

Magan, however, had a more ambitious plan. He proposed to W. C. White that, although the type would be set and the plates made by Pacific Press, the Advocate Publishing Company should be authorized to publish and distribute Education. After all, he reasoned, it certainly qualified as an educational book. He also argued that the Review and Herald and Pacific Press had given very small circulation to Ellen White's earlier books. As an example, he asserted that "absolutely nothing" was being done with the recently published volume 6 of the Testimonies. Claiming that the college could publish the book for less money, he later proposed that the profits from the sale of 15,000 copies of the book be given to Ellen White to help reduce her personal indebtedness.³

¹EMC Bd Min, November 19, 1901. P. T. Magan to W. C. White, February 24, 1903, EGWRC-DC. Cf. W. C. White to E. A. Sutherland, February 16, 1903, EGWRC-DC. [E. A. Sutherland], "Emmanuel Missionary College," TS Advocate 4 (May 1902):156.

²E. A. Sutherland to W. C. White, October 10, 1901, EGWRC-DC. Cf. E. A. Sutherland to W. C. White, July 31, 1902.

³P. T. Magan to W. C. White, July 24; August 6, 1902; November 13, 1903, EGWRC-DC. P. T. Magan to C. H. Jones and W. W. Prescott and
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In 1902 the Review and Herald Publishing Company was allowing its commercial printing work to consume most of its time and effort, to the serious detriment of the sale of denominational books. While W. C. White affirmed that he had "stood for many years loyal to our older publishing houses," he now felt "dissatisfied with their lack of power to push some parts of the work." Therefore, he felt "perplexed" regarding the publication and sale of Education. "I greatly desire," he wrote, "to place it in the hands of some one [sic] that will take special interest to push it."^1

Nevertheless, on August 29, 1902, both W. C. White and his mother wrote Magan of their decision to have the Review and Herald publish the new book. They gave him five reasons why they felt obliged to make that choice: (1) it would be best to keep only one agency operating in the subscription field; (2) "one more supreme effort" must be made to "persuade the managers of our publishing houses to unload the old iron and trash [commercial work] which is absorbing their energies, and give themselves to the publication of

A. G. Daniells, October 14, 1903, EGWRC-DC. Ellen White had made large investments to help initiate various denominational projects. Since little was being done to sell her books she had received very little return through royalties; consequently, she was in debt. For example, during the first half of 1902 she had received only $20 royalty from the sale of The Desire of Ages. Similarly, Ellen White had "laughed at the ridiculousness of the amount of royalty" that had been paid to Magan during 1901 for his book Perils of the Republic. P. T. Magan to W. C. White, August 6, 1902, EGWRC-DC. Sarah Peck to P. T. Magan, August 11, 1902, EGWRC-DC. Cf. P. T. Magan to C. H. Jones and H. H. Hall, November 11, 1903, EGWRC-DC. Magan's plan to help Ellen White with her personal debt was not acceptable to the church leaders. They feared that such a plan would expose her and the church to ridicule. Unfortunately, however, they offered no better solution to ease Ellen White's financial distress.

^1W. C. White to P. T. Magan, August 1, 1902, EGWRC-DC.
present truth"; (3) "one more supreme effort" must be made to get the publishers to cooperate unitedly in carrying forward the different aspects of church work; (4) an overemphasis on the sale of Education would eclipse the sale of the "larger books" that contain "the light given of God for the world"; and (5) should Ellen White "give the publication of the book on education into other hands than those who acted so liberally in publishing Object Lessons," she felt she would "not be dealing fairly."

Sutherland and Magan accepted the decision without complaint, pledging themselves to work just as hard to sell and distribute the book as if they had exclusive rights to it. In early 1903, as the date of initial publication of Education neared, W. C. White finalized arrangements on distribution rights. Contracts were apparently

---

1 W. C. White to P. T. Magan, August 29, 1902, EGWRC-DC. E. G. White to P. T. Magan, August 29, 1902, EGWRC-DC. As is attested by the five reasons already noted, Arthur White's conclusion that "Ellen White, especially led by God, refused to take steps that would bypass the divinely established organizational procedures that governed the publication and distribution of the literature of the church," is inaccurate. Her decision was a redemptive one toward a very wayward pair of publishing houses. She had prefaced her remarks with the statement: "Light has come to me that it would not be wisdom to do this now." That she and her son did not object to the Advocate Publishing Company having a part in "the publication and distribution of the literature of the church" is attested by the fact that W. C. White and his mother approved the inclusion of the name "Advocate Publishing Company" as a joint publisher on the title page of Education. Moreover, when the Review and Herald persisted in behaving so unreasonably toward Sutherland and Magan and the Advocate Publishing Company, W. C. White wrote that if the Review and Herald did not recognize that the Advocate Publishing Company had the "same privileges as those granted Review and Herald regarding Education," he would put Education and "several other books into the hands of the Berrien Springs house, with controlling rights in the Lake Union." White, E. G. White: Early Elmshaven Years, p. 184. P. T. Magan to C. H. Jones and H. H. Hall, November 11, 1903, EGWRC-DC. W. C. White to P. T. Magan, December 6, 1903, EGWRC-DC. E. G. White, "To Those in Council at Battle Creek," April 16, 1903, EGWRC-DC. Cf. W. W. Prescott, "The Reopening of Battle Creek College," RH 80 (August 27, 1903):4.
jointly prepared by W. C. White and the Pacific Press, and signed by Magan, giving the Advocate Publishing Company exclusive distribution rights in the territory normally assigned to the Review and Herald Publishing Company. ¹

In spite of the fact that the Review and Herald Publishing Company was much too busy to dedicate the time and effort needed to build up sales for Education, the managers were adamantly opposed to allowing the Advocate Publishing Company the right to any sales territory. Complicating the situation was the persistently negative attitude of some church leaders involved in the publishing work toward the leadership of Emmanuel Missionary College.

On the occasion of W. C. White's visit to the college in December 1902, he laid plans with the school's leaders regarding the sale of Education and the "building up of the Advocate office as a place for the publication of our educational literature." His presentation of the proposition to Daniells and E. R. Palmer, head of the worldwide literature work of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, had apparently met with approval. When White subsequently presented the plan to the General Conference Publication Committee, however, their negative reaction toward the leaders at Berrien Springs surprised him. He wrote to Magan, admitting that he had discovered the existence of a widespread feeling through the field that if the work is done at Berrien Springs it will be dominated by Brother Sutherland, Miss De Graw [sic], and yourself, and that the

¹P. T. Magan to W. C. White, May 17, 1903, EGWRC-DC. Edwin R. Palmer obituary, RH 108 (March 5, 1931):27-28. Though the precise date of publication of Education is not known, the first mention of it being ready for distribution is March 3, 1903. C. H. Jones to W. C. White, March 3, 1903, EGWRC-DC.
tendency will be to make it an exponent of the radical views held and expressed by Brother Sutherland, and that this will make our people hesitate about making it the principal place for the issue of educational books.

Nevertheless, a week later, on May 11, 1903, W. C. White wrote Sutherland and Magan to tell them that after having thought the situation through, and in spite of the widespread prejudice against them, he still felt "free" to confirm the plans they had developed together in December. He expressed his belief that adherence to the plans "will work out for the good of our work in general and for the good of the educational work especially," and promised to put his "shoulder to the wheel" with them "to get the work started along these lines."2

Support from W. C. White, however, was not sufficient to suppress the ire of the managers of the Review and Herald Publishing Company toward the struggling Advocate Publishing Company. They set out to "crush" it through a number of calculated strategems: (1) they scrupulously differentiated between correspondence received from the college, which they promptly answered, and correspondence from the publishing house, which they totally ignored; (2) though aware of the agreement between the Advocate Publishing Company and the Pacific Press regarding the ordering and distribution of Education, they blatantly chose to violate it, advertising in the Review and Herald that orders should be placed through them; (3) they wrote pointed, intimidating letters to the conference presidents and the tract society agents urging them to ignore the Advocate Publishing Company

---

1 W. C. White to P. T. Magan, May 5, 1903, EGWRC-DC.
2 W. C. White to P. T. Magan and E. A. Sutherland, May 11, 1903, EGWRC-DC.
as something almost evil; and (4) without consulting Sutherland as author, they arbitrarily lowered the price of *Mental Arithmetic* from $.65 to $.25. Though Sutherland had protested the discounting of the arithmetic book, a short time later they announced in the *Review and Herald* that the price of *Living Fountains or Broken Cisterns* had also been lowered from $1.25 to $.65. In an effort to avoid financial loss, Sutherland and Magan purchased the last six hundred copies of *Mental Arithmetic* with the printing plates for $150 payable by May 1, 1904. There is no record, however, that they purchased the remaining copies of Sutherland's larger book.¹

Throughout the long months of conflict, evidence indicates that both Sutherland and Magan treated the opposition in a consistently Christian manner. Several times they expressed to Ellen White their willingness to relinquish all rights to the book, and informed the managers of the *Review and Herald Publishing Company* of their disposition in the matter. She, however, did not see fit to alter the arrangement. In addition, Magan continued to bill the *Review and Herald* publishers at the low publisher's rate for books, though they would not reciprocate.²

¹P. T. Magan to W. C. White, July 1, 7 (two letters), 15, 25; November 4, 1903, EGWRC-DC. P. T. Magan to “Brethren,” July 1, 1903, EGWRC-DC. E. A. Sutherland to “Brethren,” July 21, 1903, EGWRC-DC. Cf. “Education,” and “Living Fountains or Broken Cisterns,” RH 80 (July 14, 1903):2. According to P. T. Magan in a letter to W. C. White, the treatment Ellen White had often received from the publishing houses seemed “unfeeling and cruel”; so much so that Magan admitted that he could not “bear the thought of it.” P. T. Magan to W. C. White, November 13, 1903, EGWRC-DC.

²E. A. Sutherland to “Brethren,” July 21, 1903, EGWRC-DC. P. T. Magan to “Brethren,” July 1, 1903, EGWRC-DC. P. T. Magan to W. C. White, November 24, 1903, EGWRC-DC.
Having tried hard to resolve the impasse, W. C. White wrote to his mother in August with the good news that he and Sutherland had met with C. H. Jones (manager of the Pacific Press) and I. H. Evans (manager of the Review and Herald Publishing Company) and they had "worked out a plan of co-operation between the Review and Herlad [sic] and the Advocate Publishing Company." He commented: "We have all made some sacrifices, and I am sure that all will be the gainers. In fact, I feel very, very thankful for the peaceful settlement of this matter."

Whether the truce held for a time is not clear, but by November Magan reported to W. C. White that at a meeting with Evans he had told Magan "plainly that he did not intend to recognize the Advocate Pub. Co. as publishers at all." While Evans thought the Review and Herald might allow the college publishers' prices on "trade and canvass books" sold to their own students, he absolutely opposed giving Magan any other concession. Within a month Evans opposed even that small concession, asserting that "the brethren in Washington" supported his position.\(^1\)

W. C. White was so disappointed at Evans' continued recalcitrance that he confided, in a letter to Magan, his plan to present in the spring of 1904 the same proposition to the "brethren in Washington" which had been presented to Evans. In essence, White would agree to grant the "Washington house" (the Review and Herald

\(^1\) W. C. White to E. G. White, August 6, 1903, EGWRC-DC.

\(^2\) P. T. Magan to W. C. White, November 24; December 14, 1903, EGWRC-DC. Irwin Henry Evans obituary, RH 122 (December 20, 1945): 20, 23.
relocated in Washington, D.C.) the same privileges regarding Education that had been granted to the Review and Herald while located in Battle Creek, in exchange for their recognition of the "Advocate Company." If they refused the offer, White intended to "put 'Education' [sic] and several other books into the hands of the Berrien Springs house, with controlling rights in the Lake Union." Whether he could have effectively carried out his threat is uncertain, but he apparently intended to try.

While the Advocate Publishing Company continued to be spurned, in the fall of 1903 the General Conference decided to help Union College establish a publishing business. Called the International Publication Company, it would be in charge of translation work and the publishing of materials in foreign languages. It must have pained Sutherland and Magan to learn that both the Pacific Press and the Review and Herald had indicated their willingness to give the International Publishing Company publishers' rates on everything they purchased, while the Review and Herald absolutely refused a similar concession to the Advocate Publishing Company. Nevertheless, the creation of another campus publishing house pleased Sutherland and Magan. It was an idea they had recommended to W. C. White several months earlier.²

In May 1903 W. C. White wrote to Sutherland and Magan that he had had a "long conversation" with his mother regarding Education. He reported:

¹W. C. White to P. T. Magan, December 6, 1903, EGWRC-DC.
²P. T. Magan to W. C. White, November 13, 24, 1903, EGWRC-DC.
Cf. P. T. Magan to W. C. White, December 14, 1903, EGWRC-DC.
Mother says clearly and decidedly that she is satisfied with the plans that we have made regarding the handling of this book, and that notwithstanding the difficulties that may arise from the feeling of opposition on the part of some of our brethren regarding our plans to make the Advocate Office the principal place for the publication of educational literature, that she is willing to stand by the plans made at Oakland and that she will encourage you to go ahead with the sale of "Education."

According to Magan, Sutherland gave an eye-witness report that at the educational convention held at Union College in June 1903, the teachers had supported the designation of the Advocate Publishing Company as the "educational publishing house," in harmony with Ellen White's counsel. The recommendation, however, had been fought by "Elders Daniells, Prescott and Evans and killed on account of their opposition." Ostensibly their resistance stemmed from a conviction that no one publishing house should have a monopoly on the publication of Adventist educational literature. That, however, was a position Sutherland and Magan had consistently agreed with. The seemingly total lack of support by the church leaders made it difficult to escape the impression that the leaders opposed the publication of any educational literature at Berrien Springs, let alone a monopoly on it.\(^2\)

In the fall of 1903, the Review and Herald undertook to publish a primer prepared by a Mrs. Ella Sanders, "spending large sums of money to illustrate it." While there was nothing ethically improper in their publishing such a book, it was apparently done with

---

\(^1\) W. C. White to P. T. Magan and E. A. Sutherland, May 11, 1903, EGWRC-DC.

\(^2\) P. T. Magan to W. C. White, May 17; November 24, 1903, EGWRC-DC. W. C. White to P. T. Magan and E. A. Sutherland, May 11, 1903, EGWRC-DC.
an ulterior motive. Magan complained to W. C. White: "This, of course, will cut into our trade and will injure us. They have money and we have none." White expressed his regrets at hearing that the Review and Herald was going to publish it, but counselled a "wait and see" attitude. Meanwhile, Sutherland and DeGraw each borrowed $600 and continued with their plan to prepare two more church-school textbooks, one of which was Bible Reader Number Two.

Describing the preparation of Bible Reader Number Two, Magan wrote that most of the three-color work on the cover had been done by a student who had only five months' experience with the Advocate Publishing Company on campus. The typesetting and all of the press work had also been done at the school. Since they could not afford professionally prepared illustrations, necessity proved to be the mother of invention. Mrs. Sutherland did almost all of the drawings, and students, with the crudest of equipment and materials, had produced the full-page half tones and zinc etchings.

W. C. White later confided to Magan that when he had read Magan's letter describing their homemade efforts his "soul was filled with terror." He feared they "had made a serious mistake" in trying to do so much themselves. The results, however, had pleasantly surprised him. "Your little book looks good," he wrote. "The art work is not above criticism, but it is not a disgrace to your concern by any means." They no doubt felt heartened by his kind words, since

1 P. T. Magan to W. C. White, November 13, 24, 1903; January 13, 1904, EGWRC-DC. Cf. W. C. White to P. T. Magan, December 6, 1903, EGWRC-DC. The title of the second textbook Sutherland and DeGraw were preparing is not known.

2 P. T. Magan to E. G. White and W. C. White, December 10, 1903, EGWRC-DC.
so few at that time seemed inclined to encourage them. Looking on the positive side, Magan viewed the primitive conditions as a blessing in disguise. He felt this way because the students are learning how to do a great many things by hand and without paraphernalia so that when they go to distant lands as missionaries they will not feel as though they will have to have a big Review Office in order to do any work in the printing and publishing line.

While other publishing had been sporadic, Sutherland, DeGraw, and Magan had been able to continue publication of the Advocate as a labor of love from its inception in 1899 when the college was still at Battle Creek. They had never considered it a "money maker," but they had always believed it a "missionary enterprise" worth struggling to maintain. Sutherland had been greatly encouraged in 1901 when the General Conference had decided to unite the Sabbath School Worker with the Advocate. By 1903, however, the General Conference had reversed its decision, and circulation dropped from a high of about 7,000 to approximately 20 percent of that. Although the General Conference decision was another tough blow, the men determined not to let the Advocate go under. They decided in January 1904 to reduce the size from thirty-two to sixteen pages.²

Compounding their difficulties was the possibility that they might lose their splendid Miehle press. The Adventist businessmen from Chicago who had donated the press to the school had agreed to pay the Miehle company for it on a monthly basis. Now, apparently

¹W. C. White to P. T. Magan, December 24, 1903, EGWRC-DC. P. T. Magan to E. G. White and W. C. White, December 10, 1903, EGWRC-DC.

²P. T. Magan to W. C. White, January 13, 1904, EGWRC-DC.
through no fault of their own, the men found themselves in such financial straits that they could no longer make the payments. Thus the school would have to assume the balance of $2,500 or lose the press. Magan wrote plaintively to W. C. White: "Have you any suggestions as to what we had better do? We cannot let the press go, for we have got our business to take care of. I am sure the Lord will help us to get through in some way, our extremity will be His opportunity." Apparently feeling the need to reveal to White more of their plight, he added: "The Advocate office is in need of a good many things." He then proceeded to enumerate them: money to pay for the $300 worth of binding machinery (Mrs. Druillard had donated $150); a furnace to replace the dangerous "little wood stoves" that did not generate enough heat; and a "gasoline lighting plant run by a tank from outside" to take the place of the dangerous gas lamps with individual reservoirs that were currently in use.\(^1\)

In spite of the numerous difficulties facing the Advocate Publishing Company, the college board voted in February 1904 to establish an apprenticeship program in printing. With emphasis on the practical side, the plan would include a daily eight-hour stint of labor rotated through every phase of the printing work, and a weekly four-hour stint of classwork. Apprentices were also expected to spend part of their time as canvassers selling books.\(^2\)

Of all the challenges and problems that confronted Sutherland during his three years at Berrien Springs, probably none were more

\(^1\)Ibid.

\(^2\)EMC Bd Min, February 23, 1904.
painful than those which swirled around the Advocate Publishing Company, since he considered the publishing work so vital. He knew that in 1902 Ellen White had recounted a vision in which she had seen a group assembled in council. She had seen E. R. Palmer present the idea that "small, local presses were not needful, and were run at great expense. He had said that he thought that all our book-making should be done at one publishing house, at one place, and thus save expense." Then, in words of special significance for Sutherland, Mrs. White wrote:

There was present One of authority, and after making some inquiries, He said, "These smaller printing offices can be managed in a way that will make them a help to the work of God, if sufficient attention is given to them. In the past, great lack of principle has been brought into the management of our book work, and this experience will be repeated unless men's hearts are thoroughly converted. . . . Those who frame yokes for the necks of their fellow-beings, will, unless they repent, be brought to the place where they will understand how these yokes bind and gall the neck of the wearer."

Sutherland, DeGraw, and Magan were strongly committed to maintaining a small publishing work on the Emmanuel Missionary College campus. Because of that commitment, however, they had been forced to wear "galling" yokes. Whether Sutherland and Magan, with the help of W. C. White, were finally able to reach an agreement with Evans regarding Education is not known. The sale and distribution of the book suffered as a result of the unnecessary bickering and strife, and the Advocate Publishing Company did not accomplish all that it might have. The missions advance of the church was the ultimate loser.

In spite of the problems that plagued him at Berrien Springs,

1E. G. White to "Brethren," October 20, 1902, EGWRC-DC.
Sutherland was able to continue a variety of curricular reforms which he had first experimented with during his last years at Walla Walla and had refined and expanded at Battle Creek. He also experimented with new ideas. While the one-study plan proved controversial, other innovations were notably successful, particularly in the areas of special study programs, more holistic ministerial training, expanded teacher training and regulation, field practicum for all classes where possible, teachers and students working together on the farm and in the orchards, and, perhaps most impressively, the building of an entire school with student/teacher labor.

In regard to manual labor problems, Ellen White wrote in 1903:

I urge that our . . . schools be given encouragement in their efforts to develop plans for the training of the youth in agricultural and other lines of industrial work. When in ordinary business, pioneer work is done, and preparation is made for future development, there is frequently a financial loss. And as our schools introduce manual training, they too may incur loss. But let us remember the blessing that physical exercise brings to the students. . . . In industrial training there are unseen advantages, which can not be measured or estimated.

Student labor had not proved to be profitable in the early construction at Berrien Springs, but that did not deter Sutherland. In a surprisingly short time students were working with efficiency. Consequently, they not only learned valuable skills but helped the college profit through significant savings as well.

It is true that curricular modifications, as well as all other aspects of the college, were affected to a lesser or greater degree

---

1 E. G. White, "Be Not Weary in Well-Doing," MS 160, August 9, 1903, EGWRC-DC. Cf. P. T. Magan to E. G. White, July 1, 1903, EGWRC-DC.
by a lack of adequate finances and the continuing burden of the Battle Creek College debt. Therefore, the monetary concerns of the institution are examined in the next chapter.
CHAPTER V

THE BERRIEN SPRINGS YEARS: 1901-1904 (Cont.)

Financial Concerns

The College Debt

When Sutherland and Magan took over as president and dean (respectively) of Battle Creek College in 1897, they inherited an institutional debt of $70,000. In spite of careful fiscal policies which enabled them to avoid adding to the debt, by the time the college moved to Berrien Springs the interest charges had increased the debt to approximately $84,000.¹

From 1901 to 1904 (when Sutherland and Magan resigned their positions at Emmanuel Missionary College), the Adventist church struggled with very heavy financial burdens. Illustrative of these were: the costs of rebuilding the Battle Creek Sanitarium, the expenses involved in moving the General Conference and the Review and Herald to Washington, D.C., the need to raise $66,000 to save the publishing house in Oslo (then called Christiania), Norway; and a $330,000 debt owed by the educational institutions of the denomination ($84,000 of which was owed by Battle Creek College alone):²

¹P. T. Magan to E. G. White, October 7, 1903, DF 256, EGWRC-DC. Magan's letters mention both $80,000 and $84,000 as the amount still owed.

²A. G. Daniells to W. O. Palmer, April 28, 1902, EGWRC-DC. A. G. Daniells, February 6, 1902, RG 9: Misc Rec, Daniells, A. G.
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Ellen White, declaring that she was following the instruction of the Lord, had donated *Christ's Object Lessons* in early 1901 as a viable means for the eradication of the enormous debt carried by the educational institutions. The plan was simple. She would give the book, the church members were to pay for the necessary material, the two Adventist publishing houses were to give the labor for printing 150,000 copies each, and every church member was to do his part by selling six copies of the book without a commission. It was estimated that if the 50,000 Adventists sold 300,000 books the debt could be eradicated.1

Due primarily to Magan's vigorous organizational and promotional efforts, sales of *Christ's Object Lessons* were brisk during the first few months of the campaign (which began in the fall of 1900), but later declined. Nevertheless, by mid-1901 the campaign had yielded $20,000 on the Union College debt and nearly as much for the Battle Creek College debt. In an effort to publish and sell the book in other countries as well, Adventist church members across America donated the funds needed to prepare and ship plates of the book to key locations throughout the world. Australia, England, Denmark, Sweden, and Germany had them by 1901.2

---

1 A. G. Daniells, February 6, 1902, RG 9: Misc Rec, documents Fld-3, GCAR.
2 P. T. Magan to E. R. Palmer, July 25, 1901, EGWRC-DC.
While lay members had taken an active part, at least during the first few months of the campaign, a lack of enthusiasm on the part of the ministers proved a major deterrent to success. Magan, in a letter to Daniells, spoke very critically of the clergy: "It seems too bad that nine tenths of our men have to be either sick or tired or good-for-nothing four fifths of the time."^1

Determined to remedy the situation, in 1902 church leaders made decisive efforts to awaken the entire denomination, especially the ministers, to the urgent need for wholehearted participation in the debt-eradication effort. As General Conference and Lake Union Conference president, Daniells determined to make it "a test with the ministers" that they personally participate in the sale of Christ's Object Lessons and also instruct their members in how to sell it. Magan heartily supported him and optimistically predicted that they would sell over 60,000 copies by April 1, 1902.^2

Daniells' ambitious plan for the Lake Union Conference involved: (1) every "Sabbath-keeper" devoting one full week to selling the book; (2) the ministers devoting their entire time during that week to selling and helping their members to sell; (3) every "Conference laborer" devoting his time to the sale until the "entire number apportioned to the State is sold"; and (4) the conference laborers holding instructional and testimony meetings for the church members.

^1P. T. Magan to A. G. Daniells, August 6, 1901, RG 9: Misc Rec, Daniells, A. G. -3, GCAr.

^2A. G. Daniells to [no addressee], February 6, 1902, RG 9: Misc Rec, documents Fld-3, GCAr.
on "Sabbaths and Sundays, and as far as reasonable, evenings."¹

Ellen White admonished:

Brethren, wake up . . . . We would have all to understand when canvassing for "Object Lessons," that they are doing a work that is essential to be done for the school which should now be going on. The Lord will help each one who will pray and work, and work and pray.²

If the Relief of the Schools Campaign to sell Christ's Object Lessons was to succeed, Sutherland and Magan knew that they would have to continue as the principal organizers and promoters. Magan, however, had not yet recovered from his near-fatal bout with typhoid and Sutherland could not condone Magan's travel and time off campus during the winter months to promote the campaign. Therefore, though Sutherland was responsible for the principal administration of the college and was in charge of the urgently needed project to erect permanent buildings, he left Emmanuel Missionary College during the winter of 1902 and visited "all the conferences" of the Lake Union. His initial impressions of the field were more optimistic than Magan's or Daniells'. While he observed that "the work of our ministers has been of such a general nature that many of them dislike to take up anything that is particular," he reported that "the spirit is good and a hearty response has been met with so far from all, for which we thank the Lord."³

After spending six weeks away from the college promoting the

¹P. T. Magan to E. G. White, January 31, 1902, EGWRC-DC. A. G. Daniells to [no addressee], February 6, 1902, RG 9: Misc Rec, documents Fld-3, GCAr.

²E. G. White "To the Ministers and other Friends of the Berrien Springs School," December 27, 1901, EGWRC-DC.

³E. A. Sutherland to W. C. White, February 11, 1902, EGWRC-DC. Cf. E. A. Sutherland to A. G. Daniells, March 21, 1902, RG 11: Bk 26, p. 189, GCAr.
campaign, however, Sutherland admitted that it might take "all summer" to sell the full quota of books in the Lake Union. On the other hand, he indicated his confidence that everyone would "stand by the work" until it was successfully completed. Daniells, who was trying to promote the campaign on the west coast, was not at all optimistic. Writing to Sutherland from Portland, Oregon, he claimed that the sales campaign out there was certainly serving to "spot the useless consumers of our tithes." He reported, with evident approval, that the California Conference committee had struck "some Herculean blows in the way of reform in the ministry"—they had "dropped from their pay roll [sic] thirty-nine persons" at an annual savings of $10,000 in tithe funds.¹

Continuing to feel as pessimistic as Daniells, Magan, in March 1902, lamented to Ellen White: "I never saw such a lot of putty preachers in my life. . . . There is no system or organization, no push, no drive among them." Nevertheless, he reported to her that as a result of the work of dedicated lay persons, 13,000 copies had been sold in the previous three weeks in the Lake Union territory.²

While Christ's Object Lessons was originally donated for the exclusive purpose of paying off the school debts, the moving of Battle Creek College to Berrien Springs made necessary the acquisition of funds with which to build a new institution. Consequently, W. C.

¹E. A. Sutherland to W. C. White, February 26, 1902, EGWRC-DC. A. G. Daniells to E. A. Sutherland, March 6, 1902, RG 11: Bk 26, p. 34, GCAr. Sutherland continued to head the Christ's Object Lessons campaign until early April when Magan was able again to assume its direction. LUC Min, April 3, 1902.

²P. T. Magan to E. G. White, March 17, 1902, EGWRC-DC.
White, with the support of the denominational leaders, established a "Missionary Acre Fund" (patterned after the one first created by Kellogg in 1895), to be used to pay off the school debts. This allowed all income from the sale of Christ's Object Lessons in the Lake Union Conference to finance construction on the newly acquired campus. Ellen White described the plan.

It was thought that our people throughout America who had land, could set apart a small portion of it for the Lord, and send the proceeds to the general treasury, to be applied in the payment of the College debts. . . . It was suggested that those who had no land to use, might give of their earnings. . . . Our brethren felt sure that if our people everywhere would give liberally of the fruit of their toil, a large sum could be raised, and the debt be canceled. [sic]

In the nine months following the introduction of the Acre plan, Magan, its principal promoter, reported what he considered a dismal showing--"six hundred pledges of missionary acres and gardens thus far, out of the whole denomination." Seeking for something to ignite the enthusiasm of church members in the plan, both Sutherland and Magan requested that Ellen White write an article expressing her wholehearted support. They felt sure that if church members were certain of her approval, they would more willingly get involved in the project. In spite of their request, for reasons unknown, she did not write the supportive article until October 1903, a year and a half later. Though Sutherland and Magan continued to try to convince church members to dedicate acres and gardens to the fund, the plan languished.  

---

1 P. T. Magan to E. G. White, October 7, 1903, DF 256, EGWRC-DC. E. G. White, "The Battle Creek College Debt," MS 123, October 8, 1903, EGWRC-DC. Cf. P. T. Magan to E. G. White, March 17; May 25, 1902, E. A. Sutherland to E. G. White, April 13; May 27, 1902, EGWRC-DC.

2 P. T. Magan to E. G. White, May 25, 1902, EGWRC-DC. E. A. Sutherland to E. G. White, May 27, 1902, EGWRC-DC. E. G. White, "The
Another problem in addition to the lack of well-publicized support for the Missionary Acre Fund by Ellen White, was the reopening of Battle Creek College in 1903 by Kellogg for the purpose of providing undergraduate training for medical and paramedical students. Since the principal church leaders opposed the reopening, church members were even more reticent to send money to the Missionary Acre Fund. They feared that since the funds were used to pay off the Battle Creek College debt, they would be aiding an enterprise the church leaders did not support.¹

The inability of Sutherland and Magan to generate money through the Relief of the Schools Fund placed the college in a very difficult financial situation. Wanting to confirm their good intentions to repay all that the college owed the Review and Herald, Magan had sent the publishing house $22,000 of the college's "own money" in 1902. He had confidently expected that the acre fund would soon replace that amount. To his dismay it had not. Two years later, when Sutherland and Magan left for the South in the autumn of 1904, A. T. Jones, as president of the Training School Board (the legal holding corporation for Battle Creek College), was still writing to the church members, trying to encourage them to help pay off the $16,000 owed the Review and Herald and "about twice this amount" owed to individual

¹P. T. Magan to W. C. White, December 8, 1903, RG 11: 1903-M, GCAr.
church members.¹ In spite of the best efforts of Sutherland and Magan during their years at Emmanuel Missionary College, the Missionary Acre Fund generated little income to pay off the old college debt.

Meanwhile, at least the "'Object Lessons' movement," as Daniells called it, showed signs of strengthening. In April 1902 he reported that Michigan, which had sold only 2,000 out of a quota of 20,000 books, had experienced a real change of heart at the conference session. In one day the conference had ordered the remaining 18,000 copies. According to Daniells, J. D. Gowell, the Michigan Conference president, had spent a sleepless night "wrestling with God and the great problem on his hands." During the night the Lord had given Gowell "a well defined plan for Michigan; and early in the morning he started out to find his committee to lay it before them." Each member had "fully united" with the president "to press this work through to a successful finish. All of the delegates had taken the same courageous stand."²

During the month of April a three-part article by Sutherland, written to promote the Relief of the Schools campaign, appeared in the Review and Herald. Drawing on the experiences of Nehemiah and the rebuilding of Jerusalem, he emphasized that now, just as then, each man had a definite work to do. If all would do their part, they could soon declare with Nehemiah: "So built we the wall; and all

¹P. T. Magan to E. G. White, October 7, 1903, DF 256, EGWRC-DC. A. T. Jones, "The Missionary Acre Fund," RH 81 (September 8, 1904):22, 23. There is a significant discrepancy between the figure mentioned by Jones, about $48,000, and the figure of $23,000 given by J. H. Haughey. J. H. Haughey to M. Bessie DeGraw, December 8, 1904, Vande Vere Coll, AUHR.

²A. G. Daniells to W. C. White, April 8, 1902, EGWRC-DC.
the wall was joined together . . . for the people had a mind to work."

Though the financial situation looked promising because of the growing willingness of more church members to go out and sell Christ's Object Lessons, the money was coming into the school very slowly. Thus, when Sutherland and Magan met with Daniells at a council that he convened just before his departure for Europe in late April, Daniells balked at their ambitious construction plans for the summer and fall of 1902. Daniells pointedly insisted that they should build "not more than half" of what they had planned, and instead "pay off a good chunk" of their debts. Appalled and frightened by the very large debts of denominational institutions, Daniells had begun to insist that all the denominational workers "live up to the beautiful doctrines we are teaching with reference to acting on a cash basis." He apparently felt that if money was not coming in from the Missionary Acre Plan to pay the longstanding college debt, it should be paid out of Relief of the Schools campaign funds.

Sutherland and Magan, however, felt certain that they had Ellen and W. C. White's support for using the money from the sale of Christ's Object Lessons to move ahead vigorously on construction, whether funds came in to pay the old debt or not. On the other hand, they planned to advance the construction program of the college on a pay-as-you-go basis in harmony with Daniells' counsel. In August,

---


2A. G. Daniells to E. A. Sutherland and P. T. Magan, April 25, 1902, RG:11: Bk 27, p. 129, GCAr.
with major construction underway, Magan wrote with justifiable pride to W. C. White that they had been paying almost all of the bills within "the ten day limit," thus receiving cash discounts. Up to that time they did "not owe one cent of money at Emmanuel Missionary College."¹

In spite of the major efforts by Sutherland and Magan in the two campaigns which they had administered, by October 1902 Magan reported that a total of only $46,000 had been paid into the Relief of the Schools Fund. The financial situation had become so acute that the college leaders decided to carry out the most intensive campaign to date, in the hope that they would not need to organize another one. Magan wrote to Daniells telling him of their resolve: "This school must not die, but live."²

Instead of reconvening classes in early January 1903, the entire school took part in a special "institute" that was to precede their "heroic effort" in the field selling books. Sutherland taught classes in the study of Christ's Object Lessons, Magan conducted studies on the history of Adventist educational work and the lives of the great reformers, and E. B. Fullmer from Iowa gave studies on the "rise and progress of the Third Angel's Message."³

According to the plan, the institute would continue until

¹P. T. Magan to W. C. White, August 6, 1902, EGWRC-DC.
³P. T. Magan to A. G. Daniells, January 12, 1903, RG 11: 1903-M, GCAr. P. T. Magan to W. C. White, January 13, 1903, EGWRC-DC.
January 23, then all faculty and students would join forces with every minister and church member in the West Michigan Conference and spend ten days dedicated exclusively to the sale of the book. Following that ten-day period they would move to the East Michigan Conference for another ten days of joint labor. They possibly also travelled to the Northern Illinois Conference territory and to Indiana. In any case, by the time they returned to the college, Sutherland reported that they had spent "one solid month of work in the field."  

Kellogg had enthusiastically lent his support as well. In a letter to Ellen White he explained that at American Medical Missionary College in Battle Creek they recognized Emmanuel Missionary College as a "sister institution," and they desired to assist it. When Kellogg presented the campaign plan to a meeting of employees, twenty-five of the "best" nurses had volunteered to go out and sell Christ's Object Lessons too. According to Kellogg, Sutherland and Magan had found it difficult to get from the Review and Herald the books which had been purchased for the campaign. He claimed in a letter to W. C. White that Evans, as manager of the Review and Herald, had tried to "cheat them [Sutherland and Magan] out of 6,000 Object Lessons they had on hands [sic] after the fire." They had, he asserted, paid cash for 29,000 copies several weeks before the fire and had drawn only about 4,000 of them. Evans had sent the remaining copies to the West. When, after the fire, Sutherland and Magan sent for 6,000 that had...
not been destroyed, Evans had refused to deliver them. Only after Sutherland and Magan had spent a "whole day's powwow with him," Kellogg confided, had Evans decided to be "decently and legally civil." Sutherland and Magan made no mention of this problem, but their relations with Evans were not cordial.¹

During the campaign, Sutherland and the college personnel made the Grand Rapids church, the largest in the conference, their headquarters. From there they published a daily progress bulletin, copies of which they sent to Ellen and W. C. White. Sutherland reported that one hundred copies were sold the first day. Though that was not a very large number, he was optimistic. To Mrs. White he wrote: "To us this is the biggest undertaking of our lives, but God is blessing, and we are of good courage."²

Later, as the campaign was ending, Sutherland lamented to Mrs. White that very few of the church members had been able to dedicate one week's time to selling. Had they all given just a week, he felt sure that they could have sold all the books "necessary to put up our buildings." Nevertheless, he claimed that the students had learned "many precious lessons which could not have been learned in the school." Furthermore, he recognized that they must not look on "the dark side, but thank the Lord for the blessings which have come to us." While he spoke very kindly of the "brethren in the Ministry," he admitted that "many of the ministers do not care to sell the books

¹J. H. Kellogg to E. G. White, January 21, 1903, EGWRC-DC. J. H. Kellogg to W. C. White, January 21, 1903, EGWRC-DC.

²E. A. Sutherland to E. G. White, January 27, 1903, EGWRC-DC. Cf. W. C. White to E. A. Sutherland, February 16, 1903, EGWRC-DC.
themselves. . . . Many of the members feel that they have no more ability to sell books than the Ministers [sic], and between them it goes very hard."

In spite of the intensive campaign waged by Emmanuel Missionary College, Magan, reporting to W. C. White in June 1903, admitted that the school was still in dire financial straits because the funds from the campaign were "coming in with exceeding slowness." By August Magan wrote to Ellen White that "over $20,000.00" was owed them by the tract societies in the Lake Union Territory.2

In October 1903 Ellen White wrote an article for the Review and Herald regarding the Battle Creek College debt. It came at a time when Sutherland and Magan sorely needed some strong encouragement. It was replete with heartening statements about the work done by "Magan and Sutherland and their associates" at Berrien Springs. They had worked "in harmony with the instruction given by the Lord," with much of their work "largely experimental." In their "pioneer effort" they

---

1E. A. Sutherland to E. G. White, February 17, 1903, EGWRC-DC. Cf. P. T. Magan to A. G. Daniells, February 22, 1903, RG 11: 1903-M, GCAr. Sutherland, Magan, and W. C. White had received requests regarding the use of Christ's Object Lessons for local educational projects and for sale by the regular canvassers. When W. C. White discussed the release of the book for use by the regular canvassers, his mother had replied: "Yes, that is what ought to be done; the book should be given a wide circulation and I should have my royalty from it." As they continued to talk about it, however, Ellen White "broke out with a very distinct and decided declaration that she had given this book to the educational institutions and that it should be theirs to the end of time." He added: "She has since told me that while we were talking the matter over it was presented to her as clearly as if there had been a hand writing on the wall, how the book should be used and what would be the results." W. C. White to P. T. Magan and E. A. Sutherland, May 11, 1903, EGWRC-DC.

had, she declared, advanced, "not inch by inch, but in sweeping strides, in the right direction."\(^1\)

Addressing the financial problem, she said that if the property in Battle Creek could have been sold for its "full value," there would have been a "good sum" left to provide the needed facilities at Berrien Springs. Those responsible for having incurred the debts should have stepped forward and said "we will take upon ourselves a part of the burden of raising means with which to pay them." They would thus, she indicated, have been "acting in harmony with the first four as well as the last [six] commandments."\(^2\)

Tracing the development of both the Relief of the Schools plan and the Missionary Acre Fund, she praised Sutherland and Magan for the fund-raising work done at Battle Creek and Berrien Springs. Confirming that the purchase of the Battle Creek College property for the use of American Medical Missionary College was approved by the conference and that God wanted the work at Berrien Springs to prosper, she urged every church member to help provide the needed funds "heartily." She declared, "Buildings are needed there [at Berrien Springs] that ought to have been erected a year ago." They should "go up at once." The "officers of the General Conference" should "lend a hand in this work," especially since "it was by the sanction of the General Conference that many of these debts were incurred, in


the erection of large additions to the College,--additions that we could have done without."¹

She entreated everyone "not to find fault" but to wholeheartedly help to eradicate the debt once and for all, thus alleviating those at the Berrien Springs school who had been "left to stagger under the load." Unfortunately, the strained relations between Sutherland and Magan and the church leaders militated against the beneficial effects her article should have wrought. As a peace-making effort, Magan, at the urging of W. C. White, attended the "Washington council for peace" held in October 1903. Magan promised White to "ignore all past controversy and . . . deal only with the issues before us at present, endeavoring to promote that unity which I so long to see in the cause."²

In an attempt to broaden the responsibility for the Relief of the Schools campaign, the General Conference committee at the Washington council appointed a Relief of the Schools committee with W. C. White as chairman and Magan as secretary. White had declined, but they voted it anyway, and Magan later claimed that he had not known he was on the committee until he received a letter informing him and read an announcement in the _Review and Herald_. Upon discovering his appointment as secretary, Magan tried to resign because of his wife's worsening illness, but W. C. White, counting very much on Magan's assistance, strongly pressured him to accept the position. White succeeded in convincing Magan at least to serve as correspondence secretary. At the request of the church leaders, J. S. Washburn

¹ _Ibid._

² P. T. Magan to W. C. White, October 9, 1903, EGWRC-DC.
accepted the position of field secretary for the committee. As the
months passed and relations worsened between the leaders at Berrien
Springs and the denominational leadership, Washburn assumed increasing
responsibility for the campaign—already lasting far longer than it
should have and still unsuccessfully completed. The campaign contin­
ued without Sutherland and Magan when they went to the South.¹

By 1904, when they resigned the leadership of Emmanuel Mission­
ary College, Sutherland and Magan had lived for seven years under the
painful burden of heavy debt, all the time knowing that they had not
incurred it. Nevertheless, both men had struggled valiantly to eradi­
cate the debt, and though it still existed at the time of their
resignation, it had been reduced by half.²

**Teachers' Salaries**

The topic of the salary of missionary church-school teachers
is relevant within the context of Emmanuel Missionary College for two
principal reasons: (1) most of the teachers received their training
there and (2) Sutherland had been a major force in the creation of
the church-school system and was intensely concerned with its develop­
ment. The topic is further related to the college debt in that any

¹W. C. White to P. T. Magan, November 23; December 14, 16,
1903, EGWRC-DC. P. T. Magan to A. G. Daniells and W. C. White, Novem­
ber 24, 1903, EGWRC-DC. W. C. White to Brethren [sic], December 10,
1903, EGWRC-DC. Cf. P. T. Magan to I. A. Ford, November 15, 1903,
EGWRC-DC. P. T. Magan to E. G. White and W. C. White, November 30,
1903, EGWRC-DC. P. T. Magan, "Our Duty to Those Who Have Loaned Money
to the Cause," December 10, 1903, EGWRC-DC. A. G. Daniells to W. C.
White, December 17, 25, 1903, EGWRC-DC.

²J. H. Haughey in December 1904 reported that the debt had
been reduced to $23,000. A. T. Jones, just three months earlier,
placed the debt at about $48,000. It is conceivable that $25,000
could have come in between September and December, but it is highly
potentially costly proposition introduced at a time of economic stress enjoys less likelihood of acceptance than at a time of economic prosperity.

The issue of teachers' salaries arose during a period of grave financial difficulty in the Adventist church. One must bear in mind that when the topic of teachers' salaries came up in educational councils and committee meetings during the first years of the existence of the college, the issue was not the salaries of college teachers but of church-school teachers. It was a relatively new dilemma because very few church schools had existed before 1897. By 1901, however, scores of missionary teachers, mostly young women, were working with remarkable dedication in generally sacrificial circumstances.

If one had the good fortune of employment in one of the larger churches and was well-liked, one might fare tolerably well financially. Most of the churches, however, were small and rural. None of the church schools had any organic connection with the local conference. In fact, schools were sometimes started without the knowledge of the local conference president. Teachers were generally expected to show an exemplary missionary spirit by being willing to work very hard for shamefully small wages. In a fractious and contentious church, the young women teachers would too often concede their own rights to avoid trouble. They also were expected to be willing to live wherever families of the local church might choose to place

them—often obligating the teachers to move from home to home every few weeks.¹

The issue of how a teacher should be paid and by whom challenged the church and the college leaders and pertained to at least three related issues: (1) should the church-school teacher be paid from the tithe, as were the ministers, or from a second tithe to be solicited from every church member; (2) should the schools operate solely under local church jurisdiction, or should the local, union, or General Conference be involved; and (3) should the teachers be considered regular conference employees like the rest of the denominational workers. One cannot escape the conclusion that the burdensome debts of the denomination, including the enormous collective debt of the educational institutions, militated against the ready acceptance by church leaders of any financial responsibility for this new growing segment of the denominational work force—namely, church-school teachers.

In mid-1901 the salary paid Sutherland, Magan, and Dr. S. P. S. Edwards was $60 "per month of four weeks." J. H. Haughey, H. R. Salisbury, E. E. Gardner, and E. D. Kirby received $60 "per month." By contrast, Adventist church-school teachers typically received $10 to $15 per month with board. To make matters worse, their salaries, room, and board were provided at the whim of the local congregation.²

Sutherland and Magan, deeply concerned over the inequities, consulted Ellen White regarding the possibility of educating all

¹ P. T. Magan to E. G. White, July 19, 1901, EGWRC-DC.
²Ibid. EMC Bd Min, June 2, 1901.
church members to pay a second tithe to the local church for teachers' salaries. Their suggested plan was that the money should be passed on by the local church to the conference treasurer for the conference-wide support of church-school teachers as "regular conference laborers." They recognized that a new mentality would have to be created if they were to convince church members that they should feel a strong sense of obligation to pay another 10 percent of their income to support Christian education. As a rule, members felt that "little children were the entire property of their own parents." That is to say, they felt no direct responsibility to see that "every child born to Seventh-day Adventist parents has a training for Jesus Christ and for this precious work."^1

Without delay, Ellen White wrote an article that addressed the concerns of Sutherland and Magan. To the question of whether the "second tithe [could] be used for the support of the church school work" she replied that "it could be used for no better purpose." While she did not directly answer the query of whether the tithe should only be paid into a local church treasury or be sent on to the conference, she intimated that it should go to the conference.^2

In the May 1902 issue of the Advocate, Sutherland raised the issue of the relationship of teacher salary to teacher competency, arguing that teaching often became a "stepping-stone to other professions" because of low salaries. To support his position he cited a recent article in the Chicago Tribune:

^1 P. T. Magan to E. G. White, July 19, 1901, EGWRC-DC.

^2 E. G. White, "The Church School: Instruction to Teachers and Parents," MS 67, July 29, 1901, EGWRC-DC. Cf. P. T. Magan to W. C. White, August 9, 1901, EGWRC-DC.
"A visit to a country teachers' institute is enough to convince one that the masses who are instructing the young, are decidedly amateurs, the greater numbers ranging in age from 17 to 24 years. . . . The reasons for this are obvious. All know there is no future to the teachers' work; their term of school is only from six to eight months in the year, while they are compelled to live twelve; their salaries are small; their calling requires them to dress well; they must buy papers, journals, and books to keep abreast of the times; [sic] they must prepare for and take examinations for which they must pay; they are required to attend summer normals, institutes, and associations, which cost money. Where is the coin to come from? . . . What inducement have they to remain in the field of tutorism, longer than till something more profitable opens for them?"

Sutherland contended that just because the Christian teacher was engaged in a "philanthropic and missionary work," this was no argument for the "small wages and irregular pay" which was forced upon many. Besides, he asked, "if men are liberal with their means for foreign fields, why should they stint those who are training laborers to fill the calls from heathen countries?" He asserted that since students were being given a strong missionary orientation in Adventist church schools, one could truthfully say that "the life of the foreign work is in the Christian school." For that reason he contended teachers not only needed but deserved adequate and consistent support.²

Just three months later, Sutherland again brought up the issue of teachers' wages in the Advocate with a hard-hitting quotation from an education journal:

"We do not sympathize with those who attempt to crush all agitation for just salaries for teachers by expiating on the need of the missionary spirit in teachers. Of course the

²Ibid.
teacher is in need of the missionary spirit. So is the physician and the clergymen. The missionary spirit is patient and longsuffering when dealing with people who are walking in the darkness of ignorance, but there are people who prefer darkness to light, just because it is cheaper."

While Sutherland and Magan were concerned about teachers' salaries, Daniells and W. C. White expressed deep concern over the injustices being perpetrated against many of the ministers through low salaries, a concern that would eventually carry over to the teachers. In a letter to W. C. White, Daniells expressed shock to discover that in a conference that received from "$25,000 to $30,000 tithes annually," a young minister and his wife, in their second year of employment, were receiving $4 a week total income. The solution, Daniells contended, was to "weed out" the "great raft of poor workers" in the conference and adequately pay those who are willing to work hard. W. C. White argued pointedly that "the Lord's money" should be distributed "according to the work done, and the necessities of the worker. It is a cruel and stupid thing to pay an earnest and efficient preacher less than a living wage, when there is money in the treasury, just because he is a beginner."  

At the first biennial session of the Lake Union Conference held in Chicago in March 1902, Magan recommended that a plan be formulated for "systematic regulation and support of the church school work," but no decision was taken. In November, at the fall session of the Lake Union Conference committee, Magan could only report that


2 A. G. Daniells to W. C. White, February 4, 1902, EGWRC-DC. W. C. White to A. G. Daniells, February 9, 1902, RG 91: Misc Rec, Daniells, A. G. -4, GCAr.
the local conferences were "committed to support teachers and schools," but that such support was "voluntary with each conference." Conferences, in his estimation, were not paying according to their "strength." Again he requested that they make some decisions. Once again no decisive action was taken.¹ The indecision of the denominational committees and sessions persisted throughout the period of the Sutherland administration at Berrien Springs.

The educational work was the first topic for discussion by the General Conference committee in November 1902. Church-school teachers, Frederick Griggs argued, should be supported either by tithe or general donations. W. C. White and W. T. Knox, treasurer of the General Conference, suggested that the second tithe could be the answer. Sutherland, Magan, and Griggs emphasized the need to pay the church-school teachers from a central fund managed by the conference committee, but H. W. Cottrell, president of the Atlantic Union Conference, opposed this suggestion. In Daniells' opinion, the Adventist "educational system should be carefully studied" and brought up at the next General Conference session. When the meetings ended, the issues had generated considerable discussion, yet the question of teacher status and salaries remained undecided.²

At the General Conference session held in Oakland from March 27 to April 13, 1903, numerous important aspects of Christian education were again discussed. Since there was opposition to the use of the first tithe for the payment of teachers' salaries, Sutherland

¹LUC Min, April 2; November 18, 1902.
²GCC Min, November 20, 23, 1902.
sought to make a strong case for educating the church members to support Christian education through the payment of a second 10 percent of their earnings. That suggestion, however, met with opposition from A. G. Harrison, the field missionary secretary of the Southern Union. Revealing a deplorably unsympathetic attitude toward the problem, he expressed fear that "the question of salary was being emphasized too much." "The young workers," he maintained, "should be encouraged to go out and work, salary or no salary." In conclusion, he recommended "the second tithe for the poor" to whom "it belonged." No substantive action was taken on the critical issues. The General Conference educational committee went on record, however, as recommending that "donations for the church-school work be gathered throughout the conference into the state conference treasury, and that the church-school teachers receive their support from the conference, the same as other conference workers." Because of the complexity of the educational problem, the delegates voted to convene a conference, sponsored by the educational department of the General Conference, to fully discuss all aspects of the issue and to "advise and inaugurate plans that [would] be of universal application."¹

¹GCB April 8, 1903, pp. 109-15; April 13, 1903, pp. 177-78. Cf. pp. 179-83.
God has placed in the church "first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers." Christian teachers, Sutherland declared, were called to "stand by the side of the minister. They are to carry the everlasting Gospel to the children, as the minister is to carry it to those who do not know the truth.\textsuperscript{1}

On this occasion, C. W. Flaiz, president of the Minnesota Conference, dissented. Taking a very dim view of the disposition of the church members regarding the payment of the tithe, he said: "It does not seem to me to be at all feasible under existing circumstances to attempt to support our church schools from the tithe, either first or second." He claimed that "they" (apparently the leaders of the local conference) had done "everything possible" to raise the tithe, but that it was scarcely sufficient to carry on the work without adding teachers to the payroll.\textsuperscript{2}

In welcome contrast, William Covert, president of the Wisconsin Conference, proved to be Sutherland's strongest supporter. Explaining that the reference he was about to read did not specifically address church schools but gave instruction "regarding conferences helping in our school work," he read from volume 6 of the Testimonies:

Those who minister in our schools, teaching the word of God, explaining the Scriptures, educating the students in the things of God, should be supported by the tithe money. This instruction was given long ago, and more recently it has been repeated again and again.

He staunchly defended the use of the tithe for the support of teachers

\textsuperscript{1} Convention of the Department of Education (South Lancaster, MA: South Lancaster Printing Co., [1903]:113-17.

\textsuperscript{2} Ibid., pp. 122-25.
at any level in the educational system.\(^1\)

Unfortunately, as the session drew to an end, Prescott (vice-president of the General Conference and one of the guest speakers) simply recommended the continuation of the status quo: that each conference "take general oversight of the work, and be left free in providing money necessary, as they may determine, for the rendering of such financial help as may be necessary in the cases of weaker schools."\(^2\) The indecisive results of the convention must have caused Sutherland keen disappointment.

By early 1904 Magan reported that "some of the conference committees still question[ed] the paying of teachers from the tithe." This remark seems to imply that some conferences had decided that it was proper to use the tithe for the support of teachers.\(^3\)

During the last part of 1903 and early 1904, Sutherland and Magan confronted other significant problems. Consequently, their correspondence during that period does not deal with teacher status and support. Teachers eventually became regular conference employees who received salaries just like other denominational workers. This, however, was not accomplished during the administration of Sutherland at Emmanuel Missionary College, even though he and Magan had labored for it with enthusiasm and perseverance.

\(^2\)Ibid., pp. 127-28.
\(^3\)EMC Fac Min, February 5, 1904.
Free Education

Free education for children in Adventist schools, especially at the elementary level, was another issue that Sutherland promoted vigorously during his years in Berrien Springs. Like the discussion and resolution of the problem of teachers' salaries, the promulgation of the ideal of free Christian education was at least indirectly impeded by the critical state of the finances of both Emmanuel Missionary College and the General Conference.

Sutherland pursued the ideal of free education on two fronts: within the context of the recently created elementary church-school system and at Emmanuel Missionary College. Throughout the three years that Sutherland was at Berrien Springs he expended considerable time and effort addressing the question of how to make free education practicable. At no point did he declare that there should be no tuition charged at Emmanuel Missionary College, though it is possible he considered that to be the ideal. Sutherland maintained that even at the elementary level it was certainly preferable to charge tuition and keep the schools open than to have no Adventist schools at all. He believed, however, that there was a better way—namely, for every church member to pay a second tithe for the support of Christian education. The second tithe would make tuition unnecessary.\(^1\)

Elementary school tuition

In the Advocate of April 1901, Sutherland, writing about the church schools, still maintained the position that "those who

patronize the school should pay tuition," though he emphasized that "those who have no children should help bear the burden." He reasoned that "Christian schools are church schools, and all should help support them as much as all citizens pay taxes to maintain the public schools, whether they have children or not."^1

At the educational conference convened in Berrien Springs from July 10 to 20, 1901, however, Sutherland had already modified his position on tuition. He asserted: "The schools for older persons may be supported by tuition, donations, etc.; but the children are the Lord's heritage, and should be provided for by the Church." The work of the "church primary school" and the church, he explained, should be recognized "as one." H. R. Salisbury, a teacher at Emmanuel Missionary College, strongly supported Sutherland's position, adding that in order to carry on the work of the primary schools effectively, "each state must have some system for the general distribution of funds to support poor schools."^2

Sutherland and Magan both spoke out against the use of the biblical tithe as a means of church-school support. Sutherland, however, qualified his statement: "Let us keep our hands off the first tithe until the Lord tells us that it should be used for school purposes." He suggested four acceptable sources of money for the schools: (1) generous contributions, (2) a second tithe by all church


^2E. A. Sutherland and H. R. Salisbury, quoted in "How Should the Seventh-day Adventist Church Organization, in a Substantial Manner, Maintain Schools for Its Children?" TS Advocate 3 (August/September 1901):216-18.
members, (3) support from "merchant princes of the world," and (4) "substantial business men" connected with the schools.\footnote{Ibid.}

E. S. Ballenger, ministerial licentiate from Fernando, California, described a novel method of raising funds for tuition that was being employed in southern California. Opportunity was given by the local conference for church members to canvass with the "subscription books, Signs of the Times, etc.," and to receive the full profits if they were applied to the church-school fund. Thus Adventist children paid no tuition. Non-Adventist children were also encouraged to attend, but were charged from $1.25 to $1.75 a month. Ballenger claimed that before the close of the school year, they had seen twelve of the thirteen non-Adventist families represented in the school join the church.\footnote{Ibid. E. S. Ballenger, quoted in "How Should the Seventh-day Church Organization, in a Substantial Manner, Maintain Schools for its Children?" \textit{TS Advocate} 3 (August/September 1901):217.}

Desirous of setting a right example, Sutherland helped the newly organized Berrien Springs Adventist church to establish a church school in late 1901. "Of one thing the church felt sure," he wrote, "the school should be a church school; that is every member should have the privilege of assisting in its support." From its inception the school charged no tuition to either Adventist or non-Adventist children. Needed support apparently came through "pledges" rather than payment of a second tithe, and "certain members" promised to "stand good for the deficit" should there be any.\footnote{E. A. Sutherland, "The Berrien Springs Church School," \textit{TS Advocate} 4 (January 1902):11-12.}
While Sutherland was busy thinking through and developing his philosophy and plan regarding free education at the college level, his colleague, Magan, devised a novel plan for needy students to acquire tuition. It was approved and voted by the college board.¹

Called the "Acre Fund" (not to be confused with the Missionary Acre Fund) in the 1901 school Calendar, it consisted of getting donors to "purchase" an acre or more of college farmland at $150 per acre, then renting the acre plots to be farmed independently by each needy student. The land would remain the property of the college, and become, in fact, endowed. Money accruing from the "sale" of the land would be used to advance funds to the students for the purchase of needed items such as seed and tools. Though the school gardener would be available to help with advice, the student would be in complete charge of planting, tending, harvesting, and marketing his produce. If industrious he would reap a sizable profit, and the money he repaid for rent and advances would serve to perpetuate the endowment fund. W. C. White perceived serious drawbacks in the plan, however, because a student thus encumbered would find it difficult to leave the school when necessary for field practicum and missionary labor. It is not known if donors were found, and if they were, how many students took advantage of the offer. In any case, the novel plan did not appear in the 1902 Calendar. It was apparently dropped.²

¹P. T. Magan to S. N. Haskell, August 6, 1901, RG 9: Misc Rec, Daniells, A. G. -4, GCAr. EMC Bd Min, July 21, 1901.

A tuition charge of $1 per week ($10 per term) was stipulated in the calendars during Sutherland's years at Emmanuel Missionary College. No offer of free college tuition appeared in the 1901 Calendar. The next year's Calendar, however, offered the possibility of free tuition to "young men and women who desire a brief training for active missionary service." Acceptance into the school on a free basis depended largely on the possession of a letter from one's local conference president testifying to one's exemplary character and ability, and confirming the prospective student's intention to become "an active laborer" on completion of "a brief course at the College."^1

In June 1902 the college board apparently recommended that arrangements be made so that the college might offer free tuition to all students approved by the conference presidents in the Lake Union. A committee subsequently dialogued on the topic with the officers of the individual conferences. Shortly before fall term classes were to begin, Sutherland met with representatives from each of the conferences to finalize on the issue of free tuition for selected students. Of the six conference presidents attending, five of them heartily supported the plan. Only S. H. Lane of Southern Illinois dissented. E. K. Slade, auditor and representative of the East Michigan Conference, also approved. Thus the limited free tuition plan began at Emmanuel Missionary College—a plan which continued throughout Sutherland's administration.2

---

^1EMC Cal, 1902, pp. 21-22.

^2EMC Bd Min, October 2, 1902. EMC Fac Min, February 5, 1904. Cf. EMC Bd Min, November 19, 1902. Sutherland cites a June 1902
By mid-1902 Sutherland had developed a more clearly defined philosophy regarding free Christian education, and his position had taken on theological overtones. In the Advocate he wrote: "We advocate free pews in our churches, free admission to our evangelical services, but make a charge for Christian teaching when it goes to the children. The principle is wrong; it is time to correct it."^1

Having asserted that "Christian education is the gospel to the children and youth," he asked: "Is the gospel to be sold?" The Hebrews did not charge for education because they recognized that "in order to perpetuate the life of the nation and to maintain prestige among other peoples, the children must be taught to adhere strictly to the principles upon which national prosperity rested." Later, in the Middle Ages, the papacy had "inaugurated a system of fees" for every favor of the church. According to Sutherland, in the early years of America, Horace Mann had "worked with the popular churches, urging upon them the importance of universal free education. But the churches pleaded poverty, and under this assumed guise they lost, not only their power, but their opportunity." Thus the state had assumed responsibility for providing free schools. In conclusion, Sutherland

recommendation of the college board recommending that arrangements be made so that the "College might offer free tuition to all students recommended by the Conference Presidents for training." The minutes where he cites it, however, contain a blank in place of the specific date in June. A careful search of board and faculty minutes for the month of June did not locate such a recommendation.

asserted that the "church which adopts a system of free schools will preach the everlasting gospel to the world... Mission fields now destitute of laborers will hear the message of salvation."\(^1\)

In harmony with Sutherland, Miss DeGraw reasoned that free tuition was not a gift, nor would it "encourage laziness," because when the child who had received it grew to manhood he would pay for his education "by assisting to support the schools in which the next generation are educated." Besides, she argued, "free tuition gives all an equal chance." That view was also endorsed by her colleague, Mrs. Druillard, who pointed out that "if the schools are to be supported by tuition the fact will always remain that some children—those whose parents are unable or unwilling to meet the tuition charge—are deprived of Christian school training."\(^2\)

Viewing the issue of financial support from the perspective of a businesswoman, Mrs. Druillard found the subscription (pledge) plan objectionable because it placed the burden on only a few individuals. On the other hand, the second tithe, in her opinion, did not belong solely to the Levites but should be shared with the "poor to meet the expenses of public gatherings, etc." Since she considered Christian teachers to be wholly in the Levite class, Mrs. Druillard

---


argued that it was consistent with Scripture to use the first tithe to support the schools.\(^1\)

When asked by a denominational worker from Iowa for his opinion regarding free education, W. C. White wrote that from his study of the "Scripture and of mother's writings" he did not feel free to "depart from the position held by our people regarding the tithe; that it is for the use of the ministry; and that we should be unselfish in its use, sending our messengers to all parts of the world." The second tithe, in his opinion, had three particularly worthwhile uses: to aid the poor, to assist in medical missionary work, and to support the educational work. In his mother's counsels he perceived a "straightforward and harmonious presentation of the matter upon the basis of tuition payment for education" without any exception for a particular level or type of school. She counselled against putting the tuition so low that the work would be crippled, but made numerous "intimations that students without friends should be helped by interested individuals and by the church."

In conclusion, W. C. White expressed the hope that the time would come when the church schools would be supported from three sources: (1) "tuitions paid by the parents of the children"; (2) "appropriations from a church fund which is raised by those who have not children as well as by those who have children"; and (3) "appropriations from the Conference tithe to those teachers who do faithful Christian work in the school, in the Sabbath-school, and in the families."\(^2\)

\(^1\)Ibid.

\(^2\)W. C. White to F. Bralliar, February 22, 1904, EGWRC-DC.
The fact that Ellen and W. C. White did not expressly criticize Sutherland's attempt to offer free education, financed primarily through the second tithe, would seem to indicate that they did not consider his experiment a violation of principle. Evidence suggests that where it was possible to convince all of the church members to pay a faithful second tithe, the ideal of Christian education without tuition was attainable.¹

By the time Sutherland left Berrien Springs in 1904, the college debt had been reduced by at least half, but approximately $48,000 was still owed. The issue of teachers' salaries had been much debated, but no general denominational policy of teacher support had yet been voted. The matter of free tuition had met with mixed success. Selected students at Emmanuel Missionary College had been attending without tuition charge for two years. The plan appears to have worked well, and it had the support of most of the conference administrators. The situation at the elementary level, however, had not yet been resolved. Some conferences were offering free tuition, at least for Adventist children, but there was no definitive church policy regarding the support of the church schools so that children could attend without charge.

¹In September 1904 the Advocate reported that the Southern California Conference had developed a school system "based on the principles of Christian education, supported by an apportionment of the second tithes as a school fund." The system comprised "various local church schools, and a central school for advanced students." According to the article, the Northern California Conference had also adopted such a plan. [E. A. Sutherland], "Free Tuition," TS Advocate 6 (September 1904):141-42.
In spite of the opposition of the denominational leaders, Kellogg, with the support of Sutherland and Magan, reopened Battle Creek College in the fall of 1903 to provide state-recognized pre-medical instruction for the students who wanted to attend American Medical Missionary College. Since Kellogg had shown an increasing disposition to ignore certain counsels of Ellen White, it was not surprising that he should choose to do so again. The fact that Sutherland and Magan would lend him their support, however, was perceived as an ominous departure from their former attitude toward her writings.

The conflict that resulted from the reopening of the college involved four pairs of denominational leaders: Ellen and W. C. White, Daniells and Prescott, Sutherland and Magan, and Kellogg and Jones. The first two pairs aligned themselves on one side, while the second two pairs took the other side of the issue. The ensuing controversy exacerbated tensions which directly contributed to the resignation of Sutherland and Magan from Emmanuel Missionary College in 1904.

The need to reopen the college at Battle Creek arose because of the requirements of American Medical Missionary College, which Kellogg had founded in 1895. Dissatisfied with the instruction available at the medical schools of the day, Kellogg established a school that would offer instruction in harmony with his views and knowledge of medicine. It enjoyed success from the beginning—instead of the twenty-five students Kellogg had hoped would attend the first term, forty enrolled, and the school continued to grow. At the time Battle
Creek College moved to Berrien Springs in 1901, the General Conference voted to purchase the empty college buildings for use by Kellogg's medical school. A Missionary Acre Fund had been established to provide funding for the purchase.¹

As long as Battle Creek College remained in the city, it enjoyed a mutually beneficial relationship with the Battle Creek Sanitarium and American Medical Missionary College. At one time as many as 160 of the Battle Creek College students provided inexpensive labor for the sanitarium, and, in turn, were able to earn the needed funds for college board and tuition. At the time of the closing of the college its attendance was principally comprised of such students. Battle Creek College also provided the preparatory and college studies required for entrance into American Medical Missionary College and the Sanitarium Training School for Nurses.²

Those students who were dependent on the sanitarium for their finances remained in Battle Creek when the college moved to Berrien Springs. While they benefited financially, their inexpensive labor was vital to the sanitarium operation. Had those student employees...


gone to Berrien Springs, the medical facility would have suffered a critical personnel problem in caring for its patients.¹

For the sake of those prospective medical students who remained in Battle Creek at the time the college was moved, Kellogg made arrangements for E. D. Kirby, for years a teacher at Battle Creek College, to continue to offer the needed preparatory subjects. Those courses had been taught for only a few months before the two main buildings of the Battle Creek Sanitarium burned on February 18, 1902. The crucial significance of Kellogg's subsequent decision to rebuild the sanitarium in Battle Creek cannot be overstated.²

Had Kellogg resisted his inclination to rebuild bigger and better, refused the offers of support and financial assistance from the Battle Creek citizens and former patients, and followed Ellen White's admonitions to move out of Battle Creek and decentralize the medical work, the problem of the continuation of Battle Creek as an educational center would not have arisen.

Once Kellogg and the church leaders decided to rebuild in the city, the die was cast. Kirby and his assistants continued to instruct students in Battle Creek. According to Kellogg, that inconspicuous arrangement could have continued except for changes in the laws of a growing number of states. State legislators were determined to establish more rigorous educational qualifications for entrance into medical colleges. Kellogg correctly perceived the handwriting

¹Ibid.
on the wall; "within a few years, a bachelor's degree in the sciences will be required as a consideration of admittance to medical schools of high standing."^1

Claiming that the requirements of the State Board of Health of Illinois, which had chartered American Medical Missionary College, were virtually the most rigorous in the nation, Kellogg declared that he had tried to procure adequate legal recognition for Kirby's instruction through the local high school. He had also sought a concession from the Board of Regents of New York. Both efforts, however, had failed.  

By January 1903 Kellogg claimed that he had consulted with the "Board of Trustees of the Emmanuel Missionary College" about the possibility of organizing "an examining faculty" under the still valid charter of the old Battle Creek College. At least one member of the board, Frederick Griggs, would later publicly deny that he had been advised of the meetings, let alone "apprised officially or otherwise of what had actually been done until [he] received the twenty-sixth annual Calendar of the College." Consultations had apparently been carried out among Kellogg, Jones, S. H. Lane (president of the Southern Illinois Conference), Sutherland, and Magan, and the five men had

^1J. H. Kellogg to "Dear Brother" [A. G. Daniells], January 20, 1903, RG 9: Misc Rec, Daniells, A. G. -1, GCAR. While some Adventist physicians claimed that Kellogg was mistaken in believing that in the future medical students would be required to take an increasing amount of pre-medical classwork, he was soon proved correct. By 1909, all University of Michigan medical students had to have certificates verifying that they had completed two years of study in a college of high standing. F. M. Rossiter to A. G. Daniells, October 6, 1903, Griggs Coll, AUHR. Ola Gladys Hylton, "A History of the Public Health Movement in Michigan" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1943), p. 164.

^2J. H. Kellogg to "Dear Brother" [A. G. Daniells], January 20, 1903, RG 9: Misc Rec, Daniells, A. G. -1, GCAR.
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tentatively concurred on approval of the idea.¹

While Kellogg claimed that "this plan has been suggested only as a last resort," he firmly declared that the "Medical Missionary College is here and must stay here." One of the reasons he noted for reopening the college was that

the opportunity of keeping students some years in training, first in the nurses' course and then in the Medical School, making six or seven years in all, renders it possible to become so thoroughly acquainted with the students that his [sic] qualifications for work can be better understood and appreciated than would be possible were it not for such intimate acquaintance.

Such a prolonged period of study, however, especially under Kellogg's influence, was precisely what concerned Ellen White. In a letter to Daniells, she wrote:

Dr. Kellogg treats those who learn under him as if he owned them, body, soul, and spirit. . . . I have recently been instructed that no one should be advised to pledge himself to spend two, three, four, five, or six years under any man's tuition, not even Dr. Kellogg's. Brethren, we have no time for this. Time is short.

Determinedly moving ahead with his plans, Kellogg, on June 4, 1903, met in Battle Creek with four men: A. T. Jones, S. H. Lane, E. A. Sutherland, and E. D. Kirby. Jones informed the men that

at a recent meeting of members of the College Board in Oakland, Cal. a committee had been authorized to reorganize the work of Battle Creek College, and that this committee


²J. H. Kellogg to "Dear Brother" [A. G. Daniells], January 20, 1903, RG 9: Misc Rec, Daniells, A. G. -1, GCAr.

³E. G. White to A. G. Daniells, August 4, 1903, EGWRC-DC.
consisted of E. A. Sutherland, S. H. Lane, P. T. Magan and J. H. Kellogg, acting with the chairman.

Those present at the meeting promptly elected A. T. Jones as president and E. D. Kirby as "Secretary of the College." They also voted to offer a "collegiate course leading to the degree of A. B." A qualifying resolution by Kellogg was voted that "no student shall be admitted, and that degrees shall be granted to no persons except those who declare it to be their intention to enter upon some line of recognized Medical Missionary work."²

The decision to reopen the college would not have taken place had Kellogg followed the counsels of Ellen White. After the fire in early 1902, she had remained silent on the question of rebuilding the sanitarium--waiting to see if Kellogg would finally follow the counsel she had given him years earlier to move the institution out of the city. When she learned that he had made the fateful decision to rebuild the sanitarium in Battle Creek, however, she did not counsel the church members to abandon it. On the contrary, she wrote: "I wish that a portion of the work of this institution had been taken elsewhere. But the Sanitarium has been erected in Battle Creek, and

¹EMC Bd Min, June 4, 1903. It is not clear what "College Board" Jones referred to as having met in Oakland. If he was implying that it was the Board of Trustees of the Seventh-day Adventist Central Educational Association (which would have been the board with proper jurisdiction), the board had twelve members, and there is no record of such a meeting. EMC Bd Min, May 6, 1903. While Frederick Griggs' name does not appear on the list in the board minutes, he must have been a member ex officio by virtue of his position as the newly elected General Conference educational secretary. GCB, April 13, 1903, p. 177.

²EMC Bd Min, June 4, 1903.
it must be helped. God will institute ways and means."\(^1\)

On the other hand, her counsel against educating students in Battle Creek remained unchanged. "Students," she insisted, "should not be crowded in Battle Creek to receive an education in medical missionary lines. . . . Let medical missionary plants be made in many places." Regarding the destruction of the sanitarium, she wrote:

By fire the Lord removed the great argument in favor of gathering many students to Battle Creek. He swept away the Sanitarium to prevent the carrying out of the idea that Battle Creek was to be the great center for the training of medical students.\(^2\)

She cited four important reasons why students should avoid studying in Battle Creek. A principal one was Kellogg's one-man rule.

His [God's] medical missionary work is not to be ruled, controlled, and molded by one man, as for some years it certainly has been. The exercise of such a power, if continued, will mar the work, and will be the certain ruin of the man exercising control. . . . If any man sets himself up as being above God, and takes the work under his finite supervision, the watchmen standing on the walls of Zion must discern the danger and take heroic action to save the man and the cause.

A second major concern was the contact students would have with the large numbers who are expected to patronize the sanitarium at Battle Creek." Maintaining a school in a place "where a worldly element prevails to so great an extent" would "counterwork" the labor


\(^2\)E. G. White, "To Those in Council at Battle Creek, Michigan," April 16, 1903, EGWRC-DC. Cf. E. G. White to F. Griggs, August 26, 1903, EGWRC-DC. E. G. White to Willie, August 3, 1903, EGWRC-DC.

\(^3\)E. G. White, "To Those in Council at Battle Creek, Michigan," April 16, 1903, EGWRC-DC.
which the "Lord has outlined should be done for our youth in our edu-
cational institutions."

Recognizing the variety of mission work that needed to be
carried out worldwide, Mrs. White's third concern was that too many
students were being persuaded to study medicine at Battle Creek when
other lines of work needed to be built up. She mentioned the need
for printers and canvassers, and urged the "Berrien Springs School"
to do more to prepare "medical missionaries." Clearly not referring
to those who had medical degrees, she asserted that "giving the common
treatments to the sick will accomplish much more [than dispensary
work], and will give opportunity to those who administer these
hygienic treatments to labor with earnestness for the spiritual
recovery of their patients." The workers were to "learn to consult
the Great Physician in prayer much more than they have done. Pray,
watch, wait, and believe." 2

Ellen White's fourth concern, previously alluded to, was that
students were committing themselves to an excessive amount of study.
She urged: "Brethren, we have no time for this. Time is short. We
are to hold out urgent inducements to the men who ought now to be
engaged in missionary work for the Master. . . . May God help us," she
added: "to develop plans so that our youth can become genuine
medical missionaries. We can not afford to allow our very best and
most promising young men and young women to drift to Battle Creek." 3

1 E. G. White to A. G. Daniells, August 4, 1903, EGWRC-DC.
2 Ibid. E. G. White to A. G. Daniells, August 27, 1903, EGWRC-DC.
3 E. G. White to A. G. Daniells, August 4, 1903, EGWRC-DC.
One may logically ask why Sutherland, though confronted with the categorical statements of Ellen White, lent his approval and support to the reopening of the college in Battle Creek. There were three principal reasons. First, he believed that there was "no way left" to "provide a legal educational body which could be recognized by state authorities" for pre-medical instruction. "To meet this situation, and for this reason alone, an organization was perfected with power to grant degrees." Second, none of the denomination's educational leaders had a better solution to offer. Sutherland recalled that when the situation had "been laid before the leaders of our schools, they were asked to present a better plan, but no other was offered." Third, he was determined not to offer degrees at Berrien Springs.\(^1\)

"To grant degrees," Sutherland explained, "necessitates the offering of long courses, and tempts students to remain in school for years when they should be active workers in the field." A degree-granting program, he believed, would thus be inimical to the goals of a training school. Consequently, his decision to support the organization of "a school in Battle Creek to meet the legal requirements" in connection with the medical profession was essentially a

\(^1\)E. A. Sutherland, "The Relation of the American Medical Missionary College to Other Schools," TS Advocate 5 (September 1903): 265-66. Sutherland does not explain just when the matter was "laid before the leaders of our schools," but Prescott alludes to the assertion of Sutherland and his colleagues that the matter had been "fully discussed at a "conference" in "the summer of 1901." Thus it was probably during the educational convention held at Berrien Springs. W. W. Prescott, "The Reopening of Battle Creek College," RH 80 (August 27, 1903): 4-5.
defensive decision, designed to protect the integrity of Emmanuel Missionary College.  

Of the two issues—the rebuilding of the sanitarium in Battle Creek and the reopening of the college there—the rebuilding was clearly the most critical. Although Daniells had voted in favor of the rebuilding of the sanitarium, he was upset with Sutherland for supporting the reopening of the college. Perhaps both men should have cast negative votes, but both had been swayed by Kellogg's considerable powers of persuasion and the apparent inevitability of the outcome.  

Sutherland believed that he had made a necessary though not ideal decision by authorizing restricted educational work at Battle Creek. He emphasized, however, that he was not condoning the offering of general educational work there. He wrote:

It is inconsistent to suppose that Emmanuel Missionary College, which holds, as one of its fundamental principles, that education should be conducted in the country, is in sympathy with the revival of Battle Creek College as a general educational institution.

The reactivation of the Battle Creek College charter, in a sense, gratified him because, as he understood it, with the legal recognition obtainable in Battle Creek, "students may take all of their preparatory work for the medical course in schools outside" of the city.

---

1E. A. Sutherland, "The Relation of the American Medical Missionary College to Other Schools," TS Advocate 5 (September 1903):265-66.

2A. G. Daniells to W. C. White, March 25, 1902; August 9; October 9, 1903, EGWRC-DC. Cf. LUC Min, March 31, 1902. Daniells stated that he believed the future of the sanitarium would be "its most glorious period."

3E. A. Sutherland, "The Relation of the American Medical Missionary College to Other Schools," TS Advocate 5 (September 1903):265-66.
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According to Sutherland, after preparatory work had been completed elsewhere, the student could enter the freshman class of the medical college. At the end of two years a student would receive the scientific degree which the state demanded of medical students, and after two more years would receive the medical diploma.¹

Daniells, however, maintained that the entire "legal recognition" issue was a ploy contrived by Kellogg to enable him to "get control of the education of the brightest and most promising young people in this denomination." Even Yale, Daniells contended, had recently voted against requiring a college diploma for entrance into medical school. Losing sight, at least momentarily, of the importance of the Christian perspective emphasized in Adventist education, Daniells argued: "Why not let them [the medical students] take their entire course at Jefferson? Or why not let them graduate from Howard University in Washington?"²

While Sutherland wanted to see the medical students in a rural environment for as much of their education as possible, and Daniells was willing to send them off to secular institutions, Kellogg wanted the most promising young Adventists to come to study at Battle Creek for as many years as possible. Viewed from Kellogg's perspective, his goal was completely logical. Viewed from Ellen White's perspective, it was dangerous and wrong; Sutherland should not have supported the reopening--no matter how expedient or inevitable it appeared.

¹Ibid.

²A. G. Daniells to W. C. White, August 30, 1903, EGWRC-DC.
By mid-1903 Kellogg had purportedly been engaged for months in a writing campaign to recruit students for Battle Creek. Writing to the elders of the churches, he had requested that they supply him with the names of all the "bright, energetic, promising young people with whom they were acquainted." He described the "great work the large Sanitarium in Battle Creek was doing, how the people were flocking in by hundreds, what a grand work was being done, and what a splendid opening there was for the young people." Daniells claimed that he had read one of the letters, and that similar ones were being sent all over the United States.¹

When the Battle Creek school calendar appeared, it undoubtedly surprised many, including Sutherland. It was titled Twenty-sixth Annual Calendar of Battle Creek College, which would lead the uninformed to assume that the school had been in uninterrupted operation for at least twenty-six years. It also listed nineteen faculty members, only one less than at Emmanuel Missionary College. It hardly looked like the restrictive, limited operation that Kellogg had claimed it would be. Addressing the matter of the curriculum, it offered "complete college courses leading up to the Bachelor's degrees [sic]." Instruction was to include preparatory courses and summer sessions. Sutherland had worked hard to develop the intermediate schools in large part to keep the younger students from going to Battle Creek for their preparatory work. Now even they were being induced to go there. It can be surmised that he felt distressed over

¹A. G. Daniells to W. C. White, August 9, 1903, EGWRC-DC.
the broad program to be offered at Battle Creek College, but evidence is lacking to demonstrate that.\footnote{1}{BCC Cal, 1903, pp. 3-7.}

Sutherland's role in the reopening of the college became well known to the members of the denomination, particularly through two strongly critical editorials by W. W. Prescott in the \textit{Review and Herald}. On August 4, 1903, referring to the school Calendar, Prescott reviewed the history that had led to the removal of the college from Battle Creek. Not hiding his disapproval, Prescott concluded: "We can but regard the reopening of Battle Creek College as an ill-advised move which will tend to confuse the minds of this people concerning the steps which have been taken under the counsel of the spirit of prophecy." While in the first editorial he registered surprise and consternation, in the second he addressed the problems more specifically. Of concern to him was the fact that a group "of four or five persons in private conference" should have agreed to a "course of action which would seem to nullify" the unanimous decision to move the college out of Battle Creek "at the General Conference." He remained strongly opposed to the reopening.\footnote{2}{W. W. Prescott, "A Surprising Announcement Concerning Battle Creek College," RH 80 (August 4, 1903):4-5; "The Reopening of Battle Creek College," RH 80 (August 27, 1903):4-5. Cf. N. H. Druillard to "girls and boys," August 11, 1903, EGWRC-DC.}

In the August 27 issue of the \textit{Review and Herald} an article appeared, signed by Jones, Sutherland, Magan, Kirby, and Kellogg, which was intended to set the record straight. Following a detailed explanation meant to justify their actions, the article particularly

\footnote{1}{BCC Cal, 1903, pp. 3-7.}
emphasized Sutherland's role. It was pointed out that "the school at Battle Creek will be conducted in perfect harmony with the school at Berrien Springs. The President of Emmanuel Missionary College is a member of the Board of Administration of the Battle Creek College."¹

That was the sort of adverse exposure that Sutherland least needed. Ever since he had arrived in Battle Creek as president of the college in 1897, he had struggled with an image problem—particularly with some of the church leaders and in a more general way with the church at large. Since Sutherland was already suffering from a marked estrangement with Daniells and Prescott, this latest incident was construed as additional evidence of a recalcitrance to work in harmony with the church, and a willingness to align himself with Kellogg, who was viewed as an increasingly independent maverick. The meager attendance at Emmanuel Missionary College during the fall term of 1903 bears silent witness to the unfortunate lack of confidence in Sutherland and the institution of which he was president.²

Through the years, Sutherland had tried to seek Ellen White's counsel, particularly at critical junctures in his experience. Had he also sought Ellen White's counsel regarding the reopening of Battle Creek College, he would have saved himself from making a decision that was fraught with dire consequences. While pragmatically logical, his decision abetted a move which fostered the presence of many of the


²Ellen White urged Daniells to encourage students to go to Emmanuel Missionary College, but it appears to have had little effect on his attitude toward the institution. E. G. White to A. G. Daniells, August 27, 1903, EGWRC-DC.
church's most promising youth in Battle Creek at the very time when the church was about to undergo a divisive struggle with Kellogg which would culminate in his loss of church membership, and the denomination's loss of the Battle Creek Sanitarium.

The Developing Crisis

In September 1903 Sutherland had only eight months remaining until he would resign his post as president of Emmanuel Missionary College; and twelve months until he would leave Berrien Springs permanently. During those last months his loyalty to the church he had tried faithfully to serve would be seriously questioned as Sutherland also sought to be loyal to his staunch supporter and close friend, J. H. Kellogg.

Finally, tired of the infighting but determined to stay loyal to the church and the counsels of Ellen White, pained by the lack of Daniells' support and discouraged by Kellogg's devious maneuverings and alienation from the church, Sutherland would decide to give up at Berrien Springs and go to the South. He would go to a part of the country whose mission challenge had beckoned him for years. Praised by Ellen White for his faithful work at Berrien Springs, the college board members would demonstrate their support of Sutherland by ignoring his resignation and urging him to try to establish a school in the southern states while still serving as president of Emmanuel Missionary College. In the end, however, he would prudently decide to dedicate himself, heart and soul, to pioneering the self-supporting educational work in the south.

The years that Sutherland and Magan served at Emmanuel
Missionary College were years of intense turmoil at the highest levels of denominational leadership. To correctly understand (1) Daniells' and Prescott's general lack of support of Sutherland, Magan, and the college at Berrien Springs; and (2) Sutherland and Magan's criticism of the church leaders, one must also understand Kellogg's increasing spirit of independence and estrangement from the church. Sutherland and Magan believed Kellogg to be one of their most loyal supporters and dearest friends. Blinded by their friendship with him and his apparently unflagging support of them, they faithfully encouraged and defended him, and, in the process, became infected with his critical attitude toward the leaders of the church.

The developing crisis that culminated at the Lake Union Conference session in 1904 and Sutherland's departure from Berrien Springs can best be understood through an examination of three factors: (1) the political climate in the church; (2) the issues involving Kellogg's book, The Living Temple; and (3) the illness and death of Ida Magan.

Divisive Church Politics

By 1901 the Adventist medical work had grown so large and powerful that it employed 2,000 workers, while only 1,500 served with the General Conference. The "right arm" of the message, as Ellen White liked to call the medical work, appeared to be in danger of becoming the "head." Further endangering the needed denominational balance, Kellogg had through the years developed an attitude of
superiority to the ministers, and seemed increasingly desirous of controlling church affairs.¹

As early as 1899 Kellogg, recognizing his numerical strength, had proposed that each conference be allowed to send to the General Conference sessions as many delegates as it wished. He had also suggested that every ordained minister should automatically be a delegate. While the recommendations were not accepted, they revealed his growing interest in tailoring the church structure to his advantage. At the 1901 General Conference session, where the issue of reorganization dominated, Kellogg was granted a larger representation for the medical institutions of the church. In addition, he, with five other medical workers, became a member of the twenty-five member General Conference Executive Committee.²

A. G. Daniells, elected to serve as chairman of the General Conference committee, initially had the support of Kellogg, and it appeared that the rift that had existed between the medical and ministerial branches of the church might be a thing of the past. Within a short time, however, Kellogg discovered that Daniells had a mind of his own. Thus in 1902 an unsuccessful attempt was made to replace Daniells with A. T. Jones as chairman of the committee of twenty-five.


Only temporarily thwarted, Kellogg began laying plans to oust Daniells at the 1903 General Conference.1

The 1902 General Conference committee session, in Daniells' estimation, had been a time of "crisis"; an occasion during which Daniells was "greatly grieved" because of the "stand" Sutherland and Magan had taken "in the controversy that arose." In a letter Daniells wrote to Sutherland in late 1904, he admitted that from that time [the fall of 1902] I felt that your judgment and course of action were so entirely out of harmony with what seemed to me to be right, that it was impossible for me to co-operate with you. I could not see that we looked at the great issues we were facing with scarcely any degree of harmony. And as I could not feel that your position was right, I could see no other way than separation.2

With words of special significance for Sutherland and Magan, Prescott later observed: "I think this General Conference Committee council marked a crisis and a turning point in our work, and I believe that positions were taken then which will tell very much on the future work of those who took them." Kellogg, reporting the council from

A. G. Daniells to C. C. Nicola, July 30, 1906, MSU Kellogg Papers.

2A. G. Daniells to E. A. Sutherland, October 30, 1902, RG 11: Bk 27, p. 437; November 3, 1902, RG 11: Bk 29, p. 2; November 18, 1904, RG 11: Bk 35, p. 425, GCAr. An examination of the General Conference Committee minutes does not pinpoint the "controversy" to which Daniells alludes. It may have been, in part, the move to replace him. The "great issues" which are mentioned in the minutes were: (1) the possibility of removal of the sanitarium from denominational control; (2) whether or not The Living Temple contained objectionable theology; and (3) the need to avoid incurring additional denominational debts. Regarding the last issue, Kellogg was incensed at Daniells' unwillingness to authorize a $20,000 debt for the purchase of property that Kellogg had selected in England for the initiation of medical work there. GCC Min, November 14, 20, 22, 1904. J. H. Kellogg to E. G. White, December 31, 1902, EGWRC-DC. J. H. Kellogg to G. I. Butler, July 20, 1904; January 15, 1905, MSU Kellogg Papers. J. H. Kellogg to S. N. Haskell, October 10, 1904, MSU Kellogg Papers. Prescott,
his perspective, claimed in a letter to F. M. Wilcox, business manager and chaplain of the Boulder Sanitarium in Colorado, that there had been a clear "disposition to rule or ruin" himself and his supporters. He indicated to Wilcox that Magan, Sutherland, and A. T. Jones stood with the medical side, but the rest were "pretty well lined up against" them. Through openly aligning themselves with the Kellogg faction, Sutherland and Magan had precipitated a nearly total severance of supportive relations with Daniells and Prescott.¹

As far as Kellogg was concerned, the problems were clearly not resolved, though he claimed to long for peace. On the last day of 1902 Kellogg wrote to Ellen White, announcing that he had just completed a "75-page letter . . . stating the truth as I see it in relation to the matters which have been under controversy." Alluding to the total destruction of the Review and Herald by fire the night after the session, alluded to two spurious rumors that were circulating: (1) that Daniells and Prescott had refused to authorize additional indebtedness because they believed that "the time has been reached in the history of our work when institutions as such have no place or part in it;" and (2) that Kellogg had been wrongly accused of rejecting the writings of Ellen White. Prescott explained that, in practice, Kellogg held that each person should "judge for himself whether a testimony is correct or not." Moreover, Kellogg had "stated in a semi-public meeting" that "a goodly number of things" which Ellen White had written about him and the sanitarium work in the "past year or two" were "utterly false." W. W. Prescott to F. M. Wilcox, December 7, 1902, EGWRC-DC.

¹W. W. Prescott to F. M. Wilcox, December 7, 1902, EGWRC-DC. J. H. Kellogg to F. M. Wilcox, January 5, 1903, EGWRC-DC. An exchange of letters between Sutherland and Daniells in December 1902 seems to indicate that each man was sincerely concerned about the other, but apparently each felt justified that his own position was the correct one. See A. G. Daniells to E. A. Sutherland, December 12, 1902, RG 11: Bk 27, p. 378, GCAr. E. A. Sutherland to A. G. Daniells, December 31, 1902, RG 11: 1902-S, GCAr.
before, he claimed that I. H. Evans, Prescott, and Daniells had been "wholly mistaken" as to his attitude toward them and the counsels of Ellen White, but that "this experience" (the fire) might "open their eyes or in some way change their attitude." Kellogg told her that after much thought he had decided not to send the long letter unless she requested it, because he had decided "to drop all controversy." He also declared that he continued to "trust" her and "believe" in her and her work as he had done from his "childhood until now."^1

In spite of Kellogg's pacific words to Ellen White, he proceeded with plans to make another attempt to remove Daniells at the 1903 General Conference session held in Oakland, California. The Kellogg and Daniells camps again squared off with each other. Ellen White had asked Sutherland and Magan to visit her. As soon as they arrived in Oakland, therefore, they gave her a report on the school and discussed the plight of Kellogg. Magan recorded in his diary that they also pleaded with her "to treat him as a son." As the meetings began Magan felt deep sadness over the "general situation," and registered in his diary his distress that "the very men who stood for reformation two years" before had "turned traitor to the principles of the denomination." The sad thing was that Daniells and Prescott believed that Sutherland and Magan were the traitors.2

---

^1 J. H. Kellogg to E. G. White, December 31, 1902, EGWRC-DC. Sutherland and Magan encouraged Kellogg to send the seventy-five page letter which he finally did on March 18, 1903. J. H. Kellogg to E. G. White, January 21, 1903, EGWRC-DC. J. H. Kellogg to W. C. White, March 18, 1903, EGWRC-DC.

2 J. H. Kellogg to G. I. Butler, February 8, 1903, MSU Kellogg Papers. J. H. Kellogg to W. C. White, January 21; March 18, 1903, EGWRC-DC. Magan diary, March 25, 26, 1903, LLUAr.
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The attitudes of both sides were colored by misunderstandings. During the two weeks of meetings, Sutherland and Magan met with Kellogg and other members of his faction nearly every day. Ellen White pleaded with everyone to stop criticizing: "Satan will keep you at this till the Lord comes, if he can.... Backbiting is cannibalism. God calls upon His people to have nothing to do with it." But her counsels seemed to fall on deaf ears. In his diary, Magan had only caustic comments for members of the opposition, and he recorded that near the end of the session, at Daniells' request, Sutherland and Magan had met with him "to talk." According to Magan, Sutherland "talked to Daniells plainer than I ever heard any man talked to in my life." The talk lasted seven and one-half hours. Not surprisingly, little or nothing was accomplished with sharp words and long talk. The most dissatisfied with the proceedings, however, was Kellogg. In spite of his maneuverings, the delegates had amended the constitution of the church, officially declaring Daniells no longer chairman of the General Conference Committee but president of the Adventist church.¹

¹Magan diary, April 5, 1903, LLUAr. E. G. White, "Unity of Effort," GCB, April 2, 1903. C. D. Anderson, "The History and Evolution of Seventh-day Adventist Church Organization," pp. 240-51. Daniells, in a long letter to an Adventist physician, explained that not long after the 1901 General Conference session where he had been elected chairman of the committee of twenty-five, he began to use the title of "president" for signing documents and legal work. "I have never denied having assumed the title President. I have never apologized for having done so. I have never known that I committed any wrong in using that title. I did not see any great difference between the words Chairman and President." "Sometime" in 1901 Daniells "had the word president attached to" his name on the letterhead of the General Conference stationery. In the General Conference Bulletin he was listed as "president" as well. At the fall council in 1902, the title of president, which Daniells had carried virtually from the time of his election in 1901, was made a legal fact. A. G. Daniells to
Nearly overwhelmed by the pressures and continuing tensions of the beleaguered presidency, and not made to feel very welcome, Daniells resigned his position in the Training School Association at a meeting held in Battle Creek on May 1, 1903. Also feeling beleaguered and discouraged, Sutherland, in a four-hour faculty meeting on May 16, talked with his teachers "over the situation in the General Conference [and] told them there was a determination to crush Emmanuel Missionary College." On May 17 and 19 Sutherland also spoke to the students on "Church Government."¹ Magan's diary does not say whether Sutherland confided his fears of the church leadership to the students. In a letter Sutherland wrote to Daniells a few months later, however, he stated that as teachers and students they were praying for "the success of our brethren." He also assured Daniells that

we have kept, as far as possible, all information concerning the difficulty that has arisen, away from our students. Personally, I never talk to any of them about it. I do not want them to know anything about these difficulties. I believe that we have greater things to teach our students than the differences that have arisen among our brethren, whether those differences are of a theological, financial, or personal nature.

Unfortunately, but not surprisingly, Sutherland and Magan's feelings of alienation and resentment over the difficulties were known to the students. If E. L. Cardey's memories of his student days are reasonably accurate, the students felt that the conferences and the

¹Magan diary, May 1, 16, 17, 19, 1903, LLUAr.
²E. A. Sutherland to A. G. Daniells, September 20, 1903, RG 11: 1903-S, GCAr.
institutions were opposed to each other. Students were encouraged to enter the work and "revamp the denomination." According to Cardey, the strong support for Kellogg and consequent opposition to the "organized work" could be "felt" in the "classroom and in chapel talks." The sense of alienation and resentment, however, was not one-sided. Judging from Daniells' correspondence, one could probably "feel" in the committees and offices of the General Conference an opposition to Sutherland and the work at Emmanuel Missionary College. In fact, Ellen White later intimated as much.

On June 1 Magan's wife suddenly became seriously ill. This heavy blow seemed to soften feelings, particularly of those closest to the tragedy. In a poignant letter to Ellen White, Magan described how he and Sutherland had sat out in the evening "under the beautiful beech trees" back of his "cottage" and talked of the "blessed experiences in getting out of Battle Creek." Describing it as a "wretched hell," "a seething, foaming mass of lying reports, unbelief, backbiting, criticism and disregard for the plain commands of God," he assured her that he and Sutherland were praying that God would "spare Doctor Kellogg and the Sanitarium, and turn the great mistake of rebuilding that institution in Battle Creek, even yet, into a precious victory." In August both Sutherland and Magan wrote letters to Daniells congratulating him on having had the courage to move the denominational headquarters and the press to Washington, D.C. Both

1E. L. Cardey to E. K. Vande Vere, July 30; October 22, 1956, Vande Vere Coll, AUHR.

offered to help him in any way they could. Daniells' letter was warm and revealed a longing for reconciliation. Touchingly he wrote:

Words fail me if I were to attempt to tell you what a grief it has been to me that the very pleasant, and I believe helpful, relations that once existed between us have been so nearly broken. This has not been my desire, but it has seemed unavoidable so far as I have been concerned. I am hoping that some way they will be more than restored, and that God will bless us in mutual co-operation in this work.

Meanwhile, Kellogg was seething with indignation at the negative reaction of the church leaders to the reopening of Battle Creek College, while ignoring the admonitions of Ellen White against it. Writing to Jones about Daniells and Prescott, he fumed: "It seems as though these men were actuated by an insane ferocity to endeavor to blacken and destroy us in any and every way possible." He expressed his gratitude to the Lord for giving them Jones as their "champion," and added: "Be sure you have the gratitude and appreciation of us all." 

In September Sutherland once again wrote to Daniells. In the friendly but not cordial letter, he dared to suggest that the difficulties "racking the denomination" would be seen as "very trivial" when "we get into the real trouble." Referring to the "fine lines which are being drawn now," he concluded: "I have no sympathy whatever with this controversy on either side." It was a frank, but ill-advised letter, and it did not fail to elicit by return mail an

---

1 E. A. Sutherland to A. G. Daniells, August 13, 1903, RG 11: 1903-S, GCAR. P. T. Magan to A. G. Daniells, August 18, 1903, RG 11: 1903-M, GCAR. A. G. Daniells to E. A. Sutherland, September 9, 1903, RG 11: BK 31, p. 551, GCAR.

2 J. H. Kellogg to A. T. Jones, August 27, 1903, EGWRC-DC.
equally frank response of bewilderment from Daniells.¹

"I can hardly understand," wrote Daniells,

that part of your letter which speaks of the difficulties now existing, as being trivial, and unworthy of our considera-
tion. . . . I can assure you, Brother Sutherland, that I
desire peace. I am not naturally a fighter. I detest the
whole business; but notwithstanding this, I have some regard
for consistency.

Turning Sutherland's statements back on him, Daniells went
on to say how Sutherland had been at "war" with other denominational
"schoolmen" over matters that the educators of the church considered
to be "a great fuss over trivial matters," but which Sutherland con-
sidered "of great importance. They appear great to you because you
believe the Lord has spoken regarding them." After referring to the
"drawing of our young people to Battle Creek," and the issue of avoid-
ing debt as anything but "a trivial thing," he ended on a pessimistic
note.

Really, my dear brother, I suppose that I ought not to write
in this strain. You and I have talked matters over many
times, and have exhausted our resources in our endeavors to
see alike; and I suppose that what we can not do in personal
conversation can not [sic] be done by correspondence. So if
you will pardon me for joining issue with you in these
matters, I will endeavor to be more quiet regarding them in
the future.²

On reception of Daniells' letter, Sutherland sent a very con-
ciliatory, apologetic response by return mail. "I desire to drop the
difficulties that seem to exist," he wrote, and to "work together on

¹E. A. Sutherland to A. G. Daniells, September 20, 1903, RG
ii: 1903-S, GCAR.

²A. G. Daniells to E. A. Sutherland, September 24, 1903, RG
ii: Bk 31, p. 710, GCAR.

³Ibid.
the points that we do hold in common." He asked Daniells to forgive him for the statements deemed "inconsistent," and promised not to write of them again. Looking forward to the autumn council, he promised to pray "earnestly for that meeting" and to remember them "constantly that great results" would come. In a postscript, Sutherland insisted that he had for "three years" believed in the Ellen White counsels regarding the "Battle Creek situation" and continued to feel deeply sorry that the sanitarium had been rebuilt. Then, in a pledge that sounded hollow considering that the reopened college was about to convene classes, Sutherland promised Daniells that "when the Lord says that young people should not go to the Battle Creek Sanitarium, and should not go to Battle Creek for medical education, I will be faithful to the instruction so far as I am able."  

Sutherland did not attend the fall council which convened at Washington, D.C., in October 1903, but Magan, who was there, felt his conversations with Daniells had been positive. In a letter to W. C. White, Magan wrote:

I am sure that he is absolutely convinced now that Bro. Sutherland and myself are not carrying on any warfare against him. I did everything that I possibly could to disabuse his mind of this thought, and he told me over and over again before I left that all was peace and happiness as far as Berrien Springs was concerned.

1E. A. Sutherland to A. G. Daniells, September 28, 1903, RG 11: 1903-S, GCAr. Sutherland, Magan, and Daniells seemed unable to avoid issues of disagreement. At the same time that Sutherland was in correspondence with Daniells, Magan was also writing to Daniells maintaining his innocence with regard to an article in the Review and Herald over which Daniells was quite upset. See P. T. Magan to A. G. Daniells, September 29, 1903, RG 11: 1903-M, GCAr.

2P. T. Magan to W. C. White, October 30, 1903, EGWRC-DC.
In spite of Magan's optimism and Daniells' assurances, Sutherland and Daniells, after their unfruitful exchange of letters in September, communicated very little until just one month before the critical Lake Union Conference session in May 1904. On April 24 Daniells answered a "note" sent to him by Sutherland nearly three months earlier in which he had reminisced about the "pleasant associations" he and Daniells had once enjoyed. Daniells responded:

I, too, remember these, and would be glad to have them repeated. For a long time I entertained the hope that the differences that have arisen would be so adjusted as to make this possible. But of late, I have almost despaired of this. The differences are not mere trifles. They are of a character that involve the integrity of this great movement; the integrity of even the Spirit of prophecy [sic] is at stake. If the communications that come to us from this source are to be relied upon, changes that have not yet taken place will have to be made.

In a poignant answer, written on May 3, Sutherland alluded

---

1. A. G. Daniells to E. A. Sutherland, April 24, 1904, RG 11: Bk 33, p. 732, GCAr. The only other correspondence they appeared to have, had been a long, angry letter which Daniells sent to Sutherland protesting two Advocate articles that had appeared in the December 1903 issue. He felt they unjustly denigrated the Sabbath school work. While neither had been authored by Sutherland, Daniells clearly blamed him as editor for allowing them to be printed. The two articles, written by E. J. Waggoner and A. W. Spalding, did contain offensive passages, though they were included to make a point. Waggoner had written: "The Sabbath School, valuable as it is, is only a feeble attempt to reach God's plan of instruction." Spalding's opening sentence was more objectionable. He wrote: "In the Sabbath school we have a splendid organization which, generally speaking, has as yet no object but to keep itself alive." The point of the articles was that the Sabbath school, to achieve its optimum effectiveness, must be converted into a "missionary society." It must carry on the mission of the church outside of the Sabbath school classroom. Daniells appeared to have completely missed the central point. No evidence was found that Sutherland tried to justify or explain the articles to him. A. G. Daniells to E. A. Sutherland, December 13, 1903, RG 11: 1903-S, GCAr. E. J. Waggoner, "The Sabbath School and the Church School"; A. W. Spalding, "Sabbath School, Work!" TS Advocate 5 (December 1903):364-66.
to a talk they had had at Union College in which Daniells had told him that the differences were settled. . . . I have felt keenly at times your silence and your apparent passiveness concerning the work here, but have tried to excuse it on the grounds that you were very busy and it was not intentional. But I now understand from what you have written me that it is due to differences that exist between us that are not mere trifles. I hope, Bro. Daniells, that you will not allow differences of opinion to effect you so that you will not be a true helper to those who would naturally expect help from one in your position.

Deeply disappointed that Daniells had avoided visiting Berrien Springs, Sutherland rather tartly observed: "I am sure that had you spent a little time with us during the year and become better acquainted with us that the situation would not be now so serious in your mind that you would be compelled to write as you have just written me."

While Magan maintained closer contact with Daniells than did Sutherland, he found Daniells to be generally hostile toward them and the affairs of the school. At a meeting Magan had with I. H. Evans in January 1904, Evans read to him from a letter by Daniells in which he stated that the "Training Co. [Training School Company, the legal holding corporation of the old Battle Creek College] had been 'crooked' all along." Daniells further "stated [that] he resigned because [he] could not stand [the] crookedness." The "differences"

1E. A. Sutherland to A. G. Daniells, May 3, 1904, RG 11: 1904-S, GCAr.

2Ibid.

3Magan diary, January 4, 1904, LLUAr. P. T. Magan to E. G. White, October 7, 1903, DF 256, EGWRC-DC. In his diary for January 25, Magan recorded, however, that Evans reported to him that Daniells had apologized for the letter regarding the "Training School Co." Unfortunately, the suspicion of crookedness was mutual. On March 5,
which were not trifles and the negative attitudes that persisted would play a role in the decision Sutherland and Magan would take as church leaders and delegates met in session three weeks later in Berrien Springs.

**Doctrinal Dangers**

Sutherland and Magan's tenacious support of Kellogg, even after he had published quasi-pantheistic concepts in *The Living Temple* in early 1903, was considered by the church leaders as tantamount to denominational betrayal. Consequently, it was difficult for them to treat Sutherland and Magan as other than members of the enemy camp.

While Ellen White had written to Sutherland and others during the summer of 1903 with warnings against the reopening of Battle Creek College, by September 1903 she had begun to address a matter which she considered far more serious. She urgently admonished the teachers at Berrien Springs not to espouse or teach Kellogg's quasi-pantheistic views.

The doctor's expressions were not new. Even before James White's death in 1881, Kellogg had discussed similar concepts with Ellen White; concepts which he considered "great light." She had told him that "these theories are wrong. . . . Never teach such theories in our institutions; do not present them to the people."¹

---

¹E. G. White, "A Message of Warning," MS 70, 1905, EGWRC-DC.
At the ministerial institute that preceded the 1897 General Conference session in College View, Nebraska, Kellogg had revealed his continuing fascination with God in nature and His relation to the universe. Describing what is theologically referred to as "divine immanence," he explained that the "force that holds all things together, that is everywhere present, that thrills throughout the whole universe . . . can be nothing else than God Himself." In a declaration revealing how dangerously anthropocentric his views were, he added:

What a wonderful thought, that this mighty God that keeps the whole universe in order, is in us! . . . What an amazing thing that this almighty, all-powerful, and all-wise God should make Himself a servant of man by giving man a free will--power to direct the energy within his body! ¹

Speaking again at the 1899 General Conference session, Kellogg declared: "We never eat anything good, but we are tasting God. It is a sacred thing to eat. This grows out of the fact that God is in everything." ²

Though Kellogg's views had been disseminated worldwide through the publication of the General Conference Bulletin in both 1897 and 1899, very few seemed to perceive the radical nature of his views. Furthermore, a growing number of Adventist ministers and workers were embracing similar concepts. Among those were E. J. Waggoner, Daniel


H. Kress (head of the medical work in England and later in Australia),
David Paulson (head of the Battle Creek Sanitarium's medical mission-
ary work in Chicago), and, according to Daniells, many other Advent-
ists who lived in Battle Creek.¹

Following the sanitarium fire in early 1902, Kellogg wrote a
book titled The Living Temple for the purpose of raising urgently
needed funds for reconstruction. Though the main thrust of the book
was physiological, it also contained numerous pantheistic expressions.
When Prescott, who was serving as acting president while Daniells was
in Europe, read the galley proofs prior to publication, he detected
what he considered dangerously pantheistic statements. Prescott
was particularly perceptive regarding such declarations because he had
believed and taught similar views only a short time before. Concur-
ing with Prescott's opinion, W. A. Spicer, returned missionary from
India and secretary of the Foreign Mission Board, had a discussion
with Kellogg that lasted several hours. When Spicer discovered that
Kellogg believed that "heaven is where God is, and God is everywhere,"
he realized that such a view would inevitably disallow a belief in
heaven and earth as separate, and thus render impossible a belief in
the biblical doctrine of the cleansing of a heavenly sanctuary—
beliefs fundamental to a Seventh-day Adventist understanding of the
Bible.²

¹GCB, February 22, 1899, pp. 53, 58, 120. E. G. White to
David Paulson, October 14, 1903, EGWRC-DC. A. G. Daniells, "How the
Denomination Was Saved from Pantheism," DF 15a, p. 2, EGWRC-AU.

²Irving Keck, mimeographed statement, [January 21], 1907, RBF
Kellogg Papers. S. P. S. Edwards to E. K. Vande Vere, August 24,
1960, Vande Vere Coll, AUHR. G. I. Butler to J. H. Kellogg, July 31;
August 12, 1904, MSU Kellogg Papers. W. A. Spicer, "How the Spirit of
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Circumventing denominational channels and disregarding the criticisms of his colleagues, Kellogg placed a personal order with the Review and Herald to print his book. A month later the printing plates and the publishing house were destroyed by fire. Undeterred, he had a commercial press in Battle Creek print 3,000 copies which he urged the Adventist tract societies to start selling.\textsuperscript{1}

As the books began circulating, Ellen White's apprehension increased. Aware of Sutherland and Magan's close association with Kellogg, she wrote a number of letters to Sutherland and the faculty throughout the fall of 1903, warning them to "point our people to the old landmarks." She identified the "sentiments" of The Living Temple as "a snare that the enemy" had prepared for the "last days." Since Kellogg claimed that he had gained his concepts from her writings, she felt "compelled to speak in denial of this claim." Teachers must beware of the "mysticism" in the book. "Those who entertain these sophistries," she warned, "will soon find themselves in a position where the enemy can talk with them, and lead them away from God."\textsuperscript{2}

While the denominational leaders were ready to consider Sutherland and Magan suspect because of their association with Kellogg, at no time did Ellen White express concern that Sutherland or others at Emmanuel Missionary College were teaching Kellogg's views. She, in fact, must have felt reasonably confident of their

\begin{itemize}
  \item Prophecy Met a Crisis" (unpublished manuscript, 1938), DF 15c, p. 18, EGWRC-DC.
  \item A. G. Daniells, quoted in W. A. Spicer, "How Prophecy Met a Crisis," p. 18, EGWRC-DC.
  \item E. G. White to P. T. Magan and E. A. Sutherland, November 11, 1903, EGWRC-DC. E. G. White, "To the Teachers in Emmanuel
\end{itemize}
theological orthodoxy and spiritual balance, since she recommended that they employ Waggoner as a teacher that fall, knowing that he was in a spiritual fog. Encouraging them, she expressed confidence in their ability to help him back to doctrinal soundness. "He is in danger," she confided, as many others are, of accepting incorrect view[s] of God. . . . Help him to place his feet on solid ground, even the Rock of Ages. I believe that he will recover his former clearness and power.

Though there had been unsuccessful attempts earlier, the denominational leaders made a major effort to help Kellogg to realize his grave spiritual situation at the autumn council of 1903 in Washington. While Sutherland did not attend the session, Magan played an active role in successfully interceding with Kellogg to cease his adversarial relationship to the denominational leadership and recognize his errors in The Living Temple. Though Kellogg had been quite recalcitrant initially, counsels from Ellen White had arrived with flawless timing, and had "turned the tide." Daniells was ecstatic over their effect. After hearing her counsels and conversing with Magan and E. J. Waggoner, Kellogg experienced a very repentant mood. In a letter to Ellen White, he admitted:

During the last year or two especially, the work has pressed so hard upon me that I have, I am sure, looked at things many times, in an extreme light, and have not had the charity I

---

Missionary College," September 22, 1903, EGWRC-DC. Cf. E. G. White, "To the Teachers in Emmanuel Missionary College," September 23, 1903, EGWRC-DC.

E. G. White to P. T. Magan and E. A. Sutherland, October 9, 1903, EGWRC-DC.
should have had. . . . I have made many mistakes and wrong moves.

Kellogg pledged that, in order to be "more level-headed and more amiable" in the future, he was going to "struggle" with all his might to keep in better health by "sleeping more, and eating regular meals, and complying with the other laws of life which I have talked to others but have not taken time to practice myself." He also conceded that he had made a mistake to rebuild the sanitarium in Battle Creek. While these confessions were most encouraging, the decision that brought the greatest joy to the delegates assembled was Kellogg's decision to withdraw The Living Temple for revision.²

Magan, in his diary and his post-council letter to Ellen White, wrote feelingly of his talks with Kellogg and the denominational leaders. In a five-hour conversation with Daniells, Magan had insisted that he had never even read The Living Temple, let alone advocated its teachings. Explaining to Daniells his position on Kellogg, he had told him: "I don't approve all he does, but cannot war on him." To Ellen White, Magan wrote:

I cannot help but feel that God is working with all the power of infinite might in Dr. Kellogg's behalf. I spent hours with him at Washington and prayed with him most earnestly. I do

---

¹J. H. Kellogg to E. G. White, October 18, 1903, EGWRC-DC. A. G. Daniells to E. G. White, October 20, 1903, EGWRC-DC. Magan diary, October 15, 18, 21, 1903, LLUAr. Cf. G. I. Butler to E. G. White, October 22, 1903, EGWRC-DC. A. G. Daniells to W. C. White, October 23, 1903, EGWRC-DC. P. T. Magan to W. C. White, October 9, 1903, EGWRC-DC. W. C. White to P. T. Magan, October 13, 1903, EGWRC-DC.

not want you to think I am a participant with the doctor, or
that I feel that he is altogether right. I do not feel this
at all, but I do feel toward him as I want to feel toward
every erring brother and sister in the world that my place
as a Christian is by the side of the erring ones to help them
to place their feet upon the solid rock.

Though Magan's attitude and behavior were correct and admirable, it is evident that he did not really understand Kellogg or the extent of his spiritual confusion. Nor did Sutherland. After Magan had visited Kellogg in early November, he wrote Ellen White that Kellogg seemed "inexpressibly sad, perfectly willing to withdraw entirely 'The Living Temple.'" He begged her to "come and help him. The Doctor is changed. He is an entirely different man." Magan was wrong. At that very time Kellogg was losing no time in marketing a "revised" edition of his book under the new title, The Miracle of Life. Sadly, it still contained much of the objectionable material.²

Though Ellen White wanted very much to believe Magan's optimistic reports, she knew better. In a letter to Kellogg dated only three days after Magan's letter declaring him to be "an entirely different man," she unequivocally declared:

I can not say that I have confidence in you as one whom the Lord is leading. You have sold yourself to the world in speech and in spirit. . . . You deny that you have been


scheming. I can only say, Then [sic] your eyes have been blinded. Your works are not standing before you as they are in fact. . . . God designed that the General Conference of 1901 should influence you to make a decided change in your life-purposes. . . . But you did not change your sentiments. You did not humble your heart, and confess, and become converted.

In spite of his repentant mood at the fall council, within two months Kellogg was revealing some of the "self" that Ellen White perceived. He fancied himself unappreciated and unwanted. "I can not help but think," he wrote,

that there has been a very determined effort to wipe me off the slate, and if you could see the bottom of my heart, you would know that nothing would please me better than to move off the earth and get out of the turmoil. . . . I am conscious of the fact that I am regarded as a supernumerary, possibly as an obstruction; but I still find something to do in the work to which I have been devoting my life to build up, and I can not drop it in any way without showing cowardice. 2

In January Daniells also reported that Kellogg was complaining "bitterly of the treatment he is receiving, and the turn things are taking." 3

By May 1904 the situation had worsened, and Sutherland and Magan found themselves in an extremely difficult position. They wanted to continue to believe in Kellogg and support him, but his relationship with the church and even with Ellen White was growing extremely tenuous. With little or no support from Daniells and Prescott, they felt they could not make Emmanuel Missionary College

1E. G. White to J. H. Kellogg, November 18, 1903, EGWRC-DC. Cf. E. G. White to J. H. Kellogg, January 2, 1904, EGWRC-DC.

2J. H. Kellogg, quoted in W. C. White to J. H. Kellogg, January 14, 1904, EGWRC-DC.

3A. G. Daniells to W. C. White, January 8, 1904, EGWRC-DC.
all they wanted it to be. Soon they would have to resolve the dilemma one way or another.

Illnesses and Deaths at Home

The illness and death of Ida Magan is germane to this study for two reasons: (1) Sutherland and Magan were such unusually close friends that what affected one of them also affected the other, and (2) her illness was precipitated in large measure by gossip against Sutherland and Magan. Cheerful, devout, and in generally good health, Ida Magan had two small children and cared well for them and for her husband. Magan's near-fatal bout with typhoid fever in the fall of 1901, however, had placed heavy demands on her strength as she had to nurse him through months of slow convalescence. Then, in July 1902, she was devastated on learning of her brother's untimely death shortly after graduation as a physician. Feeling physically weakened already, the tragic news caused her health markedly to decline. By January 1903 Magan lamented to Daniells that his wife was "terribly broken down in health, and in bed most of the time."¹

Suddenly, on the night of June 1 she was stricken with a malady which the doctors diagnosed as "acute mania" brought on by "overanxiety and worry, and lack of nutrition." Delirious for two weeks, she finally seemed to rally a little but felt "exceedingly weak." Feeling that Ellen White had enough "perplexities and sorrows," Magan had not immediately informed her of Ida's condition. Some colleagues, however, probably Sutherland or Mrs. Druillard, had

¹ P. T. Magan to E. G. White, July 1, 1903, EGWRC-DC. P. T. Magan to A. G. Daniells, January 12, 1903, RG 11: 1903-M, GCAr.
done so. The writer had also divulged that Ida's mental condition appeared to have been most directly caused by a vicious rumor that had reached her from California.¹

According to the rumor, Ellen White, while speaking to a gathering in the Pacific Press chapel during the General Conference session in Oakland, had stated that: (1) she had lost confidence in Magan and Sutherland and implied that God had also, (2) that Magan "had given up the truth," and (3) that Ida's sickness (apparently referring to the earlier physical illness) "was a judgment of God on account of our [Sutherland and Magan's] wickedness." Though Magan had missed the meeting because of illness, Sutherland had been there, had heard Ellen White's talk, and had understood it just as Ellen White intended it. Others, however, from very "high quarters" in the church, had carried away quite different reports. Those false reports had led Ida to think that "possibly" her husband "had gone all crooked: that God had deserted" him, and that he "did not know it."²

In a letter to H. W. Kellogg, a faithful church member and part-time denominational employee not related to Dr. J. H. Kellogg, Ellen White later described the incident and clarified the message she had given.

I have never said anything disparaging about Brother Magan or Brother Sutherland. In one talk, given before a few in the Pacific Press Chapel, I spoke of the good work that they had done, but said that they were working beyond their strength, and were taxing their physical and mental powers

¹P. T. Magan to E. G. White, July 1, 1903, EGWRC-DC. Cf. P. T. Magan to W. C. White, June 15, 1903, EGWRC-DC. E. G. White to H. W. Kellogg, August 9, 1903, EGWRC-DC.

²P. T. Magan to E. G. White, July 1, 1903; April 29, 1904, EGWRC-DC. Cf. P. T. Magan to A. G. Daniells, June 16, 1903, RG 11: 1903-M, GCAr.
too severely. I said that Brother Magan's sickness was the result of over-work. I said that the Lord would send them helpers who could assist them, and that they must divide their work, and rest when nature demanded rest. I have always been shown that the work at Berrien Springs is a good work, acceptable in the sight of God, and that those in charge of it must be helped, not hindered.

As soon as Ellen White had learned of Ida's illness, she wrote a long letter of heartwarming encouragement. She also categorically denied being "two-sided. I have said nothing to any one in disparagement of you or of Brother Sutherland." Her fear, she explained, was that they would "fail" if they tried to carry "the many burdens" they "were preparing to carry." It was a serious matter, Mrs. White pointed out, for the Lord has given us our work to do. He will hold us responsible if we permit ourselves to be so heavily drawn upon by different enterprises that the work which He has given us to do for perishing souls is made a matter of secondary importance.

Indignant at the malicious gossip, she exclaimed: "What an amount of mischief the unruly tongue can frame out of nothing. How much harm can be done by those who try to make things appear in the worst light!"2

Ida's condition steadily worsened. She became so self-destructive that they had to bar her windows and have someone with her at all times. During her violent moments it sometimes took three or four people to control her. In her more lucid moments she would

---

1E. G. White to H. W. Kellogg, August 9, 1903, EGWRC-DC. In the same letter to H. W. Kellogg, Ellen White complained that she had to spend "much time in contradicting fabulous reports." She cited a rumor that was reportedly being circulated "all over the East that New York is to be destroyed by a tidal wave. . . . But I never said any such thing."

2E. G. White to P. T. Magan, June 16, 1903, EGWRC-DC.
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lie on her bed "pleading most piteously with God to deliver her from her affliction." On those occasions Magan or the nurses would read the Bible to her, sing "sweet and quieting hymns," and pray God "to rebuke the power of the evil one." Her condition brought everyone in the school closer together as they unitedly interceded for divine healing. Magan described one of the occasions to Ellen White:

The Lord has come wonderfully near many times. Recently the whole school gathered for a spiritual season of prayer one evening at the close of Sabbath. There were about three hundred present, and I do not think there was a dry eye in the whole audience. We met under the trees overlooking the river, and God came wonderfully near to us. Everyone said that it seemed the most sacred meeting we had ever had on the College Farm.

By October the situation had become so serious that Magan, concerned about the impression their mother's condition was having on the children and unable properly to care for them, was forced to take them to California and entrust them to Ida's parents. Magan's visit with Ellen White while in California was a great encouragement to him, but on his return home he admitted that it almost seemed like "coming to the grave." The distress Magan and the entire school family felt was difficult to express. He, along with others, repeatedly struggled with the question, "Why?" At the same time, however, Magan claimed that he had "never felt more of His Spirit, peace and power" and had resigned himself to accept Daniells' explanation: "'That why she should suffer in this way is one of the deep, dark mysteries that will

probably not be fully understood until God's purposes are all fully revealed to His redeemed.\(^1\) When tempted to doubt divine providence, Magan could reread the words Ellen White had penned to him when she first learned of Ida's affliction:

Brother Magan the Lord does not look upon Sister Magan or upon you with displeasure. He would have you cheerful and of good courage. Sister Magan has been tempted by the enemy to give place to the doubt, "Has God forsaken me?" My sister, God has not forsaken you, but Satan has cast his shadow between you and Christ. Have faith in God; lean your whole weight upon the sympathizing Redeemer.\(^2\)

In November, on the advice of "Drs. Kellogg, Reilly, Paulson, and others," Magan put his wife in the mental hospital at Kalamazoo, Michigan, as a private patient. To lessen the burden of his increasing indebtedness for medical care, he rented the downstairs of his house to a family and the upstairs rooms to others, keeping only a study and the "little north bedroom" for himself.\(^3\)

Adding to the anguish Magan was already suffering, on December 28 he received a telegram informing him of his father's death in Ireland two days earlier. He had not seen him in nineteen years. The day after Magan received the telegram, the school family was again saddened at the news that Alva Druillard, "Mother D's" husband and a dedicated worker on the campus, had suddenly become ill with severe pain in the stomach and abdomen. Dr. Kellogg, called from Battle

\(^1\) P. T. Magan to E. G. White, October 28, 1903, EGWRC-DC. P. T. Magan to A. G. Daniells, September 29, 1903, RG 11:1903-M, GCAr.


Creek to care for him, immediately came by train to Niles, and braved a snow storm and bitter cold in an open sleigh to come the last fifteen miles to Berrien Springs. Arriving there, he found that there was nothing more he could do for Druillard. While Kellogg stayed by to monitor his condition, Druillard breathed his last.¹

During the winter months, a time of intense loneliness and struggles with doubts and questionings for Magan, Ida's condition continued to degenerate until, in her weakened state, she contracted tuberculosis. As spring came the end neared for her. Magan wrote: "We greatly fear that the poor child will not last long." On May 19, five days after Magan had gone to Kalamazoo to spend Ida's last days with her, she passed away. Mercifully for Magan, Sutherland had arrived some forty-five minutes before. Together they wept the tragic loss. Saturday afternoon, two days later, the school family and the Lake Union Conference session delegates gathered together to pay their respects and to hear A. T. Jones preach the memorial sermon. The funeral was held under the beautiful trees of the grove in the Memorial Pavilion which had been built principally with Ida's donation.²

Though the session meetings had begun two days before Ida's death, Magan, prostrated with grief, did not attend until two days after the funeral. As he sat and listened with sorrowing gratitude, Ellen White praised Ida to the delegates. Without mincing words, she


referred deliberately to those who had circulated the report that "Sister White had turned against Brother Magan." That false rumor had "so weighted" Ida down "with sorrow that she lost her reason." She died, Ellen White declared, "as a martyr, right among her own brethren." With some of the gossipers possibly present in the assembly, she asked "Who, in the day of judgment, will be held responsible for putting out the light of that mind, that should be shining today?" Emphasizing the senseless injustice of it, she said: "Now the poor woman has gone, leaving two motherless children. All this, because of the work done by unsanctified tongues." Before moving to another subject she assured Magan and everyone present that Mrs. Magan was "one of Christ's followers... This work of opposition and dissatisfaction has come from the enemy. It has cost the life of a wife and mother. But it has not taken away her crown of eternal life."¹

Intense feelings of personal loss permeated the campus as delegates met in decisive session. The sadness was mercifully tempered, however, by the almost incongruously happy news that Sally

¹Magan diary, May 18-23, 1904, LLUAr. E. G. White, "The Berrien Springs Work," MS 54, May 22 [the correct date is May 23], 1904, EGWRC-DC. Cf. A. W. Spaulding to [his mother], May 26, 1904, DF 354, EGWRC-DC. As soon as Ellen White had talked about the gossip-mongers having caused Ida's illness and death, a vicious rumor began to circulate that the perpetrators were Daniells and Prescott. The next day she stated categorically that they were not responsible. She also declared that those who had opposed the school being moved from Battle Creek were the ones who had "kept up a continual warfare." It seemed as though she was intimating that they were the originators of the rumor. E. G. White, "A Change of Feeling Needed," MS 58, May 24, 1904, EGWRC-DC.
Sutherland had given birth, the last of March, to a healthy baby boy. President Sutherland was a father.¹

**Sutherland's Resignation**

Sutherland and Magan came to the Lake Union Conference session deeply hurting from the divisive church politics, theological controversy, and personal tragedy. The session would prove to be the occasion of the final major effort by the denominational leaders to persuade Kellogg to integrate his plans with the broader goals of the church, to work in harmony with its leaders, and to renounce his pantheistic views. In contrast to her behind-the-scenes work on earlier occasions, Ellen White would speak often at this session and would play a leading role in this final attempt at reconciliation. In an atmosphere in which delegates ignored Ellen White's admonitions for unity and grew sharply critical of one another, Kellogg, Sutherland, and Magan resigned their positions as administrators, and it would only be a matter of time until Kellogg separated himself completely from the Adventist church.

Plans for the session had been discussed throughout the winter. While Magan reported that there seemed to be a "universal desire" to hold the meetings on the Berrien Springs campus because people wanted to see for themselves what was being accomplished there, Daniells opposed the idea on the grounds that there were "no sidewalks and the roads" were "bad." Daniells also wanted the meetings moved from April to March, but they were postponed until May so Ellen White could attend. Naturally, the decision pleased the folk at the college.

¹E. A. Sutherland to A. G. Daniells, May 3, 1904, RG 11: 1904-S, GCAr.
because they knew that by May the campus would be particularly beauti-

ful with spring foliage.¹

Concerned that Ellen White have comfortable accommodations, Magan generously made arrangements to have his renters find other quarters for the duration of the session so that Mrs. White and her party could stay in his home. He promised her "a nice large bedroom on the south side of the house" plus his study with its adjoining veranda. Recalling her fondness for carriage rides, he also promised that a phaeton and pony would be at her disposal "all the time." Where Daniel's stayed is not known. In a letter to him, Sutherland apologized for not being able to give him accommodations in his own home, explaining that he already had "six" people living there. In addition, his parents, who were coming from Union College for the con-

vention, would also stay with him.²

Ellen White, deeply burdened for Kellogg and his colleagues, worked tirelessly through the winter months to prepare Testimonies volume eight. Available by March 1904, it contained, among other things, a section of letters to physicians, one on Battle Creek issues, and eighty-one pages on the problem of pantheism. Departing California by train on April 18, Mrs. White travelled to Washington,


²P. T. Magan to E. G. White, April 29, 1904, EGWRC-DC. E. A. Sutherland to A. G. Daniells, May 3, 1904, RG 11: 1904-S, GCAr. Vande Vere erroneously mentions that Ellen White stayed with the Sutherlands, but the evidence makes clear that there were already too many staying there, and that she stayed in Magan's home as planned. E. K. Vande Vere, Wisdom Seekers, p. 115.
D. C., to view the new denominational headquarters and help lay plans for the new college and sanitarium that she was urging them to build there. After three busy weeks in the capital, she left for Berrien Springs and arrived on the campus on May 16.¹

The second biennial session of the Lake Union Conference was scheduled to convene May 17 and continue until the 26th. Most of the meetings were held in the study hall building. At least eighty-eight delegates attended, but there were many visitors as well. In a report of the session, Daniells noted that each day began with a devotional meeting from 5:45 to 7:00 a.m., and ended with a "preaching service." He lamented, however, that "the remainder of the time, from morning until night, and sometimes until far into the night," was devoted to business affairs. In his estimation, that was a "great mistake" because it unfit the leading men for "rendering the service they should." When the session ended, they were thus "worn out and confused."²

On Wednesday, May 13, the first full day of the session, Ellen


²[W. W. Prescott], "The Lake Union Conference," RH 81 (June 23, 1904):16. A. G. Daniells, "The Lake Union Conference," RH 81 (July 7, 1904):6. E. K. Vande Vere, "The Berrien Springs Meeting, 1904," DF 354, EGWRC-DC. Curiously, the two reports differed on the date on which the session began. Prescott says it was the 17th, while Daniells says it was the 18th. They also differed on the number of delegates in attendance. Prescott reported 88, while Daniells reported 150 plus "a number of visitors." A. L. White stated that Ellen White spoke at 11 a.m. each day. While that was no doubt true on Saturday [their Sabbath], on the basis of Daniells' report, she apparently spoke in the early mornings or evenings on the other days. A. L. White, Ellen G. White: The Early Elmshaven Years, pp. 331, 336.
White directed everyone's attention to the Bible passage of Revelation 1:1-3, 9-13, 20. Within the context of Satan's deceptive designs in the last days, she spoke earnestly regarding the dangerous mysticism of The Living Temple. Kellogg was not present. He would not arrive until Friday, but some of his colleagues were there. To them she spoke pointedly: "I have the tenderest sympathy for the physicians associated with Dr. Kellogg. But I have no sympathy for their failure to pass over the mistakes that they see made by Dr. Kellogg, saying nothing about them." With prophetic accuracy she declared: "Unless he changes his course, and takes an entirely different course, he will be lost to the cause of God." She ended her talk with a plea "for unity, for oneness." The need for unity proved to be a central theme in each of her seven talks and sermons.

On Thursday she did not address the delegates, but in the hours before dawn on Friday morning she wrote a letter to Daniells and Prescott. In it she described in detail a vision she said she had been given, in which she was impressed that "now is the time to save Dr. Kellogg." Feelingly, she appealed to the two men: "Is it not worth the trial? Satan is drawing him, but last night I saw a hand reached out to clasp his hand." She concluded: "We have not

1E. G. White, "The Foundation of Our Faith," MS 46, May 18, 1904, EGWRC-DC. Magan diary, May 20, 1904, LLUAr. Kellogg was definitely there at least Friday evening. He intimates such in his "Interview at Dr. Kellogg's Home, October 7, 1907, between Geo. W. Amadon, Eld. A. G. Bourdeau, and Dr. J. H. Kellogg," unpublished manuscript, pp. 36-37, AUHR. Hereafter cited as "Kellogg Interview, 1907." Kellogg apparently only attended part of the meeting, however: because he later told Butler that the talk was "too disgusting to be endured. I listened five minutes couldn't stand it any longer." J. H. Kellogg to G. I. Butler, June 1, 1904, JHKCC, Bd 2, Lb 4, AUHR.
a moment to spend in contention." At 5:45 a.m. she studied Colossians, chapters one and two, with the delegates. In a rich homiletical exposition of the passage she discreetly pointed out that "if we will eat of the bread of life, we shall have spiritual strength. We shall have no disposition to think or talk of the faults of others."^  

Soon after Mrs. White had finished her devotional talk she wrote another letter to Daniells and Prescott. "This morning," she said, "I told Brother Prescott to go ahead with the presentation of the subjects he mentioned to me." Now she had changed her mind, "deeply impressed" that it would "be a mistake to do this." She feared the influence of men present who "would spoil the work the Lord would have done. . . . I dare not encourage you to bring in at this time the matter of the spiritualistic theories taught at Battle Creek." Prescott and Daniells were warned not to say anything that would "gratify some and cause them to think that Dr. Kellogg is receiving a thrashing." The subject presented should be one that would "touch and tender hearts. This is what we need, O, so much. I think the present pulse of the meeting calls for subjects that will tend to bring in faith and love and unity." Signing the letter "In haste," she entrusted it to W. C. White for delivery to Prescott, confident that having been informed of the change of plan, he would still

^E. G. White to A. G. Daniells and W. W. Prescott, May 20, 1904, EGWRC-DC. E. G. White, "Lessons from the First and Second Chapters of Colossians, MS 48, May 20, 1904, EGWRC-DC.

have ample time to prepare a unifying subject for his scheduled presentation that night.  

The Friday night meeting, however, proved to be extremely divisive. Prescott had not received Ellen White's letter. Consequently, he presented the material he had prepared. Strongly accusing Kellogg of different heretical points of view, Prescott apparently sought to substantiate his accusations by reading from pantheistic books rather than from The Living Temple. He then claimed: "That is the doctrine Dr. Kellogg is teaching." As Prescott spoke, Jones took careful notes for use later in the meetings.  

Ellen White gave the sermon for the church service on Saturday. Simply titled "Lessons from the Third Chapter of Revelation," she drew numerous timely lessons from the messages to the seven

---

1The results of W. C. White's failure to give Prescott and Daniells the letter as his mother had instructed him to do are impossible to measure. If Prescott had spoken on a topic that would "tender" hearts, would Kellogg, Daniells, and their factions have been reconciled? Ellen White's own messages had failed to "tender" very many hearts there. The intriguing possibility nevertheless existed that a conciliatory spirit might have been created by Prescott through a different approach and message. Why W. C. White failed to promptly deliver the letter remains a mystery. He sincerely longed for peace and harmony among the denominational workers as much as anyone. Thus it is difficult to believe that he knowingly would have done anything that would have jeopardized such a possibility. E. G. White to W. W. Prescott and A. G. Daniells, May 20, 1904, EGWRC-DC. G. I. Butler and S. N. Haskell to J. H. Kellogg, May 27, 1904, MSU Kellogg Papers. W. S. Sadler to E. G. White, April 26. 1906, MSU Kellogg Papers. J. H. Kellogg, "The Berrien Springs Meeting," MS, February 15, 1941, cited in Schwarz, "John Harvey Kellogg: American Health Reformer," p. 401. Kellogg believed W. C. White had purposely withheld the letter and had encouraged Prescott to give the address that he had prepared. J. H. Kellogg to G. I. Butler, June 1, 1904, JHKCC, Bx 2, Fld 4, AUHR. For an alternative explanation as to why W. C. White did not deliver the letter, see A. L. White, Ellen G. White: The Early Elmshaven Years, pp. 335-36.

2"Kellogg Interview, 1907," p. 37.
churches. Quoting from the message to the church at Sardis: "Be watchful, and strengthen the things which remain, that are ready to die," she admonished: "Here is a duty that we are to perform. When we see one doing wrong, we are to go to him and tell him. . . . We are not to go to some one else with the report of his wrong-doing." With intense earnestness she urged: "Let us begin to serve God in earnest. Let us each night pitch our tents a day's march nearer home." In spite of the divisive spirit so in evidence in the Friday evening meeting, when Ellen White, at the end of her sermon, asked how many would pledge to "seek the Lord more earnestly than ever before," the entire assembly of delegates and visitors stood in commitment.

By Sunday the delegates had been in session for more than four full days. They had listened to Ellen White speak three times and had listened to other speakers as well. The spirit among the delegates, however, had not improved; it had worsened. Men talked between meetings about the "mistakes and faults" of their colleagues. Accusations were levelled at one another, and in some of the business meetings statements were made that revealed a distrust of the church leaders.

Sunday evening Ellen White preached a sermon appropriately titled "A Plea for Unity." Based on the prayer of Christ in John 17,

1E. G. White, "Lessons from the Third Chapter of Revelation," MS 50, May 21, 1904, EGWRC-DC.

she again stressed the urgent need to "press together." Commenting on Christ's desire "that they all may be one," she asked: "What kind of unity is spoken of in these words?--Unity in diversity. Our minds do not all run in the same channel, and we have not all been given the same work." "If our hearts are humble, if we have learned in the school of Christ to be meek and lowly," she explained, "we may all press together in the narrow path marked out for us." Again, as on Saturday, she asked how many would "rise" to their feet and "thus testify" that they wanted "to be made complete in Christ." Again there was an overwhelming response. The events of the next day, however, would reveal how little real change had been wrought.¹

The next morning, Ellen White selected for her devotional talk the powerful passage on unity in Ephesians 4:1-7. "Forbearing one another in love; endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." That was the message with which she tried to awaken the delegates. Chiding them as if she were their mother, she asked: "What is the matter? It is because this one and that one and the other one all want their own way. Perhaps they always had their own way when they were children, and they have never learned to yield."²

In unmistakably clear language, she insisted: "Each one is to feel that there is need for him to confess his own mistakes and errors, not the mistakes and errors of some one else." Her closing statement was: "My brethren and sisters, if you will let the Spirit of God come into your hearts, we shall have a Pentecostal season."

¹E. G. White, "A Plea for Unity," MS 52, May 22, 1904, EGWRC-DC.

²E. G. White, "Morning Talk," MS 56, May 23, 1904, EGWRC-DC.
Her words, however, seemed to fall on deaf ears; that day they had a "season" reminiscent of anything but "Pentecost."\(^1\)

According to Kellogg's recollection three years later, Jones' presentation dominated the rest of the morning meeting. Having found seemingly pantheistic statements authored in past years by Prescott, Jones methodically presented what appeared to be the same pantheistic concepts which Prescott had accused Kellogg of teaching from Review and Herald articles which quoted Prescott. It was a very tense and unpleasant session that had gone through the breakfast hour and continued until 1 p.m. When Jones finished, heated discussion ensued. It was apparently during this time--when accusations and counter-accusations were being expressed, when words were sharply critical and tempers were flaring--that Kellogg spoke up, insisting that he was ready to "repudiate" anything that was not in harmony with "what Sister White herself" had written. Then, as he had done on some earlier occasions, Kellogg apparently resigned (presumably from his position at the head of the medical work). Sutherland also announced his resignation as president of Emmanuel Missionary College, "irrevocable and final"; and Magan announced that he too was resigning as dean.\(^2\)

\(^1\)Ibid.

\(^2\)"Kellogg Interview, 1907," p. 37, AUHR. A. W. Spalding to [his mother], May 26, 1904, DF 354, EGWRC-DC. Magan diary, May 23, 1904, LLUAr. Kellogg said that Jones' presentation against Prescott took place on Sunday, but Magan's diary stated that it was Monday. Kellogg's dating, however, was given three years later, while Magan's dating was presumably written the day of the event. Spalding states that Kellogg resigned at that meeting, but did not state whether Kellogg gave any details as to the positions or responsibilities he was relinquishing. While it is not certain that he was the first to resign, it is possible, since he too had talked of it before the
Though it surely must have appeared otherwise, Sutherland and Magan's decision to resign was not a spur-of-the-moment reaction. A month earlier, while Sutherland was "laid up" with a sprain, he and Magan had "laid plans to resign if necessary at the Lake Union Conference meeting." On the same afternoon Mrs. Druillard had joined them to discuss it further, and they had had a "good season of prayer." On the day before their resignation, Magan had gone riding with Ellen White and had taken advantage of the opportunity to talk over the possibility of Sutherland's and his resigning. She had not opposed it, nor did she subsequently. However, she was deeply grieved at the terribly inopportune moment they had chosen to announce it.  

As far as she was concerned, several had seriously erred that morning, including Sutherland. A. T. Jones, she said, "had acted unwise. He acted in the light of another's mind. He introduced matters that he would not have touched had he been wholly worked by the Spirit of God." Regarding Hiland Butler, an associate of Kellogg, she declared that he had "lost a great blessing when he sought to humble others in the place of humbling himself." Sutherland had "spoken words that were untimely." For him to have presented his  

---

session began, and he was the man whose writings were under fire. Cf. J. H. Kellogg to S. N. Haskell, April 20, 1904, MSU Kellogg Papers. G. I. Butler to J. H. Kellogg, April 27, 1904, MSU Kellogg Papers. J. H. Kellogg to G. I. Butler, May 1, 16, 17, 1904, J. H. Haughey Papers, AUHR. Haughey wrote that Sutherland and Magan had openly declared at the meeting that the reason for their resignation was that "they were out of harmony" with Daniells and Prescott. J. H. Haughey to W. T. Bland, September 4, 1904, J. H. Haughey Papers, AUHR. For further details regarding Prescott's purported pantheistic statements, see Valentine, "W. W. Prescott," pp. 327-29.  

1Magan diary, April 30; May 22, 1904, LLUA.
resignation at a time "when so much was at stake . . . showed that a strange power had come in to influence his mind." He had spoken, she said, "at a time when silence would have been eloquence." Without mentioning any names, she added that the "course taken by some" at the meeting had "confirmed Dr. Kellogg in his self-righteousness." She had no criticism for Magan, quite possibly because she knew he was still deeply mourning the loss of his wife who had died just four days earlier.¹

In spite of the very unfortunate timing of the resignations, that same day Ellen White addressed the topic of the Berrien Springs work and had only words of strongest praise for Sutherland and Magan and the accomplishments they had achieved there. She indicated that God "approved of their efforts" even when few others had. With some, there had been a "settled disposition to complain and to find fault with those who have striven with all their might to carry out the Lord's instruction." Education at Emmanuel Missionary College, she claimed, "has been carried forward in right lines, under many discouraging circumstances." Determined to leave no doubt in the minds of her hearers, she declared:

And to our brethren I can say, Brother Sutherland and Brother Magan do not go out from this place as men who have made a failure, but as men who have made a success. They have taught the students from the Bible, according to the light given from the Testimonies. The students that have been with them need not be ashamed of the education they have received.²

¹E. G. White, "The Berrien Springs Meeting," MS 74, July 25, 1904, EGWRC-DC.
²E. G. White, "The Berrien Springs Work," MS 54, May 23, 1904, EGWRC-DC.
Aware of Sutherland and Magan's plan to open up self-supporting work in the South, she reminded her listeners that "for over twenty years, the work of the Southern field" had been held before them but they had not "done for the work what should have been done." These men were going to do it, and she begged all those assembled, "for Christ's sake, not to follow them with criticism and faultfinding." She mentioned that even before Sutherland and Magan had left Battle Creek they had talked to her about their burden for the work in the South. "Do not put any impediments in their way," she warned,

they think that they can better glorify God by going to a more needy field. This is their own choice; I have not persuaded them. They did not know but that Sister White would stand in their way. But when they laid the matter before me this morning, I told them that I would not hinder them for one moment. Any one who takes up work in the South has before him a hard battle. The work there should be far in advance of what it is now. We should encourage the men who go there, and hold them up by our faith and by our prayers, and with our means.

Ellen White, however, not only commended Sutherland and Magan. She had words of praise for their estranged colleagues as well. "Elder Daniells and Elder Prescott," she remarked, "have made some mistakes in their religious experience, as other men have; but they never defied the Spirit of God, and refused to be corrected." They are men, she added, "to whom the Lord has given a message; and He will be with them if they will walk with Him."2

In retrospect, Ellen White later wrote that she had been shown a representation of "the Berrien Springs meeting" that was "similar to the picture presented in the third chapter of Zechariah. 'He

1Ibid.

2E. G. White, "A Change of Feeling Needed," MS 58, May 24, 1904, EGWRC-DC.
showed me Joshua the high priest standing before the angel of the Lord, and Satan standing at his right hand to resist him." Undoubtedly referring, at least in part, to Sutherland and Magan's resignations, she indicated that

a glorious victory might have been gained at the Berrien Springs meeting. Abundant grace was provided for all who felt their need. But at a critical time in the meeting unadvised moves were made, which confused minds and brought in controversy.

Considering her work finished in Berrien Springs, Ellen White left early the next day to travel to the South.²

While the session continued, the college trustees met from Tuesday through Friday. The day following Sutherland and Magan's resignations, the board began consideration of the election of faculty for the coming year. When Sutherland was asked to give his opinion on the matter, he stated that "he believed God had called him to leave the school, but that he did not wish to drop his work and leave everything here in a bad shape." He expressed his willingness to "take charge of the summer school" and also to spend time on campus during the fall and winter to gradually break in someone to take his place.³

Jones, as a college board member, enthusiastically endorsed the plan of Sutherland and Magan to go south and open a school. By maintaining a close connection with Emmanuel Missionary College, he believed that they could work the two schools "cooperatively and thus do more good than could be done in either one place alone." Wanting to express his support of Sutherland and Magan, J. H. Haughey stated

¹E. G. White, "The Berrien Springs Meeting," MS 74, July 25, 1904, EGWRC-DC.

²Magan diary, May 24, 1904, LLUAr.

³EMC Bd Min, May 24, 1904.
that since they were "really the fathers" of Emmanuel Missionary College "they should be left free to go and come as they pleased and should not in any sense be driven out." A. G. Haughey, president of the West Michigan Conference and cousin of J. H. Haughey, then moved that Sutherland be elected as president of the college for the coming year. The motion was unanimously carried. Magan's situation was then discussed, and he was once again elected as dean. In a move reminiscent of Sutherland's first year at Walla Walla College, when he had served as principal under Prescott as president, the board voted to elect H. A. Washburn as principal of Emmanuel Missionary College to serve as "an assistant to Prof. Sutherland so as to get hold of the work."  

The ties that had bound Sutherland and Magan so tightly to Emmanuel Missionary College were loosening rapidly. In July, at a meeting of the college board, Sutherland supported a decision to have him terminate as president as of August 16 and have Washburn serve as president from that date. Allen Moon, newly elected president of the Lake Union Conference, was elected to assume Magan's varied responsibilities on October 1.  

---

1 Ibid. EMC Bd Min, May 26, 1904. H. A. Washburn had been serving as principal of the industrial school at Bethel, Wisconsin. The same day he was elected principal of Emmanuel Missionary College he was ordained at a meeting of the Lake Union Conference Session. LUC Min, May 26, 1904. J. H. Haughey, in a letter to his cousin dated June 29, 1904, indicated that confusion had arisen between Sutherland and Washburn as to who was to really be "president" of the college. Haughey stated that it had been his understanding that Sutherland was "elected for the summer school," and that Washburn was "to take the presidency at the close of the summer school or thereabouts." The board minutes, however, clarify that Haughey and Washburn were mistaken. J. H. Haughey to A. G. Haughey, June 29, 1904, J. H. Haughey Papers, AUHR.

Sutherland and Magan had a very busy schedule during the summer. They purchased a 414-acre farm a short distance north of Nashville, Tennessee; shuttled between Tennessee, Michigan, and Washington, D.C.; and packed and moved their personal possessions to the Tennessee farm. Sutherland, as he had offered to do, also visited the campmeetings of the Lake Union Conference with Washburn to promote Emmanuel Missionary College.¹

Ellen White had encouraged any teachers or students willing to do so to join forces with Sutherland and Magan in the South. Consequently, by the end of the summer only J. H. Haughey was left of the faculty at Berrien Springs. His lot was made particularly difficult because Washburn, who was needed desperately to lead out in the planning for the coming school year, discovered that he had tuberculosis and was forced to resign and move to Colorado. During the first half of September, Haughey, desperate to find the needed leadership, urged that Sutherland or Magan be persuaded to stay on for one more year. On September 13, however, the problem was resolved when the college board elected N. W. Kauble to the presidency of the college. The solution came not a moment too soon for Sutherland and Magan. They had already scheduled the initiation of classes in their new school, the Nashville Agricultural and Normal Institute, for the end of October.²


²E. G. White, "To Union Conference Presidents," June 15, 1904, EGWRC-DC. J. H. Haughey to H. A. Washburn, August 7, 1904; J. H.
Perspective

Certain that the college could never reach its full potential while located on a mere seven acres in the city of Battle Creek, Sutherland had willingly confronted the task of establishing a new institution on a large acreage near Berrien Springs. Emmanuel Missionary College was conceived and developed as a missionary training school. Due to the school's restrictive admissions policy, virtually all of the students were practicing Christians with a conscious desire to be missionaries serving the church wherever and however they might be needed.

With the goal of preparing workers who would be well-rounded, practical, and hardworking, Sutherland continued the curricular reforms begun at Battle Creek, including: the centrality of the Bible in classroom instruction, short courses, no degree programs, flexibility of individual coursework, and emphasis on manual labor. To these he added: a cooperative plan of democratic student-teacher management of the school, the controversial one-study plan, a holistic training program for ministerial students, free education (though on a limited scale), major emphasis on agricultural training with participation required of virtually every student in the school, and direct teacher participation with the students in all aspects of the work program.

There were two major challenges that Sutherland confronted during his years at Berrien Springs—challenges which dominated the thoughts and energies of the entire college family. First, he determined to build an entire educational plant with primarily student-teacher labor. In this he succeeded admirably. Second, he was dedicated to eradicating the large institutional debt that had been transferred from Battle Creek. In this he was less successful. While Sutherland was unable to eliminate the existing debt, when he resigned in 1834 Emmanuel Missionary College had incurred no additional operational indebtedness. Furthermore, his administration had managed to reduce the long-standing debt by half.

Though the college existed at a distance from Battle Creek, Sutherland was plagued by: (1) his own serious image problem, (2) his unwise support of the reopening of Battle Creek College, (3) the maelstrom of divisive church politics, and (4) Kellogg's disenchantment with the church and its leaders and his confused and confusing concepts in *The Living Temple*.

The acute sense of a loss of support from Daniells and Prescott, the denominational leaders, was possibly the greatest single factor in Sutherland's decision to leave Emmanuel Missionary College. Berrien Springs had not proved far enough removed from Battle Creek, even when the denominational headquarters were moved to Washington, D.C.

Aware of the persistent counsels of Ellen White to attempt a long-overdue work in the South, and having strongly sympathized and supported the work of Edson White for the Blacks of that region;
Sutherland determined to leave the work established at Berrien Springs to begin a new educational center in Tennessee. He little conceived, however, what time, effort, and providence would achieve as he pioneered the Adventist self-supporting educational work there.
CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS

Edward Alexander Sutherland, born into frontier America in 1865, became one of Adventism's most notable educational reformers. On graduation from Battle Creek College in 1890 with a degree in science, he became principal of the Minnesota Conference School. The following year he taught Bible at his alma mater. From there he went to Walla Walla College in 1892, first as principal then as president of the new Adventist college of the Northwest. In 1897 Sutherland was asked to return to become president and initiator of major reform at Battle Creek College.

Following four years of determined effort in Battle Creek, Sutherland moved the college to rural Berrien Springs in 1901. There he erected, and was president of, Emmanuel Missionary College until his resignation in 1904. Subsequently, Sutherland founded Adventism's most successful self-supporting college (it received no regular financial support from the denomination) at Madison, Tennessee, and served as its president from its opening in 1904 until 1946. He resigned to take up the work of secretary of the newly created Commission on Rural Living of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists. Retiring in 1950, he died in 1955.

It is imperative to understand Sutherland in the context of
his times. This is done through an overview of: (1) Sutherland's life and work and (2) his relation to educational reform both inside and outside of the Adventist church.

**Sutherland's Life and Work**

The life and impact of Sutherland may be most readily assessed through an examination of his personal and educational philosophy, his administration, and his educational reforms. These three areas played dominant roles in his professional life.

**Sutherland's Philosophy**

The philosophy that gave direction and purpose to Sutherland's life and work revealed four salient aspects: (1) independence, (2) solid biblical moorings, (3) historical perspective, and (4) belief that God spoke through Ellen G. White. Raised on a farm as the oldest of four children, Sutherland learned early that life was not to be lived in ease, dependent on others. He evidenced belief in the nineteenth-century American ethos of independence when he chose to pursue a career as a teacher even though his father wanted him to be a farmer. It is not surprising that major aspects of Sutherland's philosophy were self-sufficiency, self-support, and independence.

A strong belief in the Bible as the inspired Word of God exerted a second significant influence on Sutherland. Raised in a Christian home by God-fearing parents who modelled a reverence for the Bible, Sutherland was exposed from an early age to the story of the plan of God for man's salvation and to the Judaeo-Christian ethic. He belonged to a denomination noted for its firm belief in the
veracity of the Bible as the ultimate source of normative truth; a denomination which measured success or failure against Bible principles. His church also possessed a deep commitment to the commission of taking the Gospel to all the earth as part of its eschatological orientation. Sutherland's subsequent determination to channel all study and training of Adventist youth into preparation for global mission service was in harmony with the primary objective of the church to which he belonged. This determination naturally flowed from a personal missionary orientation. It should not be forgotten that he more than once expressed a willingness to serve his church overseas.

Throughout his life Sutherland was a careful student of the Bible, and as a practicing Christian he possessed a tenacious faith in God. Consequently, it was natural for him to feel compelled to exalt the Bible as both the basis and the ultimate expression of man's knowledge, and to exclude any literature or study that might jeopardize a supreme focus on the Word of God. His successful eradication of the classics from the curriculum at Battle Creek College was the fruit of this conviction, as was his championing of the central role of the Bible in the course of study.

A third influence on the development of Sutherland's philosophy was his historical perspective. Sutherland read rather widely on the subject of educational history, studying the different epochs from the earliest home schools with parent-teachers in patriarchal times, to the schools of the prophets and the synagogue schools of the Hebrews, and up through his own time. He was particularly intrigued by what he considered the self-serving papal corruption of
the educational system during the middle ages. In his estimation Christian education had played an absolutely vital role in the rise and growth of Protestantism in the sixteenth century. Sutherland believed that Christian education must be revived if the church was to triumph in the final era of earth's history. This led to his enthusiastic promotion of the creation of denominational elementary schools and industrial schools, and his intense desire to see the day when every Adventist child and youth would be afforded a Christian education in preparation for life-long service to humanity on a global scale.

While at Walla Walla College, Sutherland eschewed long courses of study, degrees, and academic honors out of a sense of urgency to prepare workers for the church as briefly as possible. By the time he wrote Living Fountains or Broken Cisterns in the late nineties, however, he had come to believe that the Papacy was to blame for virtually everything wrong in education—from closely prescribed long courses and degrees to the bestowal of academic honors and the use of graduation regalia. Consequently, the papal origins of such practices constituted a primary reason for their elimination. Whether a person may or may not choose to defend his view, his use of historical sources to support his conclusions was selective and not always precise.

The fourth major influence involved in the development of Sutherland's personal and educational philosophy was his belief that God was speaking contemporarily through Ellen G. White. Though he had given lip service to that belief as a youth, he traced his whole-hearted acceptance of her counsels to the summer conversations with
Magan in 1891, reinforced by her thought-provoking presentations at the Harbor Springs convention that same summer. He enjoyed frequent correspondence with Ellen White until her death in 1915, and he repeatedly observed the beneficial results that accrued when adhering carefully to her counsels.

While Ellen White's letters were generally supportive of his work, there were at least two occasions when she was quite critical of him—in 1898 and 1899. The first and sharpest criticism accused him of "cowardice" for not carrying forward reforms in manual labor at Battle Creek College as rapidly as she thought he should. The 1899 criticism stemmed from the extreme views taught by Miss Ellis in Australia—views attributed to Sutherland and Magan. Sutherland appears to have been innocent of both cowardice and the extreme views espoused by Miss Ellis. On the other hand, an extreme which he was clearly guilty of was related to Mrs. White's criticism of him for too rapidly proliferating church schools and thereby drawing money away from the promulgation of world missions. Another Sutherland extreme that went against Ellen White's view was his extended sponsorship of the one-study plan. On this matter, however, no evidence has been found to show that she ever communicated her views to him or that he even knew her position on the topic. He seems to have perceived no difference between her views and his on the one-study plan. In an attempt to follow Ellen White's counsels, Sutherland developed a philosophy and educational program that were apparently much more balanced, even at Battle Creek College, than that for which he has generally been credited.
Sutherland as an Administrator

Administration is the second significant area worthy of reflection in Sutherland's professional life. His administrative skills were learned in the school of trial and error, since he never had the benefit of classes--much less a degree--in business or educational administration. While that was the rule rather than the exception in his day, his successes as an administrator are even more impressive.

He was required to develop administrative expertise within months of his graduation from Battle Creek College. At the age of twenty-five he became principal of the Minnesota Conference School. Following a hiatus of one year while he taught at his alma mater, he became founding principal and then president of Walla Walla College at age twenty-seven, president at Battle Creek College at thirty-two, and founding president at Emmanuel Missionary College at thirty-six.

In retrospect, one can note both advantages and disadvantages to Sutherland's youth and lack of academic administrative training. His awareness of his youth and inexperience fostered a commendable attitude of humility. It prompted him to be open to counsel, particularly from the Bible and from Ellen White, and also from his peers. His youthfulness blessed him with robust health, vigor, and enthusiasm. Because of his youth, Ellen White pointed out to the older educators and church leaders on more than one occasion that Sutherland was also more malleable. He was open to innovation and experiment--and that, she claimed, was a real plus.

Youth and an absence of professional training, however, also had their disadvantages. Sutherland lacked some of the experience
that comes with maturity in the school of life, experience that would have been particularly helpful in coping with some of the critical situations he confronted. Because of his youth he tended to be viewed as an impertinent upstart by some, and he evoked a detrimental resentment and professional jealousy in others.

Sutherland did not keep a diary, nor did he as openly express his feelings in letters as did his colleague Magan. Consequently, it is difficult to describe his attitudes and reactions accurately. It would appear, however, that Sutherland was not above criticizing when criticized. It is also likely that at least some of the accusations of extremism levelled at him by his detractors were the result of ill-advised and exaggerated statements by the youthful Sutherland.

As an administrator he possessed some admirable traits. He proved to be a man of strong convictions, one who was not easily cowed. For example, opposition to his early support of the students at Battle Creek College on the no-meat-in-the-dining-room issue seemed merely to strengthen his resolve. The same was true when church leaders resisted his initial attempts to establish the Adventist church-school system. The fact that Bible-centered education and the eradication of the classics flew in the face of traditional education did not deter him either. Convinced of the indispensability of manual labor in a holistic Christian education, he tirelessly promoted its inclusion as an integral part of the curriculum in spite of the traditional goal of acquiring an education to keep from having to dirty one's hands. Those same strongly held convictions caused Sutherland to be viewed with skepticism and criticism by many. Yet, when given a chance to show what was being accomplished and an
opportunity to clarify his views, he seemed to possess the ability to win many over to his position. Perhaps the best example of this ability was the occasion at the Conference of Church-school Teachers in 1900 when many of the teachers and even W. T. Bland, president of Union College, returned home feeling considerably more supportive of the reforms that Sutherland was implementing at Battle Creek College than when they arrived at the conference.

Sutherland also possessed some less desirable administrative traits. Though there is a paucity of documented evidence to support it, he apparently could be quite forceful, even stubborn, and was not always as tactful as he should have been. The clearest example of this was his determination to support the reopening of Battle Creek College, even though the church leaders vigorously opposed it. Another example was his ill-timed resignation from Emmanuel Missionary College in 1904.

As the years went by, Sutherland as an administrator grew increasingly inclined to promote a democratic form of student/faculty self-government and institutional management which evolved into the cooperative plan practiced at Emmanuel Missionary College. While he had the reputation of being friendly and accessible to both students and colleagues, there were those with whom he did not have friendly relations. Included in this latter group during the Berrien Springs years were Daniells, Prescott, I. H. Evans, and toward the end of Sutherland's tenure at Emmanuel Missionary College, J. H. Haughey.

The evidence reveals that Sutherland considered prayer and the seeking of divine guidance to be of critical importance in his administration. At Walla Walla College he held faculty retreats for
the study of the Bible and Ellen White's counsels on education and for corporate prayer. While at Battle Creek College, he set aside a regular portion of the faculty meetings for the study of topics related to spiritual growth and Christian education. At Emmanuel Missionary College, he generated frequent discussions, accompanied by prayer, of biblical principles and the counsels of Ellen White on Christian education.

**Sutherland's Educational Reform**

Sutherland's personal and educational philosophy, coupled with his administrative skills, helped him formulate and promote his educational reforms— the area for which he is most noted. His initial interest in educational reform can be traced primarily to the landmark Harbor Springs convention in the summer of 1891. It was there that he testified to having grasped the experiential dimension of the doctrine of righteousness by faith in Jesus Christ for the first time. It gave a Christ-centered focus to his philosophy, his career goals, and his orientation as a budding educator. Sutherland's careful study of (1) the educational principles enunciated by Ellen White in 1872, (2) *Special Testimonies on Education* (published in 1897), plus (3) the reports regarding the development of the educational work at Avondale in Australia in the 1890s helped orient him in educational reform during his years as a college administrator.

Sutherland gave the first evidence of his predisposition toward reform at Battle Creek College as a teacher of Old Testament. It was at Walla Walla College, however, that he was afforded a very favorable opportunity to begin his experiments in educational reform.
W. W. Prescott was the president, but as an absentee administrator living in Battle Creek and concurrently carrying the presidencies of Battle Creek, Union, and Walla Walla colleges, Sutherland was allowed, indeed obligated, to virtually develop his own program.

Sutherland at Walla Walla College had no powerful opposing factions to contend with. He enjoyed the support of faculty, students, and community. In addition, because the school was new it had no long-established traditions. Sutherland espoused Prescott's view that the dichotomy between "religious education" and "secular education" should not exist. Aware that education to be true to its name must be redemptive both in nature and objective, Sutherland began to introduce a number of curricular reforms. The two major reforms initiated at Walla Walla involved (1) emphasis on working with the hands as well as the head, and (2) reducing the curriculum to include only those courses he deemed essential to prepare students in the shortest possible time. Manual labor was made available to a growing number of students. In addition, Sutherland began to shorten courses, to make the Bible central, and to deemphasize the classics, degrees, and academic honors.

Given the favorable environment at Walla Walla, Sutherland possibly enjoyed a greater potential for realizing his educational goals there than at any subsequent time in his professional life. In addition to the other significant factors creating a favorable environment, Sutherland had the enthusiastic support of O. A. Olsen, the General Conference president, Prescott, and W. C. White—all important men in the denomination. It was too early, however, for Sutherland to achieve optimum success in his educational reform.
program. He had only begun to think through the questions of holistic education and curricular reform. It is intriguing to conjecture what might have developed had Sutherland stayed on at Walla Walla.

The move of Sutherland to Battle Creek College in 1897 was urged by Kellogg and the reform element in Battle Creek. The transfer was arranged by the General Conference leaders because of Sutherland's growing reputation as a reformer. Though Sutherland came with a mandate to reform, several factors militated against any lasting success as long as the institution stayed in Battle Creek: (1) the school was not in a rural location, (2) a powerful element of opposition existed in the city, (3) the west end of Battle Creek was made up of an inward-looking, critical Adventist community, (4) increasing politicization and even corruption existed within the church, and (5) his youth and immaturity worked to his disadvantage.

Sutherland, in spite of the challenges and difficulties, sought to initiate a number of reforms at Battle Creek College. Christian education, he was coming to believe, was as different from "worldly" education as "faith" was from "reason" in the ultimate test of truth. Thus he vigorously promoted the expansion of the industrial and church schools to inoculate every Adventist child against the secular world view. This development of the network of schools came at a time when the church was earnestly committed to evangelizing the world. Meanwhile, church leaders initially found it difficult to perceive the evangelizing potential of providing children and youth with the "Christian" education which Sutherland seemed to view as so urgent. The results over the years in terms of dedicated workers for the church in many areas of the global work, however, seem to have
verified the practical wisdom of Sutherland's perspective and plan.

Concerned with promoting not only church schools but curricular reforms in Battle Creek College as well, Sutherland continued and refined reforms begun at Walla Walla College and introduced new ones. Included among the reforms at Battle Creek College were the centrality of the Bible, the shortening of courses, the individualization of programs of study, and the elimination of degree programs, the classics, and classical languages. Manual labor was necessarily restricted because of the location of the institution, but Sutherland was slowly creating a mentality in the teachers and students more favorable to manual labor in combination with mental effort.

Sutherland promoted reform not only in the physical but also in the spiritual realm. Students and faculty participated in active community outreach with spontaneous activities such as the thanksgiving meal for needy children of Battle Creek and institutionally organized activities such as the ongoing program of evangelism at Jackson, Michigan. Sutherland was also deliberately altering the basic philosophy and makeup of the institution from a liberal arts college to that of a "training school for Christian workers."

While the inhabitants of Battle Creek benefited from the presence and work of the college in their midst, the detrimental influence of the city, the large Adventist community, and the worldliness of the workers at the sanitarium where so many students were employed outweighed the benefits. Sutherland believed that if the college had been moved out of the city years earlier it would have profited commensurately.

All of the prior experience and innovation that Sutherland
had stimulated in educational reform was given opportunity to blossom into fuller flower with the moving of the college from Battle Creek to Berrien Springs in 1901. Sutherland selected a rural location at a reasonable distance from Battle Creek. One benefit of the move was that Sutherland no longer had to work right under the noses of potentially critical leaders and lay opponents. A major disadvantage, however, was that since Berrien Springs was "off the beaten path," the school could be ignored by those who chose to do so. Those who ignored it were forced to base their assessment of the successes or failures of the new institution on hearsay alone. As the leaders of the church felt more and more estranged from Sutherland and Magan, they conveniently did precisely that, thus worsening the estrangement. Sutherland and Magan, of course, did much to worsen the alienation through their open and aggressive support of Kellogg.

Bringing to Berrien Springs the experience in curricular reform and educational innovation gained at both Walla Walla and Battle Creek, at Emmanuel Missionary College Sutherland chose to accept only a small number of dedicated Christians who were eager to train for missionary service for the church.

Biblical principles were to lie at the foundation of all instruction, and modern languages were emphasized in preparation for service overseas. Everyone was involved in manual labor, in the cooperative plan, in agricultural training, and in the acquisition of competency in at least one marketable trade. Sutherland made certain that teacher and ministerial training was eminently practical and continually upgradeable through summer sessions, correspondence courses, and special intensive courses.
While those who tried to pursue graduate studies no doubt encountered serious difficulties because they lacked a degree, one must bear in mind that it was Sutherland's avowed purpose to train in brevity workers for the church, not graduates for professional studies. Other Seventh-day Adventist institutions, such as Union College, provided that function. Nevertheless, by 1903 Sutherland apparently had begun to recognize the growing demand in certain disciplines, particularly medicine, for the legal academic recognition a degreed program afforded. Thus he supported the reopening of Battle Creek College under Kellogg's direction. He seemed to realize the difference in purpose and curriculum between "training schools" and colleges.

Outside the realm of formal education at the college, Sutherland also made a significant contribution to the church through heightening the awareness of the members to the evangelistic potential of the Sabbath schools. He promoted special instruction for Sabbath-school teachers and urged coordination of their activities with those of the local church-school teachers.

Sutherland was also active in developing mission-cutreach programs for the college students. While at Berrien Springs, he expanded missionary labor to include the urban areas of Milwaukee and Chicago where Kellogg had previously established a strong city-mission work. Another outreach included the equally challenging mission field of the South where J. E. White had developed a successful mission to the Blacks. Students were sent to work in these areas for extended periods of time.

When Sutherland contemplated the erection of a new college
at Berrien Springs, he determined to build it exclusively with student/teacher labor. The successful attainment of his objective was one of the major accomplishments of his presidency. The united effort achieved several ends: (1) the erection of substantial, attractive buildings at minimal cost; (2) an intimate teacher/student relationship; and, most importantly, (3) practically trained students capable of self-support and valuable assistance to the church in a wide variety of situations. In the process of successfully building a school with student/teacher labor, Sutherland also confirmed the wisdom of the principles found in the counsels of Ellen White regarding the need for, and value of, useful physical labor on the part of students.

Not all of Sutherland's reform programs during his Emmanuel Missionary College years were equally successful. For example, he was not markedly successful in achieving organized denominational financial support for church schools and church-school teachers. Though neither issue was resolved by the time Sutherland left Berrien Springs in 1904, teachers were eventually included in the ranks of conference-paid denominational workers. One can only wistfully conjecture regarding the incalculable benefits that would have resulted from compliance with Sutherland's plan of every-member support of Adventist church schools which would have insured that no child of Adventist parents, from early in the century to the present, would have to be excluded from receiving a Christian education.

Reform is necessarily experimental. Mistakes and excesses are inevitable as one seeks for balance. The intrinsic pitfalls associated with reform, however, did not deter Sutherland from
venturing to attempt the untried. At Walla Walla, Sutherland apparently enjoyed quite broad support for his reforms, but when he taught what he perceived as biblical concepts of agriculture at Battle Creek he was misunderstood and misquoted. Exaggerated accounts and apparently inaccurate rumors began to circulate about him, causing former supporters to gradually distance themselves from him. Thus his work was brought into general disrepute. At Emmanuel Missionary College, his implementation of the controversial one-study plan probably did not help to quell the widespread criticisms.

Supportive relationships with colleagues and peers are essential to achieving optimum success in any corporate undertaking. While Sutherland enjoyed unusually strong support from those who worked with him in the educational institutions he administered, his once cordial relationship with Prescott soured during the Emmanuel Missionary College years, and his relations with Daniells became mutually critical.

It would be difficult to overstate the impact that the whole Kellogg issue and Sutherland's unswerving support of the doctor played in the deterioration of Sutherland's relationship with the leaders of the church, the loss of a positive image and student attendance at Emmanuel Missionary College, and Sutherland's resignation and departure from the institution after only three years as its president. Sutherland's emphasis on training "self-supporting" workers during his years at Berrien Springs was misinterpreted by the church leadership as evidence that he had espoused the same independent and divisive spirit that Kellogg was considered to hold. Thus, Sutherland's loyalty was considered suspect, in spite of the fact that his "self-supporting" emphasis squared with the ideas of Ellen White.
Torn between sympathy for Kellogg and support of the church, Sutherland, when forced to a decision, came down firmly in support of the church, even at a time when he was estranged from its principal leaders. He never allowed the temporary difficulties, serious as they were, to lead him to abandon what he considered to be God's remnant church, and he spent a long life of loyal service to the church as incontrovertible evidence of that commitment.

Sutherland in the Context of His Times
Sutherland did not live and work in a vacuum. He fought against the same educational evils as his contemporaries in American society at large and arrived at many of the same solutions. Within the Seventh-day Adventist Church he had colleagues in reform, even though he stood at the forefront of the reform forces at the peak of their early success.

Sutherland in the Context of General Educational Reform
Sutherland began his educational career in an era of unprecedented, sweeping educational transformation in the western world in general and in the United States in particular. The battle between traditional and reform education reached its greatest intensity during the last quarter of the nineteenth century and the first two decades of the twentieth—the very years when Sutherland was creating Walla Walla College, reforming Battle Creek College, and building Emmanuel Missionary College.

The move away from an excessively bookish education began to gain momentum as early as the seventeenth century with John Locke.
(1632-1714), who asserted that people gained knowledge through sensory experience rather than merely through the study of ideas. In the nineteenth century Phillip Emmanuel von Fellerberg (1771-1844), recognizing the value of practical training, began to introduce agriculture and the learning of trades into his school at Hofwyl in Switzerland.

In America, by the 1830s, movements had begun that would culminate in the demise of the traditional classicist curriculum in North American education and would spawn a marked emphasis on a practical orientation in its place. Horace Mann (1796-1859), the tireless crusader for universal elementary education in the United States, wrote much on the value of practical education, and in the 1830s the Society for Promoting Manual Labor in Literary Institutions was founded to promote practical training.

While differing in theological orientation, Oberlin College, founded in 1833 in northern Ohio, was the nearest to a curricular forerunner of later Adventist educational reform. Oberlin considered manual labor "indispensable." It promoted instruction in physiology and health reform, temperance, the Bible as the central textbook, and agricultural training on its 800-acre farm. At the same time, the school opposed amusements, novels, prizes and honors, and the classics. Regrettably, by the late 1850s Oberlin had abandoned most of its reforms and had lost its distinctive raison d'être.

Following the Civil War, Francis W. Parker (1837-1902), founder of the progressive education movement, experimented with some of the innovations that Sutherland would later espouse: curricular flexibility tailored to the individual learner, exploration and discovery instead of rote memorization, and more democratic methods of
discipline in place of regimentation. That Sutherland knew of Parker's work is evident from the fact that Parker spoke at Battle Creek College in 1898.

Nor was Sutherland's idea to build Emmanuel Missionary College with student/faculty labor original with him. Booker T. Washington (1856-1915), for example, had built Tuskegee Institute in Alabama exclusively with student/faculty help.

By the 1890s the battle against the classics was being fought in most American institutions of higher education. Likewise, there were major moves being made to make education more practical. Much of this was accomplished by the turn of the century.

An American movement of major importance for understanding the context of late nineteenth-century Adventist education was the Bible-institute movement. The movement, spearheaded in the 1880s by the Nyack Missionary College of New York and the Moody Bible Institute of Chicago, had as its supreme goal the rapid preparation of young people for missionary service. The Bible schools shunned full scholastic courses and academic degrees, partly from a sense of urgency but also to avoid exposing the students to some of the contemporary, secularizing trends such as Darwinism and higher biblical criticism. J. H. Kellogg sent his colleague, W. S. Sadler, to Moody Bible Institute in 1896 in preparation for his leadership of the Kellogg-sponsored Adventist mission in Chicago. Kellogg, in turn, probably influenced Sutherland and Magan with his Bible institute, missionary training ideas.

Sutherland's educational reforms were reflective of the needs and reforms of his era, and they were in harmony with its milieu of
societal, educational, and religious influences. His emphasis on practical education is evident in his implementation of a strong work-study program with particular stress on the value of agriculture. There is no evidence that Sutherland, in the period of his life encompassed in this study, was acquainted with the reform work of Oberlin College earlier in the century. Nevertheless, most of his reforms directly paralleled the Oberlin experiment—especially in manual labor, agriculture, eradication of the classics, and the exaltation of the Bible as the central textbook. Similarities to Parker's earlier reforms were evident in Sutherland's tailoring of the curriculum to individual needs, his emphasis on developing "learners" rather than "reciters," and his implementation of a cooperative system of school government and administration.

Sutherland was also in harmony with the reforms of the Bible-institute movement. Like the leaders of the Bible institutes, he urged abbreviated, intensive training; the centrality of the Bible; eschewal of degrees and academic honors; and a decidedly missionary orientation.

It is evident that Sutherland was not ahead of the reformers of his time in terms of either ideas or accomplishments. Rather, he was in tune with the educational exigencies of his era. Most of his reforms paralleled those instigated by reformers of the late nineteenth century. It is imperative to remember that Sutherland was aiming at educational abuses of his era. A serious error is committed when reformers in the 1980s merely try to implement Sutherland's reforms in lock-step fashion. Many of the problems have changed; therefore the specific reforms needed have also changed in many cases.
What is needed is dedicated reform and the application of Christian principles to current issues in the spirit of Sutherland rather than exact replication of his reform program.

**Sutherland in the Context of Seventh-day Adventist Educational History**

Sutherland held a key position in the evolution of Adventist educational reform. This becomes evident as one traces the development of education in the denomination. During the decade of the 1870s, a traditional classical orientation dominated at Battle Creek College. In 1881 Ellen White spoke vigorously in favor of the centrality of the Bible in the curriculum; later in the decade Prescott attempted to give the students greater exposure to the Bible at Battle Creek College. He also tried to introduce manual labor into the curriculum. At the end of the 1880s, however, the classics still dominated, even though some progress had been made in finding a place for the Bible in the course of study. The manual labor program had failed.

At the Harbor Springs convention during the summer of 1891, Ellen White intimated that the Bible would never be allowed to assume its rightful place until the central role of the classics in the curriculum was eradicated. She challenged the educators present at the convention to join the battle in favor of making the Bible and its message the central feature of Adventist education. Thus, Prescott and, subsequently, Caviness made concerted efforts to reform the Battle Creek College curriculum with the Bible at the center. Reform in the well-established institution, however, met with strong resistance, and both presidents found reform to be a difficult uphill
battle, even though they made some headway. Meanwhile, the reformers at the Avondale School for Christian Workers in Australia were demonstrating how the reforms could be put into practice.

Sutherland arrived at Battle Creek College in 1897 with a mandate for reform. The time proved propitious, and groundwork for reform had already been laid by Prescott and Caviness. Consequently, Sutherland was able to achieve the substantive curricular reforms for which his predecessors had fought. Moving beyond their reform goals, he also carried out reforms in areas in which they had shown little interest, such as the manual-labor reform. Certainly Sutherland would readily acknowledge his debt to the earlier Adventist educational leaders. He did not achieve reform in isolation. It was already alive and struggling when he arrived at Battle Creek.

During Sutherland's tenure at Battle Creek College, the school was transformed from a liberal arts college into a training school for missionary workers after the Avondale model. At Berrien Springs he pursued the same orientation. All of his reforms, therefore, made eminent sense in the context of his stated goal—to prepare missionaries.

By the time Sutherland resigned from Emmanuel Missionary College in 1904, he had already begun to moderate some details of his reform. By that time, however, he and Magan had largely lost their influence in the denomination. Frederick Griggs, and others who rose to leadership in Adventist education after 1904, continued the moderation of the reforms. Griggs and his colleagues sought to profit from the mistakes made in the Sutherland years of curricular experimentation. They tried to capture the best of the reforms while not
departing too far from traditional education. One result of this moderating effort was the gradual drift back toward a collegiate rather than a training school approach to advanced education.

History has largely viewed Sutherland as an educational radical and Griggs as an educational moderate. It appears, however, that where Sutherland has been labelled a radical, and Griggs a moderate, such labelling has obscured the fact that each succeeded notably in achieving his avowed goals—goals that were not antithetical, but different; not one right and one wrong, but both valid.

Sutherland was controversial in his day and has remained so since his death. Of one thing, however, we can be certain—he changed the course of Seventh-day Adventist education. Since the turn of the century, Seventh-day Adventist educators have continued to be challenged with the ideals he earnestly sought to implement.

Issues for Further Study

Since Sutherland's Madison years were not covered in the present study, there are at least two investigations relating to Madison that should be attempted:

1. The presidency of Sutherland at Madison College is a logical and needed sequel to this study. He spent forty-one years in self-supporting work as founder and president of that institution.

2. Though William C. Sandborn prepared a dissertation on the history of Madison College in 1953, much more documentation has been made available since that time. Thus, a detailed history of the institution is now possible and would prove enlightening.

Other research that might logically flow from this study on
Sutherland is: (1) an examination of contemporary Adventist integration of faith and learning in the light of Sutherland's work, (2) a study of how to apply the principles of manual labor in the post-industrial era, and (3) an assessment of the contemporary need for agricultural training in light of the fact that the majority of the world's nations are still predominantly agrarian and that the Adventist church seeks to penetrate the world for Christ. Sutherland, it should not be forgotten, made a direct connection between agriculture and mission outreach.

Commendation

Neither intellectually brilliant nor administratively extraordinary, Sutherland was a common man with an uncommon sense of mission. At a young age he was pressed into major service for the Seventh-day Adventist Church in the arena of Christian education. He sought counsel, worked hard, and succeeded admirably in many of his undertakings. Sutherland developed a lifelong commitment to prepare every Adventist child, youth, and adult to evangelize the world, and he lived a life dedicated to that goal. The study of his struggles, failures, and successes, should significantly assist Christian educators in evaluating the present academic situation and in planning more effective educational strategies for the future. For his conscientious attempt to point the way through a lifetime of dedication and perseverance to Christian education, the Seventh-day Adventist Church stands in Sutherland's debt.
EPILOGUE

When Sutherland left Berrien Springs to pioneer self-supporting work for Whites in the South he was only thirty-nine years old. With an unusually broad experience behind him, his administrative and human-relations skills tested in the crucible of challenging day-to-day living, and a deep personal commitment to following God's will, he was equipped for significant service in the South.

Sutherland, however, was tired of struggling with lack of support, rancor, and debt; consequently, with Magan, he decided to go into the hills of the South—away from it all—and build a small agricultural school. Providence, however, had other plans for them. Ellen White wrote:

From the light given me, I knew that this would not be the right thing to do, and I told them so. The work that these brethren can do, because of the experience gained at Berrien Springs, is to be carried on within easy access of Nashville; for Nashville has not yet been worked as it should be.

Following the Lake Union Conference session at Berrien Springs in May 1904, Ellen White had travelled to the South to visit her son Edson and see the work he had established for the Blacks, especially in Tennessee. When plans were made to travel up the Cumberland River

1E. G. White, "A Visit to the South--No. 2," RH 81 (August 18, 1904):7-8. Most of the information in the epilogue is common knowledge or can be found in sources readily available. However, where a direct quotation is used or a little-known fact or detail is mentioned, the source is cited.
on his missionary boat "Morning Star" in search of a site to build a training school for Blacks, Ellen White convinced Sutherland and Magan to come alone. At Edgefield Junction, about twelve miles north of Nashville, the boat broke down. Ellen White took advantage of the delay to make a brief visit to a large old farm--the "Nelson place"--that was for sale. On the return trip from Carthage, 170 miles to the north, she told Sutherland and Magan that the Nelson farm was the right location for their school. "This place," she said, "is what the Lord wants you to have." She referred to it as "a beautiful farm."¹

At the time of the purchase, however, it was not beautiful; it had depleted soil with frequent limestone outcroppings. When Sutherland and Magan objected to purchasing such a rundown place, Ellen White's rejoinder was that it would not be "becoming" for them to have the "best piece of land in the States to train" themselves to help the people with "very poor land in the hills."²

The 414-acre farm was purchased for $12,723 (paid for almost entirely with donated funds), and classes began on October 1, 1904. Named the "Nashville Agricultural and Normal Institute" (later changed to "Madison College"), the school emphasized agriculture and teacher-training. Sutherland and Magan's plan was to select dedicated young men and women from Berrien Springs and elsewhere in the North; educate


them in Bible study, physiology, the history of the Adventist message, at least two trades (with special emphasis on agricultural training); and send them out to establish self-supporting outposts patterned after the Nashville Agricultural and Normal Institute.

From very humble beginnings the school prospered, in spite of the fact that it received no tuition, no church or state aid, nor standard endowments. In imitation of the example set at Emmanuel Missionary College, the students and teachers constructed the buildings. Ellen White served on the school board—the only school board of which she was ever a member—until she was forced to resign because of age and failing health.

As the program evolved, three areas of emphasis became prominent. First, the educational work developed which prepared young people to go out and establish schools and be missionaries through teaching and farming. Second, the medical work was established with a sanitarium located on the campus in 1908. It provided employment and training for the students and eventually included a nursing school. Third, agriculture was developed which provided employment for self-supporting students, training for practical mission service, and abundant produce for the workers, students, and patients on campus. In 1917 the school added a fourth area of emphasis with the opening of a vegetarian cafeteria and a treatment room in Nashville. The following year a fifth area of emphasis was begun—the establishment of a health-food factory.

Sutherland and Magan, concerned about the frequent turnover of doctors at the sanitarium (low pay and long hours appealed to very few), decided to study medicine and become sanitarium physicians.
themselves. They completed the medical course at Vanderbilt University in 1914 when Sutherland was forty-nine years old.

Because an increasing number of students desired to receive their pre-medical training at Madison, Sutherland successfully negotiated accreditation for the institution as a junior college in 1929. Though he tried during the 1930s to acquire accreditation for Madison as a senior college, recognition was never granted; primarily because of the extremely low salary schedule and a lack of sufficient endowment.

Even during the Great Depression, a student could attend Madison College with no external financial support and, by dint of hard work, could receive a college education. This fact, coupled with the strong emphasis on work-study, brought international exposure to the institution when Reader's Digest carried a glowing article on Madison College in 1938.¹ The year after the article was published the college had students from nine foreign countries. In 1941 the school reached its highest-ever enrollment--458, with students from forty-four states and three foreign countries.² Also in 1938, Eleanor Roosevelt, at the request of Secretary of State Hull, visited the school and wrote of her impressions in her syndicated newspaper column, "My Day." She was particularly impressed that graduates from the institution had established thirty-five "similar institutions," mostly in the South but some as far away as Cuba and Japan. A year later Ripley's "Believe It or Not" column featured Madison as the

"only Self-Supporting college in America," claiming that the school had "27 campus industries."¹

With the coming of the Second World War, attendance dropped dramatically as many of the male students were called to fight for their country. After the war the school never regained its former appeal and popularity. For a variety of reasons (including financial), Madison college was closed in 1964, after sixty years of operation. Madison Hospital became an institution of the Southern Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists. Madison Academy continues to operate as a school owned and operated by the Kentucky-Tennessee Conference of Seventh-day Adventists. Madison Foods eventually became a division of Worthington Foods, and in 1972 the factory was moved to Worthington, Ohio. Mercifully, Sutherland passed away nine years before the demise of the college.

In 1946, at the age of eighty-one, Sutherland resigned the presidency to accept a request from the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists to be secretary of the Commission on Rural Living (forerunner of the Association of Self-Supporting Institutions). He had served as president of Madison College for forty-one years.

After travelling extensively for four years in his work for the General Conference, he retired to his beloved Madison. His last years of life brought both sorrow and joy. Sally, his faithful wife

and companion for over sixty years, died when he was eighty-eight. Lonely for companionship, the following year (1954) he married his life-long friend and colleague M. Bessie DeGraw. She was eighty-three at the time of their marriage. At the age of ninety, Sutherland died in his sleep on June 20, 1955, following a brief illness.

At the time of his death, N. C. Wilson, father of the current president of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, said of Sutherland: "To him Christianity meant walking with God each day and all day in every detail and relationship of life. He willingly gave his all to his God and to his church." That comment would have pleased the faithful old educator.1

1 "Others' Opinion[s] of Sutherland," Opinion I, 167, Madison Association Collection, Madison, TN.
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