

D. J. B. Trim

---

# In These Cities Are Jewels: Lessons from Adventist City Missions—1880–1915

## Introduction

As an introduction to this topic I begin with a powerful testimony of Ellen White's that is a familiar one now for all advocates of urban mission. "There is no change in the messages that God has sent in the past. The work in the cities is the essential work for this time" (White 1932:304). But let's dig deeper beneath that memorable statement. Notice those words: "there is *no change*" in God's messages about big cities. This comes from a letter to the leaders of the General Conference (GC) written in June 1909 immediately after the close of that year's thirty-seventh GC Session, held at the church's headquarters in Washington, DC. The letter was composed before Ellen White returned to California. The timing reflected her frustration at the session's failure to act for the cities, which she expressed very frankly, rebuking the General conference president, A. G. Daniells and vice president, W. W. Prescott by name (White 1909 Letter 47). In particular, she observed, "As I look over the past testimonies, I see that *for years* the importance of working the cities has been urged. But . . . excuses have been made, and this great work has been sadly neglected" (Letter 47). Note that she does not say the cities have *never* been worked; instead, they have been neglected, but there is "no change" in God's messages.

As Ellen White's words of 1909 imply, urban-focused mission has a long history in the Seventh-day Adventist Church. It goes beyond the work of Dr. John Harvey Kellogg in Chicago, the one exemplar which is reasonably well known but which comes with proverbial baggage, given what happened with Kellogg. I will touch on the Chicago mission, but it was not unique; in fact, our pioneers established many city missions. And while they stressed practical experience they also valued analytical approaches. For example, in 1910, the first two days of the annual council

were given over to what was essentially a scholarly conference, with papers read by various proponents and veterans of city missionary activity, crystalizing their experiences and lessons learned for church leaders to take away and apply.

In this article I will simply delineate the main contours and draw out some points that are potentially relevant to urban mission today. Adventist history has much to offer, and not only in terms of learning lessons—our history can inspire us, but it can also chasten us and I hope this article will do both. As you will see, historically Adventists have engaged with the cities—sometimes—and sometimes in innovative and creative ways. City mission is *not* something new, *not* something that is a distraction. It is something that is deep in Adventist DNA; however, admittedly for many decades obscured. It is important to recover that heritage, to recapture the enthusiasm some Adventist leaders showed for city mission along with the creative and comprehensive methodologies some of them developed.

The first two decades of Seventh-day Adventist mission reflected the largely rural nature of American society. In 1882, Ellen White published a testimony in which she counselled Adventist families to leave cities (White 1889:232-233). However, it did not end Adventist interest in evangelizing cities. On the contrary, the next year saw the beginning of the golden age of Adventist urban mission.

At the 22nd GC Session in 1883, the minutes record the following. “The subject of organizing a city mission in Chicago was introduced, and interesting remarks relative to this were made. The brethren in Illinois have about \$3,000 ready to start this work, and probably more could be raised if the work were commenced. On motion, the matter was referred to the General Conference Committee” (Oyen 1883:741).

No GC Committee minutes survive from those early years, but the Committee did follow up, for within twelve months the denomination had a Chicago Mission and a New York City Mission. From presidential correspondence it is clear that the “Michigan [Conference] gave \$1,000, [the] Wisconsin [Conference] \$500 and Illinois [Conference] \$1,500, to start the Mission” (Butler 1885).

The Chicago Mission’s day-to-day operating expenses were funded by the International Tract Society, which meant it had a GC connection rather than only being an Illinois Conference institution, though in practice this caused some friction between the Illinois Conference and General Conference (General Conference Proceedings 1883:741). The New York Mission was at least partially funded by the General Conference, for it spent \$3,004.52 on the mission in 1884. That, incidentally, was 23% of the GC’s annual budget.

In November 1884, at the round of meetings associated with the annual

(as it then was) General Conference Session, the International Tract Society's annual general meeting received reports on newly founded missions in Oakland, Portland, and Denver, and discussed prospects for founding one in New Orleans (*Seventh-day Adventist Yearbook* 1885:39-41). What, however, did these city missions actually *do*? Reports to the Tract and Missionary Society meeting reveal that "city work" largely meant systematic visitation of people's homes to conduct Bible studies (39-40). But the early city missions were also already trying to meet a range of felt needs, including social ones. Thus, in the 1884 report, it was noted that

donations of bedding, fruit, flour, potatoes, etc., would be very acceptable, and it was recommended that persons desiring to make donations of this kind, should send them together as much as possible [and] that the donors should pay the freight. . . . It was thought that most of them [the missions] might be largely sustained in this way. Many persons, especially farmers, could make donations from their large supplies, and never feel it, excepting in the way that "it is more blessed to give than to receive. (45)

This represented a good way to utilize Adventism's strength in farming areas and apply it to the needs of cities. In seeking to meet more than spiritual needs, urban missionaries were doing something different by Adventist standards; yet that was also true of their emphasis on evangelizing through visitation and Bible study, for, as leaders of the time recognized, this approach in big cities differed from that used in smaller towns, which revolved around series of public lectures in halls or tents (42, 44). Thus, Adventist urban mission, even in its earliest days, was innovative.

Only a few months after the 1884 Session, Ellen White for the first time addressed the subject at length in a testimony, written to R. F. Andrews, president of the Illinois Conference, to reprove his lukewarm or negative attitude towards the Chicago Mission. Later in 1885, that message was published in *Testimonies for the Church* (White 1889:368-385). Ellen White poses several rhetorical questions, following up with powerful reproofs.

What account shall we give for the men and women who have died without hearing the sound of present truth, who would have received it had the light been brought to them? My spirit is stirred that the work in [Chicago has] been delayed so long. The work that is now being done there might have been done years ago . . . it must not be left undone now. "Shall the prince of darkness be left in undisputed possession of our great cities because it costs something to sustain missions? Let those who would follow Christ fully come up to the work, even if it be over the heads of ministers and president. (1889:369)

Some months later, in November 1885, the 24th GC Session took up city missions with enthusiasm. A committee of nine was established (*Seventh-day Adventist Yearbook* 1886:26), which reported back with no fewer than 14 recommendations that were accepted. The first was that “each conference [with large cities], have in its bounds at least one mission”—this would be ambitious today! In addition, at a time when the whole denomination employed fewer than four hundred workers (26), the session mandated the despatch of considerable personnel resources to big cities. The New England and New York Conferences between them had a total of 20 workers but they were instructed to “furnish at least half a dozen” more for the New York City Mission. There were just three ministers and four local churches in the entire Virginia Conference, and no churches or workers in Maryland, but two ministers and two nurses were newly assigned to Washington, DC. There were only three ministers across the whole of the Deep South but three ministers were allocated to start work in New Orleans (38-40).

One has a strong impression of a rolling stone that was gathering momentum. Urban mission was the new “in thing” for Adventists. The 1886 *Yearbook* included a first-ever report of “City Missions” as of 1885, listing thirty separate missions: 25 in the United States, plus five overseas, in Copenhagen and Stockholm in Scandinavia, Liverpool and Grimsby (in England), and Richmond, in Victoria, Australia (12-13). An overall statistical report for the 25 North American missions was included which states that these 25 missions served a cumulative population of 5,041,318 people, with a total workforce of 76 “experienced workers,” thanks to whose labors a total of 446 people had “embraced the truth during the year” (*Seventh-day Adventist Yearbook* 1887:52-53).

The 26th GC Session was the first to meet in a large city, convening in Oakland. It created a new officer position, that of “Home Mission Secretary,” who was instructed to “devote his time principally to the furtherance of the city mission work during the coming year” (*Seventh-day Adventist Yearbook* 1887). The same year, the *Yearbook’s* list of city missions included six more in North America (11-12). The next year, 1888, the session again went to a major urban area, meeting in Minneapolis. While the twenty-seventh session is generally remembered for theological and inter-generational conflict, it was notable for a report delivered by the Home Mission Secretary, E. J. Farnsworth, specifically on work in US cities for a nine-month period ending June 30, 1888, which reported twenty-two city missions, with “131 workers engaged in Bible work some time during the year,” who had “made 43,021 visits, with 10,353 families.” There had been 258 baptisms during the nine months covered by Farnsworth’s report, and he believed that “fully 1,000 persons have been converted since these missions began their work” (*Seventh-day Adventist Yearbook* 1889:64-66).

Earlier that year, the fifth annual “European Council of Seventh-day Adventist Missions” in June 1888 took an action “that a . . . city mission should be established [in Hamburg] as soon as possible” (75-76). In November, delegates in Minneapolis approved a resolution with the same wording (Thirteenth Day’s Proceedings 1888, Nov. 2:1). Work had already begun in other major European port cities, but the decision about Hamburg points to the way in which denominational leaders were now thinking strategically about reaching big cities including those beyond North America. The strategic thinking is also evident in the 1888 GC Session’s decision to shift a team of seven colporteurs from rural Iowa to “the city of Baltimore” (Thirteenth Day’s Proceedings 1888, Nov. 1:1). The horizons of urban mission were thus being expanded geographically. They were also expanding in other ways.

The next year, 1889, the emerging work among colored people (to use the language of the time) also influenced denominational evangelistic strategies. In the Deep South of the United States the black population was heavily rural; but though slavery had been abolished its legacy continued. In the face of increasing white oppression and a need for better, consistent employment, Blacks began to migrate to the growing cities. In 1889, notable evangelistic efforts were held in St. Louis, led by Charles Kinney (the first Black Adventist ordained minister) and in Louisville, led by Alonzo Barry. Missions aimed at Blacks used public evangelistic methods, literature evangelism, and personal visitation; but they also utilized soup kitchens and adult literacy classes to supply the immediate physical needs of a community, which by definition was impoverished and lacked social support networks.

The more socially inflected and comprehensive approach to urban ministry, introduced in working for African Americans, was adopted more widely in Adventist city missions. In 1893, it was implemented in Chicago with the creation of the Lifeboat Mission, sponsored by the International Medical Missionary and Benevolent Association, which was led by Dr. John Kellogg. This model spread and was given prophetic endorsement. In the winter of 1894-95, the *Review and Herald* published a three-part series of articles by Ellen White, who was now serving as a missionary in Australia, with the title “Our Duty to the Poor and Afflicted.”

In the first article, White quotes Isaiah 1:17: “Learn to do well; seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow.” She then starkly declares: “Can we wonder that the curse of God is upon the earth, upon man and beast, when his law is set aside as a thing of naught, and men are following the imagination of their own hearts, as did the inhabitants of the world before the flood? All this foretells the coming

of Christ and the end of all things" (1894:785). What is highly unusual by the standards of Adventist theological discourse is that here, Ellen White links "setting aside God's law as naught" not to the fourth commandment, or indeed to any of the Ten Commandments, but rather to failing to live up to Old Testament injunctions to care for the widow, the orphan, and the immigrant. Ellen White drives the point home: "Through selfish pride, through selfish gratification, the blessing of God has been shut away from men and from his professed people, because they have despised his words and have failed to relieve the sufferings of humanity" (786). Ellen White is telling us that the test of whether we are guilty of selfish pride and selfish gratification, and of despising God's words, is whether we do or do not "relieve the sufferings of humanity."

These articles deserve to be read and re-read but they have never been reprinted in any compilation. Perhaps Ellen White is too radical for us. At the time, though, John Kellogg declared that he would use "Our Duty to the Poor and Afflicted" as a blueprint for the Chicago Mission (Butler 1970:41-51). A year later, in 1896, the Lifeboat Mission created a maternity home for prostitutes who gave birth out of wedlock and a workingmen's home for unemployed laborers (Harris 1897:340).

In 1897, the earliest Adventist welfare organization outside America was founded in Hamburg, Germany (Community Services 1996:401). In 1898, the Bow Bazaar Mission in Calcutta, headed by Dores Robinson, included an orphanage, a vegetarian restaurant, cooking school, and a monthly magazine (Olsen 1926:517-520). In 1897 and 1898, city missions in Portland, Salt Lake City, and San Francisco, according to an official report, were places "where unfortunates can find food and lodging. Many have been supplied with clothing, and made comfortable during sickness" (Breed 1899:19). Elsewhere in the US West, there was a workingmen's home in Spokane; but there was also one in Melbourne, Australia (Breed 1899:19; Directory of City Missions 1901:547). In 1899, in Montgomery, Alabama, a Black pastor, T. S. Bucknor, opened the Montgomery Charity Mission, which not only disbursed aid to the African-American community, but also included a school for them (Buckner 1903:17).

Meanwhile the San Francisco mission had expanded. Its origins lay in an 1887 initiative by the San Francisco church that won the support of that year's GC Session held in nearby Oakland (The General Conference 1887:776). In the late 1890s it expanded, operating a "hygienic restaurant," health "food store," "treatment rooms," workingmen's home, sailor's ministry, a school, and an orphanage (The Vegetarian 1899:52; *General Conference Bulletin* 1902:6-7). Ellen White commended on what was happening in San Francisco and urged that this approach be widely emulated (White 1900; Krause 2013:6-9).

That these were concerted efforts, not outliers, is evident from an address to the 1899 GC Session by the GC president George Irwin. He stressed medical missionary work and addressing socio-economic ills and needs, and he averred, with evident pride, that “this work has spread *until now medical and rescue missions have been established, and are being successfully carried on, in nearly all the prominent cities in the United States*. Thousands in this way are being clothed and fed, and souls are being rescued from sin and degradation” (Presidential Address 1899:6). City mission was no longer only primarily about personal visitation and Bible studies. It had become almost identified with medical mission, though one should stress that this was medical mission broadly conceived—what is presently promoted as a “comprehensive health ministry.”

The obvious question to ask at this point is, How did things change so much? This is a question both about the long term and how quickly Adventists caught the vision for city work. How was it that Adventists largely abandoned cities, except for the comfortable suburbs, and then had to re-spark urban mission in the last decade? But even more, it is about the short term—how did things change so much just in the ten years, between Irwin’s words in 1899 and 1909, when the lack of work in cities led Ellen White to issue the stinging rebuke to church leaders mentioned at the beginning of this article.

For all the activity and for all that was being done right and done well, some things were going wrong. One was theological missteps. Crucially, under Kellogg’s influence, the distinctively Adventist character of the flagship mission in Chicago had gradually been abandoned. Kellogg increasingly portrayed the mission as a Christian one, not an Adventist one, and restructured its governance so that the American Medical Missionary College (which he had founded and led) was the mission’s parent. He had also amended the governance of the college and the Battle Creek Sanitarium so that they were no longer Adventist controlled. In 1900, Ellen White raised concerns over the non-denominational nature of the Chicago Mission. Over the next few years Kellogg would be at loggerheads with her and with the GC officers over his doctrinal views and over control of the Battle Creek Sanitarium. Relations were very strained and the city mission continued to be a source of friction.

The controversy over Kellogg, which ultimately led to his being disellowshipped in 1907, discredited, to some extent, the methods of the Chicago Mission, even the concept of city mission itself, as they were tarred with the Kellogg brush and deemed guilty by association. This can be overstated. It is true that the last time city missions had their own separate report was in the 1904 *Yearbook*, which listed missions in just six cities, three in America plus one each in Australia, New Zealand, and Sweden.

But we *know* that at this time there were missions in several other cities in the US (Nineteenth Meeting 1905:10), as well as in South Africa and Canada (Elder Goodman's City Mission 1905:1-5; Fortner 1905:1-2). It seems more likely that in 1904 there was a change in reporting, rather than that there was an immediate collapse in the number of city missions. More striking is that some dropped the nomenclature of "city mission." This fact suggests that the leaders of city missions felt the potential for being tainted by association with Kellogg and the Chicago missions so it was worth dropping that name.

In 1909 and 1910 there was a revival in urban mission, thanks to the emphatic encouragement of Ellen White. In December 1909, the GC Committee voted to allocate \$18,000 for city missions — no small sum — adjusted for inflation it would be around half a million dollars today. Furthermore, world evangelistic appropriations in 1909 totaled \$214,000. Just over one twelfth of that went to six US cities: Baltimore; New York City; Philadelphia; Portland, Maine; Richmond, Virginia; and Washington, DC (General Conference Committee 1909:149-150). New York got \$12,500 or over two thirds of the total appropriation for urban mission and the GC president Arthur Daniells himself went to New York City to evangelize in the city.

Yet by the end of the 1910s, there had been a definite decline in urban missions — not just in the nomenclature of city mission but in the substance. My staff and I have only been able to identify a handful of urban missions in the 1920s. So, why did all the effort of 1910 and 1911 ultimately end in disappointment, with the Adventist Church ending up focusing, yet again, on rural areas and small towns?

I propose there were five factors. First, an enduring perception that Kellogg's methodology was tainted, not just his theology and ecclesiology. Second, the death of Ellen White in 1915, which removed the foremost and most eloquent advocate of city work. Third, the immense distraction and destruction of the First World War. Fourth, the influence, in the decade following the First World War, of Fundamentalism, to which Adventists were not immune, and which tended to affirm positions that were socially and politically (not just theologically) conservative. This mattered because of the fifth factor, which I want to stress, and which was the nature of city work. It was difficult, dirty, smelly, insalubrious work, involving ministry to the working classes, to immigrants, to African Americans, to the poor, and to prostitutes — all this meant it attracted social stigma. But Seventh-day Adventists wanted to be respectable.

The evidence that the decline in city mission was associated with more than Kellogg is partly statistical. In going back to 1900, it is notable that the *General Conference Bulletin* reported city missions in 24 cities in 17 states and in three countries outside the United States. These numbers do



not reflect any significant shift from 1888. The expansion in city missions of the previous decade had stalled and plateaued before the crisis with Kellogg over control of the American Medical Missionary College and the Chicago Mission.

There undoubtedly were other difficulties and challenges. One of these was the expense of working in big cities—a recurrent problem still faced today. A report to the 1889 GC Session acknowledged: “Some excellent results have been seen from city mission work in the past; but it has proved too expensive for the various State Conferences to establish and maintain missions in all their large cities” (*Seventh-day Adventist Yearbook* 1890:144). In 1910, when city mission underwent a brief renaissance, veteran church administrator Allen Moon presented a paper on finances to the annual council. He declared: “The mistake of years ago in this matter was in securing expensive properties for city missions, involving conferences in debt. This discouraged the people and led to the dropping of this line of work” (General Conference Committee 1909:301).

Another problem was the pronounced perception that urban ministry primarily meant ministry to ethnic groups. In the mid-1890s, Chicago had two missions: the first was the main mission, led by Kellogg, often called the English Mission: that is, English-speaking. There was also the Scandinavian Mission, which focused on people who spoke Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish, which eventually became known as the Swedish Mission (*Seventh-day Adventist Yearbook* 1887:52-53). When a new city mission was founded in Winnipeg in 1897, the Canadian leaders asked the GC to send “a German colporteur: and a Norwegian “laborer,” for these were the ethnic groups they wished to focus on, especially “the Norwegian settlement” (General Conference Committee 1909:301). The same year, work in Louisville and Chattanooga was begun by an African-American pastor, Lewis Sheafe, while in 1900 a new mission was established in Atlanta by a White northerner, M. C. Sturdevant; however, all three missions ministered only to local blacks (Sturdevant 1901:6). Nine years later, after Ellen White’s post-GC Session testimony to GC leadership, with which I began this article, the same leaders brought proposals to the 1909 Fall Council. One stressed the need for greater resources for city missions in the large cities of the northeastern United States, but on the grounds that: “There is in Greater New York and other eastern cities a vast foreign population of all nations and tongues, who must soon hear the truths of this message” (General Conference Committee 1909:117). Thus, it seems that city work meant black or immigrant work. It was niche work, specialized work—and often not respectable.

The impact that this could have is evident when looking more closely at what city missionaries actually did and at the *sort* of work that was involved in city work.

In 1905, Ellen White visited the Lifeboat Mission and the Workingmen's Home in Chicago, and lauded their ministries (1905b:8). In 1909, Illinois Conference leaders moved Chicago's "Rescue Home" for prostitutes to Hinsdale, which today is in Chicago's suburbs, but then lay outside the city's metropolitan area. In addition, it was repurposed to become a home for foundlings. But this meant it still had a social function, and Ellen White addressed the home's personnel and patrons at the new site's dedication (W. C White 1909:7). Her visits in 1905 and 1909 show that she retained her views from 1885 about "relieving the sufferings of humanity." She condemned Kellogg's theology, his bizarre and objectionable racial and sexual theories, his determination to work unilaterally, and his refusal to submit to the authority of the GC. Yet crucially, she did not condemn his methods of ministry in cities. It is deeply unfortunate that many Adventists apparently assumed that anything associated with Kellogg had to be abandoned. This was not what Ellen White wanted—just the opposite.

Indeed, at the 1910 Spring Council, Allen Moon, a veteran member of the GC Committee, "spoke of an interview in which Sister White said that it was not so much by public evangelists that the work [in cities] was to be done as by seeking out the people one by one through Bible work and canvassing effort, and medical missionary work" (General Conference Committee 1910:199). These words are similar to those in *Ministry of Healing*, published a few years earlier in 1905, where Ellen White writes not only of how Christ "mingled with men as one who desired their good. . . . [and] ministered to their needs," but where she also states, "There is need of coming close to the people by personal effort. If less time were given to sermonizing, and more time were spent in personal ministry, greater results would be seen. The poor are to be relieved, the sick cared for, the sorrowing and the bereaved comforted, the ignorant instructed, the inexperienced counselled" (1905a:143).

Church leaders, however, were not listening. Seven months after Moon shared Ellen White's counsel to him, a large part of the Autumn Council was devoted to city mission. Papers were based on experience not theory, but they went in a very different direction to that urged by Ellen White. Rollin D. Quinn (1869-1928), who twelve years earlier had served in the Salt Lake City Mission and was now president of the Greater New York Conference (Gosmer 1928:22; *Seventh-day Adventist Yearbook* 1910:22), presented a paper on the "Methods and Agencies in City Work," in which he declared, "The experience in New York City has convinced the workers that a strong, well-organized public effort . . . is of the highest efficiency in

reading the public.” He argued explicitly: “Well-advertised, well-manned and well-organized public effort in tent and hall . . . is the *chief* means of reaching the public of the great cities” (General Conference Committee 1910:295-297). This was the opposite of Ellen White’s counsel.

This was not the end of matters, though, for George B. Starr, who had been involved with city work for 24 years, read a paper entitled “How to Conduct a City Mission,” in which he emphasized “the combination of evangelistic and medical work,” but also “suggested the elimination of the word ‘mission’ from our city efforts as that name has come to signify work for the depressed classes.” Evidently the lower classes were not who Starr wanted to reach. Hetty Haskell, who had experience in New York City and who presented a paper on “City Mission Training Centers,” began by urging that “a respectable quarter of the city should be the location” (General Conference Committee 1910: 302).

The views of Quinn, Starr, and Haskell all suggest that the focus of city mission was no longer on the majority of a city’s inhabitants, those with the greatest needs, or on ministering *to* their needs, as Ellen White had urged. Instead, Adventists sought to reach the prosperous middle classes, even though these were everywhere a minority of city dwellers. The switch in focus was betrayed by Quinn in making another point: namely, that his preferred “method in tents and halls this year has brought 200 new members, and raised the title \$4,000” (General Conference Committee 1910:297). By 1913, outreach by the Scandinavian Mission in Chicago, in contrast to earlier work in Chicago, was largely a matter of door-knocking—this and the doors being knocked on were only those of suburban Swedish speakers (Nord 1913:60).

The nature of city work had shifted from its initial focus on personal visitation and Bible study to one of “relieving the sufferings of humanity” in Ellen White’s words. The poor were clothed and fed; illness was treated, and wellness promoted. However, the new aim was, in George Irwin’s words, to rescue from sin and degradation. Then the focus shifted again, to providing spiritual comfort to those who had no real physical wants, and who could, in exchange, provide the funds needed to maintain expensive urban and suburban institutions.

And in some ways, this trajectory is understandable. As far as one can tell, most Seventh-day Adventists in early twentieth-century North America were of Anglo-Saxon or Northern European ethnicity who stressed education. To go back to the Swedish Mission in Chicago, I do not doubt that hard-working middle-class people of Swedish descent were easier to deal with than the denizens of the teeming city streets where once the Lifeboat Mission had been a veritable lighthouse in the dark. With hindsight, one can see that Seventh-day Adventists had abandoned the city to

Satan. And Chicago was not alone. Adventists did not want to deal with dusty, dirty, gritty, smoky, unhealthy downtown neighborhoods or their equally soiled, filthy, foreign, illiterate, intoxicated inhabitants, many of them Italians, Jews, and Blacks. Sometimes the most seductive temptation is respectability—and that is as true in the early twenty-first century as the early twentieth century. That, it seems to me, is one of the main lessons to be learned from the rise and fall of Seventh-day Adventist city missions.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup>Twenty-Third Session, 5th meeting, Nov. 3, 1884

<sup>2</sup>Although the published testimony was addressed to “Brother M.,” records in the White Estate show it was sent to Elder R. F. Andrews regarding the Chicago mission. It is likely that the “Br. N” mentioned in the first sentence was the GC President, G. I. Butler; the White Estate has a letter from him to EGW dated Feb. 18, 1885, in which he shares a letter from Andrews with her about the Chicago Mission. This provides parameters for the date of composition: it must have been between Butler’s Feb 18 letter and the publication of this testimony in mid-May of 1885. (I am obliged to Tim Poirier for these facts.)

<sup>3</sup>Although this is a diary entry, her words here would be printed in numerous publications. For a brief discussion see Gary Krause, “Treading urban ground like Jesus,” *Ministry* 85, no. 5 (May 2013): 6-9.

<sup>4</sup>This probably partly reflected the realities of race laws; a decade earlier Adventist ministers in the South were already commenting on how preaching to African-Americans and Whites provoked strong feelings among the latter: see J. H. Howard to O. A. Olsen Nov. 3, 1889, Presidential Incoming Letters, GC Ar., RG 11, box 3059, folder 11. Howard was then pastoring in Washington, D.C.

## Works Cited

- Breed, A. J. 1899. Review of the Field. *General Conference Daily Bulletin* 8, no. 2 (February 17): 19, 21.
- Buckner, T. B. 1903. Alabama. *The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* 80, no. 25 (June 23): 17.
- Butler, George I. 1885. Letter to Ellen G. White. February 5.
- Butler, Jonathan. 1970. Ellen G. White and the Chicago Mission. *Spectrum* 2, no. 1 (Winter): 41-51.
- Community Services. 1996. *Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia*. Vol. 1, 2nd rev. ed. Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald.
- Directory of City Missions. 1901. *General Conference Daily Bulletin* 4, no. 3 (Third Quarter).
- Elder Goodman’s City Mission. 1905. *The Canadian Union Messenger* 5, no. 29 (July 20): 1-5.

- Fortner, O. O. 1905. City Mission in Cape Town. *The South African Missionary* 3, no. 11 (November): 1-2.
- General Conference, The. 1887. *The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* 64, no. 49 (December 13): 776-777.
- General Conference Bulletin*. 1902. 4, nos. 6-7.
- General Conference Committee Minutes. 1909. Vol. 7.
- General Conference Committee Minutes. 1910. April 12. Vol. 8.
- Gosmer, W. A. 1928. Obituary for Elder R. D. Quinn. *The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* 105, no. 39 (September 27): 22.
- Harris, A. J. 1897. Slum Mission Work in Chicago. *The Bible Echo* 12, no. 43 (October 25): 340-341.
- Howard, J. H. 1889. Letter to O. A. Olsen. November 3. Presidential Incoming Letters, General Conference Archives, RG 11, box 3059, folder 11. Silver Spring, MD: General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists.
- Krause, Gary. 2013. Treading Urban Ground Like Jesus. *Ministry* 85, no. 5 (May): 6-9.
- Nineteenth Meeting. 1905. *The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* 82, no. 22 (June 1): 9-10.
- Nord, G. E. 1913. Principal's Report of the Swedish Seminary, Broadview, ILL. *General Conference Bulletin* 7, no. 1 (May 16): 60-61.
- Olsen, M. E. 1926. *A History of the Origins and Progress of Seventh-day Adventists*. 2nd ed. Takoma Park, MD: Review and Herald.
- Oyen, A. B. 1883. General Conference Proceedings. *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* 60, no. 47 (November 27): 741-742.
- Presidential Address. 1899. *General Conference Bulletin* 8, no. 1 (February 16): 5-7.
- Thirteenth Day's Proceedings. 1888. *Seventh-day Adventist General Conference Daily Bulletin* 2, no. 12 (November 1): 1-2.
- Seventh-day Adventist Yearbook*. 1885. Battle Creek MI: Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1886. Battle Creek MI: Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1887. Battle Creek, MI: Review and Herald.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1889. Battle Creek, MI: Review and Herald.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1890. Battle Creek, MI: Review and Herald.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1910. Takoma Park, MD: Review and Herald.
- Sturdevant, Melvin C. 1901. Notes From the Field. *The Gospel Herald* 3, no. 1 (January): 6.
- The Vegetarian. 1899. *Pacific Health Journal* 14, no. 3 (March): 52.
- White, Ellen G. 1889. *Testimonies to the Church*. Vol. 5. Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1894. Our Duty to the Poor and Afflicted. *Review and Herald* 71, no. 50 (December 18): 785-786.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1900. Manuscript 79. E. G. White Estate.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1905a. *Ministry of Healing*. Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1905b. Notes of Travel—No. 3. *The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* 96, no. 52 (February 9): 8-9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1909. Letter 47. Silver Spring, MD: E. G. White Estate.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1932. *Medical Ministry*. Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2012. *Mission to the Cities*. Hagerstown, MD, Review and Herald.  
White, W. C. 1909. Mrs. White's Labors in Illinois and Wisconsin. *The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* 86, no. 2 (December 30): 7-8.



D. J. B. Trim is Director of Archives, Statistics, and Research at the Seventh-day Adventist Church world headquarters. His PhD is from the University of London (2003) and he is a Fellow of the Royal Historical Society.