THE KELLOGG PROBLEM

By Terry Hill

Index

Section one	A brief introduction	Page 2
Section two	The trinity doctrine	Page 4
Section three	Counsel during the Kellogg crisis	Page 5
Section four	Kellogg: Once a non-trinitarian	Page 8
Section five	Early SDA views regarding the Holy Spirit	Page 9
Section six	Kellogg, The Living Temple and the Holy Spirit	Page 10
Section seven	The Kellogg interview	Page 15
Section eight	The Living Temple	Page 17
Section nine	A SDA perspective of Ellen White and the trinity	Page 23
Section ten	Warnings through the spirit of prophecy	Page 25
Section eleven	The alpha of deadly heresies and the omega	Page 27
Section twelve	Conclusions	Page 30

THE ALPHA OF DEADLY HERESIES

In the book "Living Temple" there is presented the alpha of deadly heresies. The omega will follow, and will be received by those who are not willing to heed the warning God has given." ***(Ellen G. White, Special Testimonies, Series B, volume 2, page 50, 1904)***

First published 17th January 2025

Website: https://www.theprophetstillspeaks.co.uk

Email: terry_sda@blueyonder.co.uk

THE KELLOGG PROBLEM

A brief introduction

In 1903, John Harvey Kellogg (1852-1943), Director of the Battle Creek Sanitarium and head physician of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, had a book published called *The Living Temple*. It was a highly controversial book. It depicted God as having His existence everywhere, even in the things He had made. This led to Ellen White condemning these views.

On September 22nd 1903, Ellen White wrote a letter to the teachers at Emmanuel Missionary College. She was warning about Kellogg, also about what he had written in his book. The next month, on October 14th, this letter was read to those attending the Autumn Council where a whole morning session was devoted to discussing the matter. This same letter, as an article called *Teach the Word,* was also published in the *Review and Herald* of October 22nd. In so doing, not only was Kellogg's book publicly condemned, but also Kellogg himself. Here are some of the statements made by Ellen White in that letter.

> "I have some things to say to our teachers in reference to the new book, "The Living Temple." Be careful how you sustain the sentiments of this book regarding the personality of God. As the Lord represents matters to me, these sentiments do not bear the indorsement of God. They are a snare that the enemy has prepared for these last days. I thought that this would surely be discerned, and that it would not be necessary for me to say anything about it. But since the claim has been made that the teachings of this book can be sustained by statements from my writings, I am compelled to speak in denial of this claim. There may be in this book expressions and sentiments that are in harmony with my writings. And there may be in my writings many statements which, when taken from their connection, and interpreted according to the mind of the writer of "The Living Temple," would seem to be in harmony with the teachings of this book. This may give apparent support to the assertion that the sentiments in "The Living Temple" are in harmony with my writings. But God forbid that this opinion should prevail.
>
> We need not the mysticism that is in this book. Those who entertain these sophistries will soon find themselves in a position where the enemy can talk with them, and lead them away from God. It is represented to me that the writer of this book is on a false track. He has lost sight of the distinguishing truths for this time. He knows not whither his steps are tending. The track of truth lies close beside the track of error, and both tracks may seem to be one to minds which are not worked by the Holy Spirit, and which, therefore, are not quick to discern the difference between truth and error." *(Ellen G. White, Letter 211 1903, to the Teachers in Emmanuel Missionary College, September 22nd 1903)*

In the same letter it says (please note the ellipses).

> "All through the book, "The Living Temple," passages of Scripture are used, but in many instances these passages are used in such a way that the right interpretation is not given to them…..The sophistries regarding God and nature that are flooding the world with skepticism are the inspiration of the fallen foe, who is himself a Bible student, who knows the truths that it is essential for the people to receive, and whose study it is to divert minds from the great truths relating to what is soon coming upon the world. Let our teachers beware lest they echo the soothsaying of the enemy of God and man." *(Ibid)*

So how and why did *The Living Temple* come to be written?

The story begins with the destruction of the Battle Creek sanitarium by a fire that began in the early hours of February 18th 1902. Kellogg regarded the sanitarium as his own personal 'empire'. He desired it to be the greatest health centre in the world. He was constantly asking for money to improve its facilities. A. G. Daniells, then the General Conference President, suggested to Kellogg (it may have been Kellogg who put it in Daniells' mind) that he should write a book on physiology and health care which the church would publish, and the proceeds go towards the rebuilding costs. Kellogg was warned though, by Daniells, not to include in it any of his 'strange' views about God – which were well known by the church leadership, including Ellen White. Kellogg agreed.

When the galley proofs for the book were presented to the church for approval prior to publishing, it was realised that Kellogg had included these beliefs. The very first sections detailed many of them explicitly. In brief, this eventually led to the church refusing to publish his book.

Still determined to publish it. Kellogg placed a personal order with the *Review and Herald* but before a page could be printed, the press, like the sanitarium earlier in the year, burned to the ground, and the plates for the book which were ready for printing were destroyed in the fire. This happened on December 30th 1902. Not to be thwarted; Kellogg placed an order with an outside publishing company, and so the book was published.

Some of the SDA ministry rejoiced over its publication. Others denied the views of God that Kellogg had presented. Such were the mixed views and feelings about Kellogg's book.

Ellen White was amazed that so many of the ministry agreed with Kellogg. She not only feared for them, but also for the future of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. This is why she wrote so vehemently against what Kellogg was teaching. Especially she feared for those who were subject to his influence. In one letter to her son Edson in 1904 she wrote

> "I hope sometime to visit Washington when I am not worn out with intense anxiety regarding the condition of the churches and the attitude of Dr. Kellogg. The thought that the doctor is so strongly influencing the physicians associated with him has bowed me to the ground and almost killed me. I thought of the warnings that Christ has given us, and it seemed more than I could bear for any of our physicians or ministers to be seduced from the truth. I hope soon to be able to say that the spell is broken and that some precious souls can say, "My soul is escaped as a bird out of the snare of the fowler; the snare is broken, and we are escaped." *(Ellen G. White, Letter 357 1904 to J. E. White, August 8th 1904)*

Strange as it may seem, an integral part of the 'Kellogg problem' involved the trinity doctrine. As we shall see later, Kellogg, in attempting to justify himself for what he had written in his book, confessed to A. G. Daniells that he had come to believe in 'the trinity', which, like most SDAs at that time, he had previously rejected as unbiblical. According to Daniells, this led Kellogg to confess a belief in God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit.

So what constitutes this three-in-one teaching called *The Trinity Doctrine*? Before we go any further in this article, this is something that needs to be understood.

The trinity doctrine

For an expression of the Godhead to be trinitarian, it must depict three persons in one being (of existence). Without the 'three' there is no 'tri', and without the 'one being' there is no 'inity' (unity or oneness). As used in trinitarianism, the expression *the trinity* denotes three persons in the one (compound) being of God (an indivisible tri-unity) – hence, in trinitarianism, God is three-in-one, meaning three as to persons and one as to being (existence or substance). If either of these two expressions are absent, meaning without the threeness or without the oneness, there is no such thing as the trinity doctrine. As Paul Petersen (as Chair of Religion, Andrews University) explained it

> "The core elements of the doctrine of the Trinity are oneness and distinctiveness. The Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are one, yet three. To express this conviction, words and expressions came into use that are not explicitly used in the Bible. The oneness of God we confess by claiming that God is one in being; the distinctiveness we confess by teaching that there are three persons." *(Paul Petersen PhD, Andrews University, May 2015, page 3, 'God in 3 Persons — in the New Testament')*

A word of explanation:

A pie chart, divided into three equal segments, is not representative of orthodox trinitarianism, neither is it correctly illustrated by the oft-used example of an egg (shell, albumen and yolk = 1 egg). This is because one single segment of a pie chart, or one single part of an egg, is not the whole. In trinitarianism, each person is the whole. This is why to depict their belief, trinitarians use the following illustration (this is taken from the Seventh-day Adventist *New Pictorial Aid for Bible Study, Revised and Enlarged, 1987)*

It is the above understanding of 'the trinity' that the early SDAs rejected. This teaching was not only regarded as unbiblical, but also as serving to lose the distinctiveness of the persons of the Godhead. This is because in trinitarianism, no single divine person is God in personality. The above though, in their present (2025) understanding of God as a trinity, is how Seventh-day Adventists are portraying the "one God" of the Bible.

Other than as explained above, there is no such thing as a trinity doctrine. It is the belief that the *one God* of the Bible is a unity of three inseparable divine persons in one immutable, indivisible, and immortal divine trinitarian being (mode of existence).

Here I would ask you, the reader, a question. In your understanding of spiritual matters, is the one God of the Bible a person? If you say "yes", and at the same time claim to be a trinitarian, are you not saying that this God is three persons in one person? Look again at the trinity illustration above and ask yourself if this three-in-one God is a person. On the other hand, if, as a trinitarian, you say that God is not a person, is this not denying the personality of God?

Allow me now to draw your attention to the Fundamental Beliefs of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. Four of them, namely beliefs No. 2, 3, 4 and 5, pertain to the Godhead. Of those beliefs, the latter three deal with the Father, Son and Holy Spirit respectively. This means that everything we find in the Bible concerning these three personalities can be detailed under these three fundamental beliefs (No. 3, 4 and 5). So what is Fundamental Belief No. 2 all about?

In our current church manual, under the heading of *The Trinity* (which, as far as I know, was not a heading voted as part of this belief at Dallas in 1980) it says

> "There is one God: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, a unity of three coeternal Persons. God is immortal, all-powerful, all-knowing, above all, and ever present. He is infinite and beyond human comprehension, yet known through His self-revelation. God, who is love, is forever worthy of worship, adoration, and service by the whole creation. (Gen. 1:26; Deut. 6:4; Isa. 6:8; Matt. 28:19; John 3:16; 2 Cor. 1:21, 22; 13:14; Eph. 4:4-6; 1 Peter 1:2.) *(Fundamental Beliefs of Seventh-day Adventists, the 2015 SDA Church Manual, page 162)*

The question is though, as I have asked already: Is the "one God", as depicted in this belief, a person? If the answer is "yes", isn't this saying that this "one God" is three persons in one person? I will now insert the word 'person' into this belief, and you will see what I mean.

> "There is one God [a person]: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, a unity of three coeternal Persons. God [a person] is immortal, all-powerful, all-knowing, above all, and ever present. He [a person] is infinite and beyond human comprehension, yet known through His self-revelation. God [a person], who is love, is forever worthy of worship, adoration, and service by the whole creation…."

If this "one God", as depicted here, is not a person, then what is it - an essence without bodily parts and features? On the other hand, if this "one God" does have bodily features, what would these features look like? We shall return to this point later.

Counsel during the Kellogg crisis

In 1903 following the publication of Kellogg's *Living Temple*, Ellen White penned these words. This was in a manuscript called *The Personality of God*

> "The word of the Lord to me is that I am to repeat the instruction that God has given me, showing what He has revealed for the benefit of His people and the way in which He has presented His word to them." *(Ellen G. White, Ms 137 1903, 'The Personality of God', typed November 12th 1903)*

God's messenger continued

> "If God had desired to have Himself represented as being in the things of nature—in flower and leaf and tree—Christ would have spoken of this when He was in the earth. But where in the teaching of Christ is God spoken of as He is in *Living Temple*? In *Patriarchs and Prophets* God has presented to His people the way in which they are to view the plan of salvation. The instruction contained in this book is not an idle tale. It is the presentation of truth in accordance with the Word of God." *(Ibid)*

Ellen White also wrote in this same manuscript (and this is very important)

"From my girlhood I have been given plain instruction that God is a person, and that Christ is "the express image of His person." God always has been. That which concerns us is not the how or the wherefore." *(Ibid)*

In another manuscript (this one is headed *A personal God*), we find these statements (note the paragraphs are not necessarily contiguous)

"The mighty power that works through all nature and sustains all things is not, as some men of science represent, merely an all-pervading principle, an actuating energy. God is a spirit; yet He is a personal being; for men were made in His image. As a personal being, God has revealed Himself in His Son. Jesus, the outshining of the Father's glory, "and the express image of His person," was on earth found in fashion as a man. [Hebrews 1:3.]"

"As Jehovah, the supreme Ruler, God could not personally communicate with sinful men, but He so loved the world that He sent Jesus to our world as a revelation of Himself."

"The disciples had asked many questions that revealed their ignorance of God's relation to them and to their present and future interests. Christ desired them to have a clearer, more distinct knowledge of God. I will show you the Father and will make you better acquainted with Him, He said. It is this knowledge that Christians today need. This knowledge, which Christ alone can give, is the highest of all education."

"The seventeenth chapter of John speaks plainly regarding the personality of God and of Christ and of their relation to each other. "Father, the hour is come," Christ said; "glorify Thy Son, that Thy Son also may glorify Thee; as Thou hast given Him power over all flesh, that He should give eternal life to as many as Thou hast given Him. And this is life eternal, that they might know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent." [Verses 1-3.]"

"God's handiwork in nature is not God Himself in nature. God uses nature to reveal His power and His love. But no one is authorized to say that God Himself is in leaf or flower or tree."

"Man cannot by searching find out God. This problem has not been given to human beings. All that man needs to know and can know of God has been revealed in His Word and in the life of His Son, the great Teacher."

"Let men remember that they have a Ruler in the heavens, a God who will not be trifled with. He who puts his reason to the stretch in an effort to exalt himself and to delineate God will find that he might far better have stood as a humble suppliant before God, confessing himself to be only an erring human being."

"God cannot be understood by men. His ways and works are past finding out. In regard to the revelations that He has made of Himself in His Word we may talk. But other than this, let us say of Him, "Thou art God, and Thy ways are past finding out."

"There is a knowledge of God and of Christ which all who are saved must have. "This is life eternal," Christ said, "that they might know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent." [John 17:3.]" *(Ellen G. White, Ms 124 1903, 'A Personal God', Typed October 14th 1903)*

In these statements, the emphasis that Ellen White is placing upon God being a person, and Christ being another person distinct from God, can easily be seen, as can also easily be seen she says that a knowledge of both these persons is essential for salvation. Notice that Ellen White, like Jesus (at John 17:3), says nothing about knowing the Holy Spirit.

In a talk at Berrien Springs in 1904, Ellen White spoke of Kellogg. She also spoke of his teachings about God that are found in his book *The Living Temple*. In this talk she said

> "Our ministers must be very careful not to enter into controversy in regard to the personality of God. This is a subject that they are not to touch. It is a mystery, and the enemy will surely lead astray those who enter into it. We know that Christ came in person to reveal God to the world. God is a person, and Christ is a person. Christ is spoken of in the Word as "the brightness of His Father's glory, and the express image of His person*." (Ellen G. White, Ms 46 1904, Talk at Berrien Springs, May 18th 1904, 'The Foundation of our Faith')*

The next year, in a letter addressed to A. G. Daniells, also to W. W. Prescott and Associates (Daniells was then the GC President), Ellen White again expressed concerns over Kellogg. She said she felt she should print all the warnings given to her concerning him but was impressed to wait. After quoting John 17:1-3 she wrote the following

> "In this scripture God and Christ are spoken of separately. They are two distinct persons, but one in mind, one in heart, one in holiness and justice and purify, and one in the work of seeking to save the sinful race. To those who believe in Christ, God will give power to become His sons, even to them that believe on His name. This is the science of the life that now is, and of the life which is to come. This is the true science that our medical men need to study—the science of the saving grace of the gospel." *(Ellen G. White, Letter 311 1905, to A. G. Daniells, W. W. Prescott and Associates', October 30th 1905)*

In the November of 1903, the same year that *The Living Temple* was published, Ellen White wrote the following

> "God's Word and His works contain the knowledge of Himself that He has seen fit to reveal to us. We may understand the revelation that He has thus given of Himself. But it is with fear and trembling, and with a sense of our own sinfulness, that we are to take up this study, not with a desire to try to explain God, but with a desire to gain that knowledge which will enable us to serve Him more acceptably. Let no one venture to explain God. Human beings cannot explain themselves, and how, then, dare they venture to explain the Omniscient One? Satan stands ready to give such ones false conceptions of God.
>
> To the curious I bear the message that God has instructed me not to frame answers to the questions of those who enquire, in regard to the things that have not been revealed. The things that are revealed belong unto us and to our children. Beyond this, human beings are not to attempt to go. We are not to attempt to explain that which God has not revealed. We are to study the revelation that Christ, the great Teacher, has given of the character of God, that in spirit and word and act we may represent Him to those who know Him not.

> In regard to the personality and prerogatives of God, where He is and what He is, this is a subject which we are not to dare to touch. On this theme silence is eloquence. It is those who have no experimental knowledge of God who venture to speculate in regard to Him. Did they know more of Him, they would have less to say about what He is. The one who in the daily life holds closest communion with God, and who has the deepest knowledge of Him, realizes most keenly the utter inability of human beings to explain the Creator.
>
> Let men beware how they seek to look into the mysteries of The Most High" *(Ellen G. White, Manuscript 132, November 8th 1903, 'God's Chosen People')*

In the same manuscript, Ellen White also wrote the following

> "Let not our medical missionary workers accept theories that God has not given to any one. God will not excuse men for teaching theories that Christ has not taught. He calls upon His army of workers to fall into line, taking their stand under the banner of truth. He warns them to beware of occupying their time in the discussion of matters that God has not authorized any human being to discuss." *(Ibid)*

All of the above counsel was given in the backdrop of the Kellogg crisis of the early 1900's – and it really was a crisis for the SDA Church. I believe Ellen White would have applied the above counsel to all who claim the trinity doctrine to be correct. God has not revealed anything of that which the trinitarians attempt to prove by their three-in-one theology. It is pure speculation, ergo, the trinity doctrine is only an assumed doctrine.

Kellogg: Once a non-trinitarian

In my own personal research, I have not found any reason to believe that Kellogg's Godhead beliefs, prior to the onset of the *Living Temple* controversy (during the early 1900's), were any different as generally held across the board by SDAs. In other words, I believe that prior to the publication of *The Living Temple*, Kellogg's Godhead beliefs were the same as believed by SDAs in general. Notice now how Kellogg once refuted trinitarianism. It is not only interesting but also very enlightening.

> "The Sabbath Recorder having entered upon the publication of a series of articles by Eld. N. Wardner, controverting especially the views set forth in the book entitled "The Soul and the Resurrection," by Dr. J. H. Kellogg, it has been decided to lay before the readers of the REVIEW, both the articles of Eld. Wardner and the replies of Dr. Kellogg." *(Review and Herald, April 5th 1880, 'Adventism')*

Wardner was a Seventh-day Baptist minister, and at that time regarding what happens to a person at death (the immortality of the soul question), Seventh-day Baptists held different beliefs to SDAs. In one response to this minister, Kellogg wrote (this shows what he and other SDAs then thought of the trinity doctrine)

> "Our reviewer seems to be somewhat displeased at our reference to the doctrine of the trinity, a doctrine which is confessedly in the highest degree unphilosophical, unreasonable, and unreconcilable with common sense, which leads us to conclude that we were not incorrect in supposing him to be a believer in the doctrine. Our only reason for mentioning the doctrine of the trinity was to remind our reviewer that so long as he held a view so utterly at variance with logical reasoning, he ought to have at least a small amount of liberality for other views in which there may at first seem to exist slight difficulties." *(J. H. Kellogg, Review and Herald, August 19th 1880, 'The soul - No 2. Reply to Dr. Kellogg's rejoinder')*

Three months later in another reply to Wardner, Kellogg wrote the following

> "The only grounds upon which our reviewer could be justified in making such a statement would be the supposition on his part that we believe in the doctrine of the trinity; but he very well knows, from positions taken and arguments used in previous articles, that we do not agree with him on this subject any better than on that of the nature of the soul. We believe in but one Deity, God, who is a unity, not a compound being. We think the Bible as well as common sense sustains this view." *(J. H. Kellogg, Review and Herald, November 25th 1880, 'Reply to Eld. Wardner's rejoinder')*

In the same reply, Kellogg later said

> "We repel the charge of "trinitarianism" without the slightest hesitation. We do not believe in a triune God, as before remarked. And we will not, as did our reviewer in a, former article, leave the reader in doubt as to our position on this point. We are utterly at a loss to comprehend how our re-viewer could have blundered so strangely as to suppose us to share in so gross an error as we believe the orthodox doctrine of the trinity to be." *(Ibid)*

As can be seen so very clearly, Kellogg, at that time, was as much against the trinity doctrine as were SDAs in general.

Early SDA views regarding the Holy Spirit

In the main when early SDAs spoke of God (as in the expression *God and Christ*), they were referring to the Father. In their reasoning, God was the Father of Christ, and Christ was the only begotten Son of God (John 1:14, 1:18, 3:16, 3:18 and 1 John 4:9). The Holy Spirit though, to these early SDAs, was not thought of as an individual person like God and Christ are individual persons but was believed to be, in some mysterious way known only to God, the power and presence of God when they, the Father and Son, were not bodily present.

Dudley Canright was a very well-known early SDA minister. In an article explaining the Holy Spirit he wrote

> "Then, almost every illustration that is given of the Holy Spirit is inconsistent with the idea of being a person." *(D. M. Canright, Signs of the Times July 25th 1878, 'The Holy Spirit')*

I do believe that if we were honest in our own personal studies of the Bible, we would all agree with Canright. Many of the things said in the Bible about the Holy Spirit could never be attributed to a person such as God and Christ are persons. After relating some of these things, Canright concluded

> "All these illustrations plainly show that the Spirit of God is not an individual." *(Ibid)*

At that time, this was the belief generally held by SDAs.

When answering a question received from a reader of the *Review and Herald* who had asked if the Holy Spirit was a person as the Father and the Son are persons, its editor, Uriah Smith, answered

> "This Spirit is the Spirit of God, and the Spirit of Christ; the Spirit being the same whether it is spoken of as pertaining to God or Christ." *(Review and Herald, October 28th 1890, 'The Question Chair')*

In his reply, amongst other scriptures, Smith referred to Matthew 18:20, also chapters 14, 15 and 16 of John's gospel. He then noted (in keeping with Canright's reasoning)

> "But respecting this Spirit, the Bible uses expressions which cannot be harmonized with the idea that it is a person like the Father and the Son. Rather it is shown to be a divine influence from them both, the medium which represents their presence and by which they have knowledge and power through all the universe, when not personally present." *(Ibid)*

At that time (1890), what Smith wrote here was the ballpark belief of most of the SDA ministry, also of SDAs in general. This was that in some way known only to God, the Holy Spirit was the presence of both the Father and the Son when they, the Father and the Son, were not tangibly (corporeally) present. This belief, when coupled with all the other things that the Bible says about the Holy Spirit that are not suggestive as depicting a person like we would normally conceive a person to be, help us to understand why these early SDAs could not bring themselves to regard the Holy Spirit as a person. In their minds (so it seems to me from studying their writings), a 'person' would mean the same type of individual as both the Father and the Son, also like you and me etc. Why should they have reasoned any differently? It was a natural conclusion.

Even after Ellen White had said that the Holy Spirit is a person, SDAs in general did not change their views about this mysterious divine personality representing the Father and the Son when they, the Father and Son, were not tangibly (corporeally) present. In other words, even though they accepted, as said by Ellen White, that the Holy Spirit is a person, these early SDAs continued to believe that the Father and Son 'shared' the one and the same Holy Spirit. They regarded this as scriptural (John 14:18-23, Romans 8:9, 1 Corinthians 12:13, Ephesians 2:18, Ephesians 4:4-6, also compare 1 Peter 1:11 and 2 Peter 1:21). We now need to consider Kellogg's *Living Temple*, also his views regarding the Holy Spirit.

Kellogg, The Living Temple and the Holy Spirit

On October 24th 1903, which was 2 days after the close of that year's Autumn Council, Kellogg wrote a letter to Ellen White. At that council, two testimonies from her, both pointing out the dangers in his *Living Temple*, had been read to those in attendance. One of which we noted on page 2 of this article. In his letter to Ellen White, Kellogg wrote

> "As regards THE LIVING TEMPLE, I think I see where the trouble is. I was very willing and anxious to have it right, but I did not understand where the trouble was. I began to see it about two weeks ago. None of us understood Prof. Prescott's criticisms last fall. The one point in the book that I was anxious to maintain was the fact that you bring out so beautifully in your new book on Education, that man's life comes from God, and that all his bodily functions are under control of this life.
>
> I understood that I was required to surrender this view, and I could not. I argued that God's life and God must be one and the same, and I could not see differently until I read your letter on the personality of God, which you sent to Elder Daniel Is and Prof. Prescott. This makes it clear. I see why it is not proper to speak of God being in the tree.

> There was all the time a mystery and a perplexity which made me hesitate. I am glad enough that only a few, comparatively, of the books are out. The edition just sold out was only 5,000.
>
> I have put the book in the hands of Prof. Prescott and Eld. Jones to revise. I shall accept all the criticisms of both, and am going to get Eld. Haskell's criticims [sic] also. I have not planned to teach any new doctrine. I supposed the things I wrote were accepted as being true. I shall correct all the ambiguous and mystical passages, with the help of these brethren, and try in every way possible to undo the mischief. I have earnestly asked the brethren to help me to see all my mistakes and to correct them, and to make straight paths for my feet." *(J. H. Kellogg, Letter to Ellen White, October 24th 1903)*

Notice that Kellogg said that "two weeks" previously he *thought* he could see the problem of what he was teaching in *The Living Temple.* It had been 10 days prior to Kellogg writing this letter when the two testimonies from Ellen White, warning of the dangers in this book, had been read at the Autumn Council – so it was around this time that Kellogg had said he thought he could see the problem. Notice too that Kellogg said he had "not planned to teach any new doctrine".

The Autumn Council had begun on the 7th October, and had ended on the 22nd October. Just four days into the council, on the 11th October, Ellen White wrote to A. G. Daniells and W. W. Prescott saying

> "Matter has been sent to you in regard to the teachings in the book *Living Temple*. Many have received the theories advocated in this work as something very spiritual. Like Adam and Eve, who took the apple from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, and ate it, our own sheep and lambs are swallowing the deceptive morsels of error offered them in the pages of this book.
>
> I am instructed to warn our brethren and sisters not to discuss the nature of our God. Many of the curious who attempted to open the ark of the testament, to see what was inside, were punished for their presumption. We are not to say that the Lord God of heaven is in a leaf, or in a tree; for He is not there. He sitteth upon His throne in the heavens." *(Ellen G. White Letter 224 1903, to A. G. Daniells and W. W. Prescott, 11th October 1903)*

I assume this "matter" were the testimonies read to the Autumn Council of that year (see page 2).

Kellogg, in *The Living Temple*, claimed that God, as well as being everywhere, was actually present **in** everything. Kellogg knew that regarding his book he was not getting anywhere with the SDA leadership or with Ellen White, so on the last day of the Autumn Council he said to Daniells (according to Daniells) that he had changed his views on 'the trinity' and could now explain himself better than when he initially wrote his book.

Daniells, as GC President, was chair at the council. He later wrote to Willie White explaining what Kellogg had said to him. Daniells explained to White that Kellogg said he had now come to believe in God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit – and that it was not God the Father who was in everything and everywhere but the Holy Spirit. Daniells conveyed Kellogg's 'confession' to Willie White a week after the Autumn Council had ended. Here is what Daniells wrote

> "In one of the Doctor's statements made to the brethren while in council, he referred to "The Living Temple," and gave us to understand that it would be entirely withdrawn from the market, and its career brought to an end; at least this was the idea I received from what he said. But the day the council closed, I had a long conversation with him about the book. He then told me that he did not think that after all there was a very great difference of opinion between us regarding the subject dealt with. He said that some days before coming to the council, he had been thinking the matter over, and began to see that he had made a slight mistake in expressing his views. He said that all the way along he had been troubled to know how to state the character of God and his relation to his created works. He felt sure that he believed just what the Testimonies teach, and what Dr. Waggoner and Elder Jones have taught for years; but he had come to believe that none of them had expressed the matter in correct form." *(A. G. Daniells, Letter to W. C. White October 29th 1903)*

Daniells continued

> "He [Kellogg] then stated that his former views regarding the trinity had stood in his way of making a clear and absolutely correct statement but that within a short time he had come to believe in the trinity and could now see pretty clearly where all the difficulty was and believed that he could clear up the matter satisfactorily. He told me that he now believed in God the Father, God the Son and God the Holy Ghost and his view was that it was God the Holy Ghost and not God the Father that filled all space and every living thing." *(Ibid)*

We have seen above that Kellogg, at one time, had been in harmony with his fellow brethren in their rejection of the trinity doctrine. Now he was saying he had changed his views and believed this teaching to be true. Note well the last part of that final sentence. It was this that was causing a great deal of trouble concerning Kellog's reasoning found in his book (although not the only thing). It was his view that "it was God the Holy Ghost and not God the Father that filled all space and every living thing".

It seems that if this is what Kellogg did say to Daniells, then he must have believed it imperative to lead people away from the idea that in his book he was saying it was God the Father who was 'in every living thing". To this end therefore, it appears he attempted to make the Holy Spirit an individual in His own right as are the Father and the Son as depicted in the trinity doctrine (see pages 4-5 above). This was instead of the Holy Spirit being the power and presence of both the Father and the Son when they, the Father and the Son, were not bodily present – which was the belief then generally held by SDAs.

Some say that Kellogg was a pantheist, but he was not. All the evidence is that he believed in a personal God and a personal saviour. This is not pantheism. Pantheism, putting it in a nutshell, is the belief that everything ***is*** God (nature identical to God). Never have I found where Kellogg made such a profession. If he did, I have never come across it. Kellogg believed that God was **in** nature, not that nature **is** God. That is saying two different things.

It appears that Kellogg's problem - at least with respect to the Godhead - only concerned whether the Holy Spirit was a person or not as portrayed in the trinity doctrine. At that time, as has already been said, the belief of SDAs was that this was the power and presence of both the Father and the Son when they were not bodily present. This did not suit Kellogg. He tried to make the Holy Spirit out to be an individual such as God and Christ are depicted in the trinity doctrine – at least this is the way I see it.

Personally speaking, I believe Kellogg just wanted to 'get away' from the idea that he was saying that it was 'God the Father' who was in all things (because SDAs then believed that it was the Father who was God in personality), so by saying he had come to believe in 'the trinity', he just opted to make it look as though the Holy Spirit was an individual like God and Christ are individuals. In this way, he could still say 'God was in things' without making it look as though he was saying it was the Father who was in them. To put it another way: Kellogg, in order to justify himself for what he had written in his book, needed to separate the Holy Spirit from the Father, which he could not do if he had held on to what he once believed, which was the same as what SDAs still believed at that time.

Prior to the 1903 Autumn Council, Kellogg did write to Butler saying

> "You certainly believe that the Holy Ghost is a person; and at the same time believe that the Holy Ghost is present everywhere and that God and the Holy Ghost are one and the same person. This is what I believe. I do not object to anybody holding the view which you hold, providing they recognize the active agency of God in the miracles of nature and in every way present in all the activities of nature." *(J. H. Kellogg, Letter to G I. Butler September 30th 1903)*

I would suggest that Kellogg was saying to Butler that because, he, Butler, believed that God was omnipresent by the Holy Spirit, that this meant that where the Holy Spirit is, so is God Himself present. This though was not what Butler believed. Butler responded

> "I have not by any means reached your conclusion, "that the Holy Ghost and the Father are one", and probably never shall." *(G. I. Butler, Letter to J. H. Kellogg, 18th October 1903)*

He later made clear

> "God and the Son of God must be two different persons. Christ says, "My Father is greater than I", and yet He says we should be one, even as the Father and He are one. It would be pretty hard to make fifteen or twenty of us, all children of God, into one person. But it is just as difficult to make the Holy Ghost and the Father one person" *(Ibid)*

Kellogg had said to Butler that they both believed the same, yet we know for a fact that at that time, Butler believed the same as did SDAs across the board. As he said to Kellogg the next year (1904).

> "God dwells in us by His Holy Spirit, as a Comforter, as a Reprover, especially the former. When we come to Him, we partake of Him in that sense, because the Spirit comes forth from him; it comes forth from the Father and the Son. It is not a person walking around on foot, or flying, as a literal being, in any such sense as Christ and the Father are – at least, if it is, it is utterly beyond my comprehension or the meaning of language or words." *(G. I. Butler, Letter to J. H. Kellogg, April 5th 1904)*

This was the view then generally held by SDAs. It was that the Holy Spirit is both God and Christ dwelling within us (a spiritual manifestation) yet not bodily present. So Kellogg was not correct. Butler did not believe that God and the Holy Ghost are one and the same person. He believed, as did SDAs in general, that the Holy Spirit is God omnipresent while God, as a personal (corporeal) being, resides in the throne room of Heaven.

Kellogg, so it seems to me, was being very clever with his words. He had previously written to Butler saying (perhaps his gripe about the Holy Spirit in a nutshell)

> "As far as I can fathom, the difficulty which is found in the Living Temple, the whole thing may be simmered down to this question: is the Holy Ghost a person? You say no." I had supposed the Bible said this for the reason that the personal pronoun he is used in speaking of the Holy Ghost. Sister White uses the pronoun he and has said in as many words that the Holy Ghost is the third person of the Godhead." *(J. H. Kellogg, Letter to G. I. Butler, October 28th 1903)*

In another letter written to Butler 4 months later, Kellogg wrote

> "I believe this Spirit of God to be a personality, you don't. But this is purely a question of definition. I believe the Spirit of God is a personality; you say, No, it is not a personality. Now the only reason why we differ is because we differ in our ideas as to what, a personality is. Your idea of personality is perhaps that of semblance to a person or a human being. This is not the scientific conception of personality and that is not the sense in which I use the word. The scientific test for personality is the exercise, of will, volition, purpose, without any reference to form or material being." *(J. H. Kellogg, Letter to G. I. Butler, February 21st 1904)*

Remember, all of this came about because of what Kellogg had written in his book *The Living Temple*. If this book had not been published, it is more than likely that this debate he had managed to get himself embroiled in would never have taken place. I don't believe his gripe was from a theological standpoint. I believe he was simply attempting to justify himself for what he had written in his book. Nothing more. Nothing less.

Interestingly, in the March of 1908 (this was the year after Kellogg had been disfellowshipped from the SDA Church), Kellogg again wrote to Butler on the same subject. In turn, a few weeks later, Butler wrote to Willie White quoting some of the things that Kellogg, in that letter, had said to him. Here is one statement that Butler said that Kellogg had made

> "By the way, I notice that Elder M.C. Wilcox is becoming a Pantheist. In the SIGNS OF THE TIMES of March 4 he writes as follows in reply to a question: "To the mind of the writer the Spirit is the life of God or better, the life of the Godhead common both to the Father and the Son. It is that which makes Deity everywhere present. . . It is spoken of as a person because by the Spirit the Father and the Son come personally to us." This is splendid Pantheism and of the sort that I believe in. Consistency is a rare jewel these days." *(Extract of letter from Kellogg to Butler of March 9th 1908, as quoted in a letter from Butler to W. C. White, 1st April 1908)*

So what had actually been written in the Signs? A question had been submitted to the editor. It was under the heading of *The Trinity*. It was asked

> "We speak of the Trinity, the Father, the Son, and Holy Ghost; do we understand that the Holy Ghost, or Spirit, is a personal being as God the Father and Jesus the Son? In Christ's talk with the disciples, in John 14, He uses the personal pronoun in referring to the Comforter. J. B. J." *(Signs of the Times, March 4th 1908, 'With our Inquirers')*

The supplied answer was

> "There are various interpretations and differences of opinion in regard to the matter. To the mind of the writer, the Spirit is the life of God, or better, the life of the Godhead, common both to the Father and the Son. It is that which makes Deity everywhere present. In Acts 2 it is spoken of as that which came into the room and filled all who were there. In the thirty-third verse Peter speaks of it as the power which Christ had poured forth." *(Ibid)*

It was then explained

> "It is spoken of as a person, because by the Spirit the Father and the Son come personally to us. In John 16: 7 Jesus tells us, "It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send Him unto you." Jesus was a person located in one place; the Spirit was that which was shed abroad among all His children, but it brought to every one of those children the presence of Christ. So we read again, "He [the Spirit] shall glorify Me; for He shall take of Mine, and shall declare it unto you." *(Ibid)*

Was Kellogg, because Wilcox had said that by the Spirit, Deity was "everywhere present", trying to inflict on Butler the idea that Wilcox was saying the same as himself in *Living Temple* – which was that God Himself was everywhere, including in the tree, in the flower, and in every other living organism. I have never found evidence that Wilcox ever believed such a thing. Kellogg therefore, so it seems to me, whether accidentally or deliberately, was placing a meaning on the words of Wilcox that the latter had probably not intended.

Personally speaking, I do not believe that Kellogg's views of the Godhead, however they are interpreted, had anything to do with the trinity doctrine making its way into the SDA Church – although they were a precursor of what was to come. If we had heeded the warnings that Ellen White gave at that time (that we noted earlier on pages 5-8) where she said that God is a person, and that Christ is a person, and that we should not delve into this any further, this present trinity controversy, within our denomination, may not even have begun, let alone get to the stage where it is today. As it was, we did not heed her counsel – so here we are today, in this controversy.

As I said, it appears to me that Kellogg's claim regarding the Holy Spirit was simply his attempt to justify himself for what he had written in his *Living Temple* – but like a lot of other errors, it has a knock-on effect concerning other beliefs. We shall see this later when we review what Ellen White had to say regarding the application of his beliefs. I don't believe Kellogg was particularly concerned about theology. It seems to me that the push for us to become a trinitarian denomination came from a completely different direction – but that's another story.

The Kellogg interview

In 1907, a short while prior to Kellogg being disfellowshipped from the SDA Church, two Seventh-day Adventist brethren, namely G. W. Amadon and A. C. Bourdeau, interviewed Kellogg at his home. At one point in this interview, Kellogg asserted

> "All I wanted to explain in "Living Temple" was that this work that is going on in the man here is not going on by itself like a clock wound up; but it is the power of God and the Spirit of God that is carrying it on." *(Interview, J. H. Kellogg, G. W. Amadon and A. C. Bourdeau October 7th 1907, held at Kellogg's residence)*

Kellogg continued

> "Now, I thought I had cut out entirely the theological side of questions of the trinity and all that sort of things. I didn't mean to put it in at all, and I took pains to state in the preface that I did not. I never dreamed of such a thing as any theological question being brought into it. I only wanted to show that the heart does not beat of its own motion but that it is the power of God that keeps it going. Now, Sister White wrote an article and said, "It is wrong to say that God Himself is in the tree." *(Ibid)*

It needs to be remembered that Kellogg's confession of *the trinity*, as Daniells explained it to Willie White, was not mentioned in his book. In fact I cannot recall where Kellogg himself professed this belief. Perhaps he did say it somewhere that I have not yet come across. If he did, I am sure someone will show me. For that I would be very grateful. As Kellogg said though in the *Preface* to his book, it was not his "purpose to write a theological treatise, but simply to study man from a physiological standpoint". Kellogg continued

> "Now, I didn't intend to say that. I didn't intend to say that, -- that God Himself, the Almighty, separate and distinct from His power, from His Spirit as a separate entity, -- that He was in the tree. I didn't mean to say that. I meant simply that the Spirit, the power, the intelligence of the Almighty is being manifested in all these living things that are going on about us." *(Ibid)*

When *The Living Temple* is read, it will be seen that this statement from Kellogg, in this interview, cannot be taken as true. In the following section, we shall note what Kellogg did actually write in his book. You can then decide for yourself whether the above is true or not. A link to the interview is provided below.

As I read through the report of this interview with Kellogg, it became evident that there were made many contradictory statements and accusations. Who and what is true, and who and what is not true, is sometimes very difficult to determine. What we do know is that the next month, November 10th 1907, Kellogg's name was removed from the membership of the Battle Creek SDA Church. We must not think though that Kellogg was disfellowshipped only because of what he had written in his *Living Temple*. There were far more factors involved. In the online SDA Encyclopaedia it says (note the two footnote links for further info)

> "On Sunday, November 10, 1907, three days after a long interview with Kellogg by local church leaders, members of the Battle Creek Tabernacle voted to disfellowship him. Charges against the doctor included failure to attend services, neglect to pay tithe or make other financial contributions to the church, and antagonism toward "gifts now manifest in the church," a reference to Ellen White's testimonies. Despite the charges, Kellogg continued to pray, study the Bible, and accept general Christian beliefs, but he never joined another church organization.[109]
>
> Kellogg's separation from the Seventh-day Adventist Church was, of course, more complicated than the stated charges against the doctor would suggest. As already noted, Kellogg had antagonized the Adventist clergy and leadership with his independent spirit and power grabs. Moreover, his attempts to convert the denomination into a medical missionary organization would have resulted in a downplaying of Adventist doctrinal distinctiveness. As Kellogg himself stated, "My medical and scientific training made it impossible for me to believe some of the doctrines of the church, and I frankly said so." Thus, it appears likely that issues of both power and theology were inexorably linked in Kellogg's break with the denomination.[110]
> (*https://encyclopedia.adventist.org/article?id=89LQ&highlight=kellogg)*

For those who would like to read the report of the interview with Kellogg, they can read and download an edited copy here

https://ia804707.us.archive.org/32/items/KelloggVs.TheBrethrenHisLastInterviewAsAnAdventistoct71907/1990_kellogg_vs_brethren_lastInterview_oct7_1907_spectrum_v20_n3-4.pdf

The Living Temple

In this section we will be looking at some of the things that Kellogg, in *The Living Temple*, wrote about God. This will help the reader to understand why Ellen White spoke out so strongly against both this book and its author. This section will reveal that Kellogg was teaching that God was actually (personally) present in the things of nature. In fact he was teaching that God is **in** everything. This is not pantheism but it is akin to it. As we noted above, pantheism is the belief that all is God ('pan' = all, 'theism' = God). Please note the ellipses in some of the following statements.

Under the sub-heading *God the Explanation of Nature* Kellogg wrote on page 28 of his book.

> "God is the explanation of nature, - not a God outside of nature, but in nature, manifesting himself through and in all the objects, movements, and varied phenomena of the universe." *(J. H. Kellogg. The Living Temple, page 28, 'The Mystery of life')*

Kellogg here says that God is "in nature". Even without reading anything else he wrote, this is contradictory to what he said in the interview above. He went on to say

> "Says one, "God may be present by his Spirit, or by his power, but certainly God himself cannot be present everywhere at once." We answer: How can power be separated from the source of power? Where God's Spirit is at work, where God's power is manifested, God himself is actually and truly present." *(Ibid)*

Again there can be no mistaking what Kellogg is saying here. It is a direct contradiction to what he said in the interview he had with Amadon and Bordeau (see above). He is saying that where God's power is manifested (which he says is throughout the entire universe), "God himself is actually and truly present". So according to this reasoning, God does fill all space with His presence. How can anything be said any plainer? Kellogg, foreseeing the objections to this reasoning, explained

> "Said an objector, "God made the tree, it is true, just as a shoemaker makes a boot; but the shoe-maker is not in the boot; so God made the tree, but he is not in the tree." The objector overlooked the fact that the process of tree-making in the living tree, is never complete so long as the tree is alive… Suppose now we have a boot before us -- not an ordinary boot, but a living boot, and as we look at it, we see little boots crowding out at the seams, pushing out at the toes, dropping off at the heels, and leaping out at the top -- scores, hundreds, thousands of boots, a swarm of boots continually issuing from our living boot -- would we not be compelled to say, "There is a shoemaker in the boot"? So there is present in the tree a power which creates and maintains it, a tree-maker in the tree, a flower-maker in the flower, - a divine architect who understands every law of proportion, an infinite artist who possesses a limitless power of expression in color and form; there is, in all the world about us, an infinite, divine, though invisible Presence, to which the unenlightened may be blind, but which is ever declaring itself by its ceaseless, beneficent activity." *(Ibid)*

Again there can be no mistaking the thought that Kellogg was conveying to the readers of his book. It is that God Himself is in the things He had made. Under the sub-heading *Infinite intelligence a personal being*, Kellogg then says (realising it might be said that by this reasoning he was failing to depict God as a personal being)

> ""But," says one, "this thought destroys the personality of God, Do you not believe in a personal, definite God?" Most certainly. An infinite, divine, personal being is essential religion. Worship requires some one to love, to obey, to trust. Belief in a personal God is the very core of the Christian religion." *(Ibid, page 29)*

He then wrote by way of explanation

> "The conception of God as the All-Energy, the infinite Power, an all-pervading Presence, is too vast for the human mind to grasp; there must be something more tangible, more restricted, upon which to center the mind in worship. It is for this reason that Christ came to us in the image of God's personality, the second Adam, to show us by his life of love and self-sacrifice the character and the personality of God. We can approach God only through Christ." *(Ibid, page 29-30)*

Kellogg says that the idea of God as an all-pervading presence is "too vast" (too big) for us to imagine – therefore to have a focus (a centre) of worship, "Christ came to us in the image of God's personality". We will now see what Kellogg meant by the former statement.

After quoting such Scripture as Isaiah 40:12 which says "Who hath measured the waters in the hollow of his hand, and meted out heaven with the span, and comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure, and weighed the mountains in scales, and the hills in a balance?", Kellogg explained

> "Here is a most marvelous description of God. His hand, his arm, his bosom are mentioned. He is described as "sitting on the circle of the earth," he metes out heaven with the span, he holds the waters in the hollow of his hand; so there can be no question that God is a definite, real, personal being. A mere abstract principle, a law, a force could not have a hand, an arm. God is a person, though too great for us to comprehend, as Job says, "God is great and we know him not." Job 36 : 26." *(Ibid page 32)*

This may sound very reasonable but now notice how Kellogg goes on to explain himself

> "A hand large enough to hold the waters of the earth in its hollow would be as large as the earth itself. Hence no human eye could ever see more than a very small fraction of it at a time. A span great enough to mete out even the earthly heavens would cover at least 9,000 square miles. Try to form a conception of a hand of such proportions; when outstretched, the distance from the tip of the thumb to the tip of the little finger would be 9,000 miles. The height of a person is nine times the length of the span, so the height of a being with such proportions must be at least 81,000 miles. It is just as easy to conceive of a person filling all space as of a person having a height equaling ten times the diameter of the earth." *(Ibid)*

Kellogg claims that God is so big, that at any given time we can only see "a very small fraction" of even His hand. He says that God must be at least "81,000 miles" in height. It is true that no one knows the actual 'size' of God, but this reasoning, coupled with Kellogg's 'God Himself is in nature' belief, does tend to make God someone to whom we cannot relate. What have been told through Ellen White is that

> "Before Christ left Heaven and came into the world to die, he was taller than any of the angels. He was majestic and lovely. But when his ministry commenced, he was but little taller than the common size of men then living upon the earth. Had he come among men with his noble, heavenly form, his outward appearance would have attracted the minds of the people to himself, and he would have been received without the exercise of faith." *(Ellen G. White, Spirit of Prophecy volume 2, page 39, 1877)*

Kellogg continued describing God

> "This great being is represented as sitting on the circle of the earth. The orbit of the earth is nearly two hundred million miles in diameter. A being so great as to occupy a seat of such proportions is quite beyond our comprehension as regards his form. The prophet recognizes this, and so diverts our attention away from speculation respecting the exact size and form of God by showing us the absurdity of trying to form even a mental image, intimating that this is closely akin to idolatry. See verses 18-21. He then shows us where to find a true conception of God, pointing us to the things which he has made:" *(Kellogg, op. cit.)*

Kellogg is saying that to attempt to form a mental picture of God is "akin to idolatry" yet the Scriptures are clear that mankind was made in the image of God (see Genesis 1:26). Kellogg does not deny that God's appearance is similar to that of humanity, yet he tries to combine this with God filling all space and existing in everything. Kellogg's point though is that God is so big, it is impossible for us to even imagine His size. He went on to say

> "Discussions respecting the form of God are utterly unprofitable, and serve only to belittle our conceptions of him who is above all things, and hence not to be compared in form or size or glory or majesty with anything which man has ever seen or which it is within his power to conceive. In the presence of questions like these, we have only to acknowledge our foolishness and incapacity, and bow our heads with awe and reverence in the presence of a Personality, an Intelligent Being to the existence of which all nature bears definite and positive testimony, but which is as far beyond our comprehension as are the bounds of space and time." *(Ibid pages 32, 33)*

Here Kellogg claims we cannot conceive the form or size of God. He says it is beyond the imagination of mankind. This is very similar to what is said in the *Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist theology* where Dr. Fernando Canale, when describing God as a trinitarian being, states

> "In Himself He is real and has a form, yet that divine reality and form completely surpass the reality and capability of comprehension of the highest intelligences." *(Fernando L. Canale, Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist Theology, Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopaedia Volume 12, page 113, 'Doctrine of God')*

This may not be exactly the same as what was said by Kellogg, but the end result is the same. It is saying that God's structure cannot be imagined. Now we can see a major common factor between Kellogg's beliefs and trinitarianism. It is making God someone, or something, to which we cannot relate.

Immediately preceding this statement, Canale had explained that although God can perform tasks such as can you and I can perform, He does not have like body members as we do (like arms etc). He explained

> "Only God can use analogy to reveal Himself without involving vain speculations. Some of the analogies God draws are called anthropomorphisms, that is, they attribute to God characteristics belonging to human beings." *(Ibid)*

Anthropomorphism is ascribing the characteristics of humanity to something not human. This is what Canale is saying here – that God does not have body and parts like as we have but with what He does possess (whatever that may be) He can accomplish the same tasks that we are able to accomplish. He also says

> "In biblical anthropomorphisms, God reveals what He is and what He can do in terms of human realities. For instance, when God says that He has an arm (Exodus 15:16; Psalm 89:13), He does not mean that He has exactly or univocally what we call an arm. The expression signifies that God's reality is capable of performing all that can be performed by a human arm and infinitely more." *(Ibid)*

In other words, God does not have bodily parts such as we have (like arms etc) but He can do the things that we do with our bodily parts. Canale concludes

> "We cannot conceive or imagine the actual structure of God's reality that allows Him to perform these acts. Yet the analogical language reveals to us aspects of God's being and divine capabilities, while at the same time guarding the mystery of His divine nature." *(Ibid)*

So here it says, in the *Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist Theology*, as did Kellogg in his book *The Living Temple*, that we cannot perceive the reality of God's structure. Remember that Canale is here describing God as a trinity of divine persons (as we noted above as portrayed in the fundamental beliefs of SDAs on pages 4-5). The end result though is exactly the same. Both Kellogg and Canale say that God's structure is beyond our imagination. This is tantamount to destroying the persons of God and Christ as two distinct personages. It is the depersonalising of God – making Him someone, and something, to whom human beings cannot relate.

On that subject, consider what S. N. Haskell, one of the most well-known ministers of the SDA Church, had to say about what Kellogg had written about God in *The Living Temple*. This was in response to Kellogg's request for him to critique what he had written in it. On page 11 above, we noted that Kellogg, when writing to Ellen White, told her that he had asked Haskell and Prescott to tell him of any criticisms they had concerning his book. On the 28th October 1903, Haskell wrote to Kellogg saying

> "We promised you when you were here to look over the "Living Temple", and write you what we thought of it. When I first saw the book I looked it through, and wrote you what I thought of it, saying that the trend of it never would be received by Seventh-Day Adventists." *(S. N. Haskell, to J. H. Kellogg, October 28th 1903)*

Haskell continued

> "But you asked us to mark out what we thought to be objectionable and write you freely about it. Of course, all I have to say is on the theological trend to it. It is not so much expressions which you used in the book, as it is the standpoint from which it is written, so it appears to me. We could not mark out any particular words or passages, unless it is where you make God such a monstrosity that you yourself, or anyone else, could never believe in Him." *(Ibid)*

This was said in response to Kellogg's description of God as we noted above. Haskell said that Kellogg, in his *Living Temple*, was making God such a "monstrosity" that no one could believe in Him. Haskell later wrote

> "The impression that I got from it was that you did not believe there was a personal God. Now I do not mean by this that any one can comprehend God in His attributes of greatness and infinity, but the impression anyone would get from the book is that no man can comprehend the fact of His personality. Now this is untrue, and contrary to all the teachings in the Bible." *(Ibid)*

Haskell was in complete agreement with what Ellen White had written. Kellog had depicted God as someone to whom human beings could not relate.

Returning our thoughts to *Living Temple*: Kellogg, in summary of his thoughts, had this to say

> "Scientific men have ceased the attempt to prove man to be a mere product of physical forces, but they recognize in his existence, and in every function of his body, the presence of an infinite Intelligence, working, controlling, creating, for man's good. God dwells in man. He is the life of man. He is the servant of man." *(Kellogg, op. cit. page 36)*

That is quite a statement – that God is "is the servant of man". Here are some other notable statements made by Kellogg

> "It is important that we should recognize the fact that God creates every man. We often fall into error by a careless or superficial use of terms, - we say that "nature does this or that," forgetting that nature is not a creator. What we call " nature " is simply the picture of divine activity which we see spread out about us in the universe. God is not behind nature nor above nature; he is in nature, - nature is the visible expression of his power. "Christ is all, and in all." Col. 3:11." *(Ibid, page 40)*

> "God not only forms a man from the dust of the ground, but continues to form him as long as he lives; and the moment the creative process ceases, the walls of the temple totter and fall, its timbers fall apart, and the whole edifice crumbles back to dust." *(Ibid, page 41)*

> "In this permanence of form and feature we have a physiological proof of the existence within the body of some power superior to the material composition or substance of the body, which exercises a constant supervision and control whereby individual identity is maintained. This can be nothing less than the Power which builds, which creates, - it is God himself, the divine Presence in the temple." *(Ibid page 52)*

From the above we can see that Kellogg was really saying that God was not only far bigger than the earth itself (much too big for us to even imagine) but also that God Himself was ***actually present*** in the things He had made – and this included within every human being ("God himself, the divine Presence in the temple").

After reviewing what Kellogg wrote in *The Living Temple*, it is no wonder Ellen White objected to what this physician was teaching. It is no wonder also that she said he was making God and Christ to look nonentities (non-personal beings). As she said to the delegates at the 1905 General Conference session

> "This subject has been kept before me for the past twenty years, yea, for more than twenty years. Before my husband's death, Dr. Kellogg came to my room to tell me that he had great light. He sat down and told me what it was. It was similar to some of the views that he has presented in Living Temple. I said, "Those theories are wrong. I have met them before. I had to meet them when I first began to travel." *(Ellen G. White to the delegates at the 1905 General Conference, Ms 70, 1905, "A Message of Warning, May 30th 1905")*

Kellogg's ideas and teachings in *Living Temple* were no surprise to Ellen White. She knew of them only too well, even knowing of them before her husband's death (James White had died 24 years previously in 1881). She also remarked that she had encountered these theories from her first travels as God's messenger to the remnant. She went on to say

> "Ministers and people were deceived by these sophistries. They lead to making God a nonentity and Christ a nonentity. We are to rebuke these theories in the name of the Lord." *(Ibid)*

Note here as she often did, that Ellen White differentiated between God and Christ. She regarded them as two distinct personal beings - two distinct personages. Take particular note that she says nothing at all about the Holy Spirit. If Ellen White had believed, as some would have us believe, that the Holy Spirit is an individual person like God and Christ, then why did she not include Him here in this statement? In other words, why did she not say that Kellogg was making the Holy Spirit a nonentity? This should be regarded as highly significant.

In reply to a letter written to her by Kellogg, she had this to say to him

> "The sanctuary question is a clear and definite doctrine as we have held it as a people. You are not definitely clear on the personality of God, which is everything to us as a people. You have virtually destroyed the Lord God Himself." *(Ellen G. White. Letter 300 1903, to J. H. Kellogg, March 16th 1903)*

As a matter of interest, I will show you what Daniells said to Willie White. This was in the same letter he told of Kellogg's change of views regarding *the trinity*. This was shortly after the Autumn Council ended. He explained

> "You will remember that a year ago, Professor Prescott pointed out three fundamental errors which strike at the very foundation of the gospel: One is a clear-cut denial of the personality of God as set forth in the Scriptures; another is the utter ignoring of the atonement, and the third the removal of the bridge or gulf that separates the sinner from the man who is saved by the grace of God. As you know, some of us have seen these errors so plainly, and have felt them so keenly, that we have been greatly troubled during the entire year as to what course to take to prevent them from leavening our young people." *(A. G. Daniells, Letter to W. C. White, October 29th 1903)*

This is exactly what was said by Ellen White. Daniells then added (referring I assume to the two testimonies from Ellen White which were read at the Autumn Council)

> "Now the Spirit of Prophecy comes forward and denounces these errors in unmistakable language." *(Ibid)*

On the subject of the spirit of prophecy: We have been told through Ellen White that we do look very similar to God. God's servant wrote

> "Man was to bear God's image, both in outward resemblance and in character. Christ alone is "the express image" (Hebrews 1:3) of the Father; but man was formed in the likeness of God." (*Ellen G. White, Patriarchs and Prophets, page 45, 'The Creation')*

No one expects God to look exactly the same as us in every precise detail, but from these remarks ("outward resemblance") we must look very similar. If we did not look similar, then these comments would be pointless. Notice we are told that whilst we look like God in "outward resemblance" - also in character - that "Christ alone is "the express image"" of the Father. This is a divine similitude. On the very same subject we find these words

> "In the beginning man was created in the likeness of God not only in character but in form and feature". *(Ellen G. White, Spirit of Prophecy, Volume 4 page 463, 'God's people delivered, see also 'The Great Controversy, page 644)*

Here the emphasis is on "form and feature". We can see from this that Ellen White would not have agreed with the trinitarian view of God as explained in the *Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist Theology*. This is one more reason why she must not be called a trinitarian.

Something else very interesting we have been told through the spirit of prophecy is that

> "Evil originated with Lucifer, who rebelled against the government of God. Before his fall he was a covering cherub, distinguished by his excellence. God made him good and beautiful, as near as possible like himself." *(Ellen G. White, Review and Herald, 24th September 1901, 'Without excuse')*

The inference here is that Lucifer was made to look very similar to God – just as were Adam and Eve (Genesis 1:26).

A SDA perspective of Ellen White and the trinity

We need here to reflect upon the SDA perspective of Ellen White and the trinity doctrine. In so doing, we shall consider what is said by someone who is considered to be one of the leading theologians of the SDA Church. His name is Max Hatton, a now retired minister living in Australia. In 2001 he had a book published called *Understanding The Trinity*. Its purpose is self-evident.

Hatton's book is highly prized by the SDA Church. It is very often referred to in articles, papers and books, written by leading ministry, to uphold the SDA belief of God as a trinity of persons. Hatton also has a website on which he has various articles relating to the SDA Church and the trinity doctrine. One such article is called *Ellen G. White and the Trinity*. In this article he presents God's messenger as someone who was once a non-trinitarian but later changed her view of God to be a trinity of persons as depicted by the present-day SDA Church. What Hatton says is very revealing. It probably reflects what many SDAs believe today about Ellen White. It comes under the heading of *My first encounter with a statement from Ellen White which bothered me*. Here is what Hatton says.

> "Not long after I became an Adventist I was quite astonished to read a statement from Ellen White which says:

"Man was to bear God's image, both in outward resemblance and in character." (emphasis supplied) Patriarchs and Prophets, page 45.

I was quite puzzled by this. I had recently spent well over a year intensely studying things about God that caused me to become a Trinitarian. Now could I accept that God was much like me to look at? I was busy with other things and didn't understand how the statement related to other matters in Ellen White writings, so for the time being I just let it go at that.

Now I can see this was from the pen of Ellen White who had been conditioned to be a Semi-Arian. God looks something like me? How could a single human look something like the Great Spirit Trinity God who is everywhere present at the same time? The statement of our dear lady does fit the Semi-Arian God quite well, but certainly not the Trinitarian God!" *(Max Hatton, Ellen G. White and the Trinity, https://thetrinitydoctrine.com)*

There are a number of things to note here. The first is that Hatton denies what is said by Ellen White. He denies, as she says, that we were made in God's image "both in outward resemblance and in character". He says, how could we look like "the Great Spirit Trinity God who is everywhere present at the same time?". This is in keeping with what Dr. Fernando Canale says in the *Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist Theology* (see pages 19-20 above). He says we cannot imagine what God, as depicted in the SDA trinity doctrine, looks like.

Many would say that the "Semi-Arian" view to which Hatton refers is the view of God and Christ that was believed by SDAs across the board throughout the time of Ellen White's ministry. This is the belief that before anything was created, Christ was begotten of God's very own substance therefore He is truly the Son of God and truly God. Notice too that in a similar vein to Kellogg's description of God, Hatton says "the Great Spirit Trinity God" is "everywhere present at the same time". Hatton is admitting that what Ellen White wrote is not in keeping with trinitarianism.

Hatton also noted in the same article

"It must be accepted that God is unique and that there is really nothing that we can compare Him with in the whole Universe. The plain truth is that God is pure spirit – *John 4:24.* God is not like us for a spirit does not have flesh and bones – *Luke 24:39.* In fact God is Omnipresent - in other words, He is everywhere present at the same time (this should not be confused with Pantheism – which claims that God is not only everywhere but is everything)." *(Ibid)*

Again, like Kellogg, Hatton is saying that God Himself (this time as a trinity) "is everywhere present at the same time". The fact that Hatton compares this with pantheism shows that he believes that God Himself is actually present everywhere – which again is what Kellogg believed. After quoting from *Psalm 139 and Jeremiah 23*, Hatton remarks (note the ellipses)

"The attributes of God are far beyond our complete understanding really. It is clear however that God is everywhere. Yet Scripture says we are made in His image *(Genesis 1:26, 27).* It cannot be physically for God is a spirit of immense, even unlimited, proportions….In some way we are made in God's image, but does that suggest that He exists in our physical image? Surely we can agree that such a conclusion would be taking the matter too far." *(Ibid)*

Notice that again in a similar vein to Kellogg, Hatton says that this trinity God "is a spirit of immense, even unlimited, proportions". I believe we should all be able to clearly see the parallel between what Kellogg was teaching and what is taught by our present-day trinitarian theologians. This is that we cannot imagine the structure of God, or imagine His size, also that God Himself is present everywhere, and not just physically (bodily) in one place. Notice too he claims that to say that God looks similar to our physical image is "taking the matter too far".

In the next section called *Here are a few of the statements of Ellen White that convince me that she was Semi-Arian in her early years*, Hatton again openly disagrees with Ellen White. He then quotes the following statements of hers with which he disagrees.

> "I asked Jesus if His Father had a form like Himself. He said He had but I could not behold it, for said He, 'If you should once behold the glory of His person you would cease to exist." (*Ellen G. White, Early Writings, page 54, 1882)*

> "I have often seen the lovely Jesus, that He is a *person*. I asked Him if His Father was a person and had a form like Himself. Said Jesus, "I am in the express *image* of My Father's *person*." *(Ibid page 77)*

Hatton then makes this remark

> "The fact that Mrs White says she saw in vision that Jesus and the Father are quite separate individuals does not fit with the Trinitarian concept found in Scripture." *(Hatton, op. cit.)*

In early SDA theology, this how the Father and Christ were regarded. They were regarded as two distinct individuals. This is how the Bible depicts them. This though, in support of their teaching that God is a trinity of divine persons as depicted by the trinity doctrine, is what is necessary for the trinitarians to reject. They need to reject what is so simply said in the Bible and the SOP - that God and Christ are two separate individual persons.

Warnings through the spirit of prophecy

In May 1905, Ellen White wrote about what had God revealed to her during a night season (this was the time of the General Conference session that year).

> "The Lord would have us at this time bring in the testimony written by those who are now dead, to speak in behalf of heavenly things. The Holy Spirit has given instruction for us in these last days. We are to repeat the testimonies that God has given His people, the testimonies that present clear conceptions of the truths of the sanctuary and that show the relation of Christ to the truths of the sanctuary so clearly brought to view." *(Ellen G. White, Ms 75 1905, Building the Waste Places, May 1905)*

Notice particularly that Ellen White said that God had given these beliefs to "His people" (the pioneers of Seventh-day Adventism). She then said

> "If we are the Lord's appointed messengers, we shall not spring up with new ideas and theories to contradict the message that God has given through His servants since 1844." *(Ibid)*

Seeing that our denomination is saying today that our pioneers had it all wrong about the Godhead, this is something to seriously think about. She continued

> "At that time many sought the Lord with heart and soul and voice. The men whom God raised up were diligent searchers of the Scriptures." *(Ibid)*

Ellen White had a very high regard for our pioneers as students of God's Word. She said the same in a number of places. She continued

> "And those who today claim to have light, and who contradict the teaching of God's ordained messengers who were working under the Holy Spirit's guidance, those who get up new theories which remove the pillars of our faith, are not doing the will of God, but are bringing in fallacies of their own invention, which, if received, will cut the church away from the anchorage of truth and set them drifting, drifting, to where they will receive any sophistries that may arise." *(Ibid)*

This is something else to think about! Ellen White had no problem with what her fellow pioneers were teaching. In fact she made it clear that they had been "working under the Holy Spirit's guidance" – and this was in 1905.

Regarding the "sophistries", "new theories" and "fallacies" that she mentions would come in, if what we then believed were to be changed, she said

> "These will be similar to that which Dr. J. H. Kellogg, under Satan's special guidance, has been working for years." *(Ibid)*

Two very important things to note here. The first is that Ellen White said that for years, Kellogg had been "under Satan's special guidance" (this was in direct contrast to her saying that the pioneers had been "working under the Holy Spirit's guidance"). Secondly, she said that the "new theories", "sophistries" and "fallacies" that would arise if we changed our beliefs, would be "similar" to what Kellogg had been teaching. ***That*** was the warning. We should have heeded it. As it is though, we didn't.

What we have seen above, in the SDA denomination's acceptance of the trinity doctrine, is Ellen White's predictions come true. I believe though that to limit this warning only to the personality of the Holy Spirit would be a huge mistake – albeit the latter is an important topic. There is so much more to Kellogg's views that proved detrimental to the gospel. The most important is Kellogg's belief that the Holy Spirit is within everything and within everyone. This is what Ellen White saw as a very grave danger. It invalidated the gospel. This is because according to the Bible, the Holy Spirit only dwells within those who have experienced conversion. That was probably her main objection to what Kellogg was teaching. It makes the gospel a 'nothingness' – and this physician's views of God were causing havoc in the minds of people regarding the personalities of both God and Christ.

Note now the seriousness, at least as Ellen White would have viewed it, of Kellogg's beliefs (that in the person of the Holy Spirit, God was in everything and in everyone)

> "Let not the theory be presented that God would dwell in the soul-temple of a wicked man. No greater falsehood could be presented." (*Ellen G. White, Ms 181, 1905, Notebook Leaflets from the Elmshaven Library, 'Be Earnest and Steadfast')*

With reference to Kellogg's beliefs and the gospel, Ellen White made it very clear that

> "If God is an essence pervading all nature, then He dwells in all men; and in order to attain holiness, man has only to develop the power that is within him. These theories, followed to their logical conclusion, sweep away the whole Christian economy." *(Ellen G. White 8th Volume Testimonies, 'The essential knowledge', page 291, 1904)*

This was the result of Kellogg's reasoning. It destroyed the gospel. As Ellen White explained to Kellogg about his book

> "If the ideas presented in this book were received, they would lead to the uprooting of the whole construction of the faith that makes Seventh-day Adventists a chosen, denominated people." *(Ellen G. White, Special Testimonies, Series B, No. 7, page 48, 1906, 'A Great opportunity slighted', written originally to J. H. Kellogg, Letter 253a, November 18th 1903)*

There can be no doubt as to how seriously Ellen White regarded what Kellogg was teaching. It was as serious as possibly could be. We shall see this now.

The alpha of deadly heresies and the coming omega

At the height of the Kellogg crisis in 1904, God led Ellen White to write to a physician called Dr. A. J. Read. It was about Kellogg and his book.

> "I am given a message to bear to you and to the rest of our physicians who are connected with the Medical Missionary Association. Separate from the influence exerted by the book *Living Temple*; for it contains specious sentiments. There are in it sentiments that are entirely true, but these are mingled with error. Scriptures are taken out of their connection and used to uphold erroneous theories."
>
> The thought of the errors contained in this book has given me great distress, and the experience that I have passed through in connection with the matter has nearly cost me my life." *(Ellen G. White, to Dr. A. J. Read, Letter 277 1904, July 31, 1904)*

She later wrote

> "In the book *Living Temple*, there is presented the Alpha of deadly heresies. The Omega will follow and will be received by those who are not willing to heed the warning God has given." *(Ibid)*

This was very, very serious. To refer to a teaching as a "deadly" heresy is just about as serious as it gets. This though is how Ellen White regarded Kellogg's teaching about God. Just as importantly, perhaps even more so, is that she said the "omega" of heresies was on its way into the SDA Church. Even more importantly, some may reason, is that she said it will be received by those who "are not willing to heed the warning God has given".

In a manuscript written in 1907, Ellen White again warned about Kellogg's views of God.

> "The theories contained in Living Temple are the alpha of a long train of heresies that the enemy framed to be brought in amongst us by the great and widely known Dr. Kellogg." *(Ellen G. White, Ms 168 1907, Stand firm for the right)*

This was very similar to what she wrote to Kellogg and his fellow physicians in 1903

> "*Living Temple* contains the alpha of a train of heresies. These heresies are similar to those that I met in my first labors in connection with the cause in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, then in Boston, Roxbury, New Bedford, and other parts of Massachusetts. Through them the evil one worked upon the minds of men and women." *(Ellen G. White, Letter 265 1903, to J. H. Kellogg and Associates, November 26th 1903)*

The previous month she again wrote to Kellogg saying

> "I ask my ministering brethren to examine themselves, to see whether they are in the faith or not. If they accept the spiritualistic representations made in *Living Temple*, their feet will soon be treading in forbidden paths. These representations are the Alpha of doctrines that would lead far away from the truth as we have received it from the Word of God. *(Ellen G. White, Letter 232, 1907, to J. H. Kellogg, October 6th 1903)*

Originally, Ellen White did not feel the need to read Kellogg's book. This is even though she knew that people were saying her writings supported what Kellogg had written. After saying she felt heart-broken over this claim, she explained,

> "Finally my son said to me, "Mother, you ought to read at least some parts of the book, that you may see whether they are in harmony with the light that God has given you." He sat down beside me, and together we read the preface, and most of the first chapter, and also paragraphs in other chapters. As we read, I recognized the very sentiments against which I had been bidden to speak in warning during the early days of my public labors. When I first left the State of Maine, it was to go through Vermont and Massachusetts, to bear a testimony against these sentiments. "Living Temple" contains the alpha of these theories. I knew that the omega would follow in a little while; and I trembled for our people. I knew that I must warn our brethren and sisters not to enter into controversy over the presence and personality of God. The statements made in "Living Temple" in regard to this point are incorrect. The scripture used to substantiate the doctrine there set forth, is scripture misapplied." *(Ellen G. White, Special Testimonies, Series B, No 2 page 53)*

Today, 120 years on from when Ellen White gave these "alpha" and "omega" warnings, we need to give them very serious attention indeed. As a denomination, we have now discarded what was then, in the early 1900's, "the faith" that Ellen White said had made the Seventh-day Adventist Church God's "chosen, denominated people". This was "the faith" that she described as "the platform of eternal truth, which since 1844 has stood the test."

As a denomination, we have done as J. H. Kellogg did in the early 1900's. We have accepted a teaching – the trinity doctrine – that not only effectively destroys the personality of both God and His Son, but also denies the gospel. Through the SOP we were warned that Satan would attempt to change our faith. On the next page we find these words

> "The enemy of souls has sought to bring in the supposition that a great reformation was to take place among Seventh-day Adventists, and that this reformation would consist in giving up the doctrines which stand as the pillars of our faith, and engaging in a process of reorganization. Were this reformation to take place, what would result? *(Ibid page 54)*

Ellen White then explained the result of such a reformation. She wrote

> "The principles of truth that God in His wisdom has given to the remnant church, would be discarded. Our religion would be changed. The fundamental principles that have sustained the work for the last fifty years would be accounted as error. A new organization would be established. Books of a new order would be written. A system of intellectual philosophy would be introduced." *(Ibid)*

In the changeover from non-trinitarianism to trinitarianism, which did take decades to accomplish, this is exactly what has taken place. What the early SDAs (and that includes Ellen White) believed about the Godhead is now counted as error and has been discarded. This is even though it was held by SDAs for over 100 years. The books promoting this 'old view' have been discontinued and books promoting the 'new view' have taken their place. The trinity doctrine, because no support for it can be found in Scripture, can only be described as "intellectual philosophy". It is only a man-made teaching.

Ellen White asked the following about the satanic suggestion that a reformation to our beliefs was necessary.

> "Who has authority to begin such a movement? We have our Bibles. We have our experience, attested to by the miraculous working of the Holy Spirit. We have a truth that admits of no compromise. Shall we not repudiate everything that is not in harmony with this truth?" *(Ibid, page 55)*

God's messenger saw nothing wrong with what SDAs were then teaching about God and Christ, but she described Kellogg's views of God, as he had presented them in his *Living Temple* in 1903, as the "alpha of heresies". She also said that the "omega would follow in a little while".

There were a number of reasons why Kellogg's views were regarded by Ellen White as detrimental to the faith of SDAs. In a talk at Berrian Springs in 1904 (mentioned previously), Ellen White told her listeners

> "Our ministers must be very careful not to enter into controversy in regard to the personality of God. This is a subject that they are not to touch. It is a mystery, and the enemy will surely lead astray those who enter into it. We know that Christ came in person to reveal God to the world. God is a person, and Christ is a person. Christ is spoken of in the Word as "the brightness of His Father's glory, and the express image of His person*." (Ellen G. White, Ms 46 1904, Talk at Berrien Springs, May 18th 1904, 'The Foundation of our Faith')*

She later said

> "In a representation which passed before me, I saw a certain work being done by medical missionary workers. Our ministering brethren were looking on, watching what was being done, but they did not seem to understand. The foundation of our faith which was established by so much prayer, such earnest searching of the Scriptures, was being taken down pillar by pillar. Our faith was to have nothing to rest upon—the sanctuary was gone, the atonement was gone. I realized that something must be done." *(Ibid)*

As we have seen from the above, Kellogg's views of God being in every person born on earth, did away with the atonement. As Ellen White said (see page 27)

> "If God is an essence pervading all nature, then He dwells in all men; and in order to attain holiness, man has only to develop the power that is within him. These theories, followed to their logical conclusion, sweep away the whole Christian economy." *(Ellen G. White 8th Volume Testimonies, 'The essential knowledge', page 291, 1904)*

As far as the sanctuary teaching is concerned (the cleansing of the sanctuary etc), note what W. A. Spicer wrote in his book *How the Spirit of Prophecy Met a Crisis: Memories and Notes of the "Living Temple" Controversy*. This tells us why the sanctuary message was gone (in Kellogg's thinking). Here Spicer is referring to a meeting he had one Sabbath afternoon with Kellogg about the doctor's beliefs. Spicer, who was General Conference Secretary in 1903 during the Kellogg crisis, recalled

> "Sitting down with no thought that there could be any differences of a really controversial nature, and with the heartiest of friendly feelings, personally I was at once in the midst of a discussion of the most controversial questions. Instead of things in the book being inadvertently overdrawn because of employment of scientific terms, unfamiliar to most of us, I learned that the teaching was conservatively stated in the book; that the teaching was really of intent to signify that God was in the things of nature. "Where is God?" I was asked. I would naturally say, He is in heaven; there the Bible pictures the throne of God, all the heavenly beings at His command as messengers between heaven and earth. But I was told that God was in the grass and plants and in the trees (with motions to the grass and trees about us, as we sat on the open veranda.) Where is heaven? I was asked. I had my idea of the center of the universe, with heaven and the throne of God in the midst, but disclaimed any attempt to fix the center of the universe astronomically. But I was urged to understand that heaven is where God is, and God is everywhere in the grass, in the trees, in all creation. There was no place in this scheme of things for angels going between heaven and earth, for heaven was here and everywhere. The cleansing of the sanctuary that we taught about was not something in a far-away heaven. The sin is here (the hand pointing to the heart), and here is the sanctuary to be cleansed. To think of God as having a form in the image of which man was made, was said to be idolatry." *(W. A. Spicer, 'How the Spirit of Prophecy Met a Crisis: Memories and Notes of the "Living Temple" Controversy', page 19, 1934)*

According to Spicer, Kellogg was saying that the sanctuary that needed cleansing was the heart, therefore to Kellogg, the living temple of God was the individual person.

When the interview with Kellogg is read, it will be seen that when he was asked about the sanctuary, he was very evasive with his answers. He denied also that he did not believe the atonement was gone. Rather he said that he did believe that Christ died for sinners. He also said that Ellen White had been told lies about him. Ellen White though was saying that if the Holy Spirit dwelt within everyone, then all that the individual need to do was to "develop the power that is within him" (see above).

As can be seen, Kellogg's beliefs were affecting the greater part of our message as God's remnant church. As Ellen White said, if these beliefs were received, "they would lead to the uprooting of the whole construction of the faith that makes Seventh-day Adventists a chosen, denominated people" (see page 27). What we see here, in Spicer's words, is simply a reflection of what Kellogg had written in his *Living Temple*.

At the time of the 1905 General Conference session, Ellen White warned (this was in a manuscript that has the title *A Warning Against False Theories*)

> "Those who seek to remove the old landmarks are not holding fast; they are not remembering how they have received and heard. Those who try to bring in theories that would remove the pillars of our faith concerning the sanctuary, or concerning the personality of God or of Christ, are working as blind men. They are seeking to bring in uncertainties and to set the people of God adrift, without an anchor." *(Ellen G. White, Ms 62 1905, 'A Warning Against False Theories', May 24th 1905)*

These are the two areas of belief under attack from Satan. One concerns the personalities of God and Christ – which is vital to understanding the gospel (that God has a Son whom He gave as sacrifice to pay for the sins of humanity). The other, our sanctuary message, is crucial to understanding the work that since 1844, Christ has been doing on behalf of mankind. The latter is one of the identifying marks of God's final (remnant) church. Without the sanctuary message, our (SDA) claim to be God's remnant church is invalidated. At that time, Albion Ballenger, by his interpretation of the 2300 days of Daniel chapter 8, was also attacking the SDA church regarding their understanding of it. Eventually, Ballenger's ministerial credentials were withdrawn and his name removed from the membership of the SDA Church.

Conclusions

All the warnings were there for us to heed. We are therefore without excuse. Today, the denominational belief of the SDA Church regarding God is that He is not, as once taught by early SDAs, a single personal being who has a Son whom He gave as a sacrifice to pay for our sins and is omnipresent by His Spirit. In its place, through intellectual philosophy, we have contrived a God who is a composite being (a nonentity), comprising of three divine persons, none of whom can be separated from the others, and none of whom have a son.

What is very interesting, also well worth contemplating, is that throughout the time these early SDAs were teaching these things, and even though the SDA Church today says that their beliefs are not scriptural, Ellen White never once condemned them for what they were teaching. Yet when Kellogg published his *Living Temple*, she condemned what he was teaching about the personalities of God and Christ. She said he was making both to be non-entities (non-personal beings).

Today, in the ministry, we have those who teach that the divine person known as the Son of God is not really God's Son but is only someone who is role-playing the part of a Son. It is also said that the terminologies 'Father' and 'Son' are only metaphors. This is being taught in our official church publications. We also have those who teach that the divine person of Christ did not die at Calvary, and that only His human nature died - which means in effect that the divine person of the Son of God did not make the atonement.

As a denomination, we have also made the Holy Spirit to be, as did Kellogg, a divine being such as are both God the Father and Christ, therefore not the omnipresence of both (John 14:23). Thus the belief is no longer held that the Holy Spirit is a spiritual manifestation of Christ which in turn means Christ is not depicted as our Comforter (see John 14:18, 23). It seems that Satan's plans and intentions have well and truly reached their fruition. As Ellen White said

> “The reason why the churches are weak and sickly and ready to die, is that the enemy has brought influences of a discouraging nature to bear upon trembling souls. He has sought to shut Jesus from their view as the Comforter, as one who reproves, who warns, who admonishes them, saying, "This is the way, walk ye in it."” *(Ellen G. White, Review and Herald, 26th August 1890, ‘The righteousness of Christ’)*

The SDA church, by their intellectual philosophy, and by making the Holy Spirit to be another divine being like God and Christ, is depriving people of knowing Jesus as their Comforter, the One who says: "This is the way, walk ye in it.”

In conclusion therefore, I would say that the so-called reformation that Ellen White said that Satan has sought to bring into Seventh-day Adventism (see page 29) has taken place. The fundamental beliefs that were held throughout the time of Ellen White ministry have been discarded. Our religion has indeed been changed.

One more thing before I close. In the “alpha”, it was said by Ellen White that as well as scripture, her writings were being erroneously used by Kellogg to support what he was teaching in his book. The same is happening today. Her writings, as well as scripture, are being misused to support the SDA beliefs that God is a trinity as purported by the trinity doctrine. So it was in the “alpha”, so it is in the “omega”.

Looking back, I can see the parallel between the Kellogg controversy and the trinity controversy that is taking place within our church today although I am sure others will have different views of the ‘Kellogg problem’. The above though, at the time of writing, are mine. I could write much more but I hope something I have said has helped in some way.

God bless you as you seek for the truth.

Terry Hill

Website: https://theprophetstillspeaks.co.uk

Email address: terry_sda@blueyonder.co.uk