

of
Seventh-Day Adventists

1025 Jefferson St.

Nashville - - Tennessee

August 12, 1904.

Dr. J. H. Kellogg,
Battle Creek, Michigan.

Very dear Doctor,-

Yours of July 30 came to hand some little time since. You requested me to read it to "Uncle Stephen," so I had to wait until I got down to this Camp Meeting, which I reached day before yesterday, and read it to him.

I see you had not received my lengthy letter, which must have come to you in a day or so after a reply to a previous letter.

I expressed the opinion, if I remember correctly, that I thought it was hardly worth while to write any more lengthy letters, only to keep up a friendly correspondence, as John was about to leave me while I go on my way to Florida, he remaining here in Georgia. I start day after tomorrow.

But you have presented matters in such a shape in your letter that I should not feel quite willing to let it stand just that way, as if I understand your effort, you undertake to show that the doctrine you taught in "Living Temple" was all straight and correct. This, you know, I do not believe. I stand with the Testimonies on this subject, and not because the Testimonies say it merely, but because they have always been my views, and I expect always will be.

I never could see any sense in some of the positions you advance. You remember that the very first time you broached the subject to me, sending me some proofs, I told you I did not have any faith in those positions, and did not think them in harmony with the Word of God.

"Uncle Stephen" and I have talked over this subject at some little length; and, so far as I know, we agree exactly in our positions. Both are absolutely opposed to some ideas you advance - so in one sense this may be considered a joint letter. Probably he will have an opportunity to read it, though possibly not until after John has sent you the original, as I shall have to leave it with John to finish, and he will send a copy to Brother Haskell. I have no idea that I shall vary a hair from Brother Haskell's views. So as you generally group us together, you will have the word substantially from both of us.

I shall not enter into this because of any desire upon my part to have a lengthy argument. I do not like to enter into contests of this kind as well as I used to when younger. You know you and I measured swords several times over the salt question; over the resurrection question, etc. al.

Of course, I realize, when I sit down to an argument with you, that I have no mean opponent. I know that you can come as near making the worse appear the better reason as any man I ever know. I think you have a remarkable versatility of mind in that direction, Doctor, though I have always given you credit for honesty and integrity of purpose. But you are a man of a good many resources, more, I think, than I have. I am simply a plain matter of fact person, who tries to present my thoughts as forcibly as I know how; but so far as dialectics are concerned, you have greatly the advantage of me. But, enough of this.

I have no disposition to bandy epithets, or attribute to you evil motives, or anything of the kind. That is none of my business. My difficulties with you are radical; and, in the very nature of things, I

opposed to your views.

You have, virtually, as far as I am able to judge, taken the ground that "Living Temple" was all right; that you simply made those changes to try to make it a little more palatable; but you have never changed your views, so far as I am able to discern, Doctor, in the slightest degree, in reference to the "Living Temple."

In taking such a position, you place yourself athwart the Testimonies, emphatically. Indeed, you come right out and say that Sister White is mistaken.

Now, I do not believe that she is mistaken. I believe you are the man who is mistaken, and that you are advancing views which really lead to doctrines held by the heathen, more than the doctrines taught in the Word of God.

Now, that is straight and square, but I think it is actually so. I shall try to show you that it is before I get through.

We will start, therefore, on the basis that you do not accept the teachings of the Testimonies, brought out at great length in her writings, over and over repeated, that your book, "Living Temple," is not sound; that it teaches errors, dangerous errors. There is exactly where Brother Haskell and I stand. So this matter is really a radical matter between us, not that we should attribute to you wicked motives - a great many people can be mistaken, and yet be honest Christians meanwhile. So understand me distinctly, that I have no evil motives to impute, but you are mistaken in your philosophy.

Of course this fact goes a good ways with me: that my views, without any presentation of them to Sister White, and without ever having spoken with her on the subject in my life, are precisely those endorsed by the Testimonies; are precisely the doctrines I have taught, and Elder Haskell has taught. We always have taught these, and they have been the doctrines of this body.

Your doctrine is radically opposite to all that Elder James White, Elder J. N. Andrews, Elder Uriah Smith, and Elder Waggoner, the leading men in the origination of this Cause, taught. Your doctrine is radically contrary to the Seventh-Day Adventist doctrine as always held by this body, and by those who were representative men in it. It is a new offshoot from Elder Waggoner's and Elder Prescott's views as adopted and taught all through this Denomination. And your medical fraternity have adopted them.

So we might as well understand the bearings of this subject, to start on. Sister White's views simply endorsed the good old doctrines of this Denomination. You and your sympathetic Brethren are following on another track. I was alarmed several years ago, when I began to see these doctrines first broached. I knew they were not true. They came through such philosophical minds as Elder E. J. Waggoner's; and, as far as I know, Brother Jones has endorsed them, to a considerable extent, and a whole lot more, but the line is being drawn, and this will not stand as one of the doctrines of this body of Seventh-Day Adventists as a people. They never will, in my judgment.

I do not know that I care to discuss the question of scepticism concerning which you speak, as derived from the "Living Temple." That word, "scepticism" is a word that cannot be defined exactly, as it covers all varieties of doctrines contrary to the express revelations of our Lord Jesus Christ. There are all sorts of shades of it; multitudes of people who call themselves Christians, and Christian ministers at that are really skeptical, but they do not think so. You do not think this doctrine leads to it, but I do.

Perhaps this is all I should say on that point. As I used to

man out and out skeptic myself, and have always, because of that, been able to detect things of that kind, perhaps more than one who had always been a Christian, I think I am pretty well qualified to say what is skeptical in its nature, that leads away from the plain teachings of the Word of God.

Now, so far as the matter between us is concerned, I wish to simmer that down to about as fine a point as possible; agree to all that we can agree to, and differ only when we have to.

That the power of God is working, all through nature, I believe, as much as you do, but I certainly draw a distinction between the power of God as exerted in various ways and in various manners, and in manifestations which I cannot explain, nor which any other person under Heaven can explain. I believe that life, wherever it exists, was derived from God, and that, in some way, mysterious to myself, and to you, and all philosophers who have ever existed, it is still working. I believe that that life is in the bug, or the pissmire, as well as in the elephant and man, but I do not believe that that life is ~~the~~ God.

The heathen do believe this, and you, in some of your remarks, seem to me almost to be on the heathen side of the question. In speaking of Christ, John says:

"In the beginning was the Word, (Christ) and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made that was made. In Him was life, and the life was the light of men."

It does not say that that life was Christ, or that Christ was that life, but in Him was life, and the life was the light of men. That principle of life proceeds from God and Christ.

I take the absolute statement of the Word, that Christ was the Son of God, of the same substance and nature. I believe that text which you quote, that "in Him the Godhead was bodily manifested; that He was in Christ in a sense that He is in no other being existing in heaven or on the earth, or in the universe. He was the Son of God, in a sense that nobody else is.

Now, the whole heathen world, and the Christian Scientists, and I think my dear Friend, Doctor Kellogg, are off on this idea that life is God, and that that life, wherever manifested, is a part of God. I do not believe that the Scriptures maintain any such idea.

I might illustrate it by the sun, and the light which proceeds from the sun, more forcibly than you can in regard to life. It is said in the Bible that God is a sun. It does not say anywhere that God is life, that I can recall, but in God was life. We behold the light of day shining all around. When the sun is around on the other side of the earth, everything is dark, sometimes pitchy dark, and no light is discernible to our eyesight. When the sun arises, which was made the light bearer at the creation, Genesis first chapter, the light shines all around us. That light comes from the sun, but that light is not the sun. By no process of reasoning, twisting, or turning, or anyway can it be made to appear that the light is the sun. It proceeds from the sun. The sun is the source of light to us, but the light is not the sun. No more is life God.

Here is a point, Doctor, which I am willing to predicate the whole argument on, and here is where you go astray. You and your friends hold a strange position, which I have never before heard of, in all my studies of theology.

I can understand the Buddhists and the Brahmans position, that God is a sort of an essence, distributed all through nature. That is the Christian Science Doctrine, and multitudes are teaching it today, in substance. I can see some consistency in that, when they say this is all

There is of God; that he is distributed through nature in the form of an essence so minute and so fine that there is no microscope under heaven that can find a particle of Him. That is their view. And so as you bring up, the good Hindoo could bow down and worship God in the tree, that is not Pantheism, you say in the flower, wherever life is, it bows down and worships, and you seem to endorse that doctrine, as far as I can see, and thus place yourself on the heathen side instead of on the Christian side.

You understand me, I do not say that these Hindoos worship the tree. They worship God that is in the tree, you say, and you seem to endorse that idea, and you can pray to that God in the tree.

But they do not believe in any personal God up in Heaven. Therefore their system is consistent with itself throughout, but you have a personal God up in heaven, sitting on a throne, dwelling in a temple literally, with angels all around him.

That personal Being, great and glorious, is represented in the 7th Chapter of Daniel as the Ancient of Days, presiding over the judgment scene, as literal and actual a person as you and I are, or Christ ever was on earth, and yet is disseminated all through nature at the same time, on the same hypothesis that the heathen have their essence god distributed all through the universe.

You have two systems, utterly diverse from each other, mingled into one, and there is where you are away off the mark. You cannot make those two united together, only on the same kind of logic that you can make the sun and light one and the same thing. They are not one and the same thing. There is a literal body which sheds abroad the light which we call the sun. It arises every day, and shines over the earth as it goes along, disseminating light everywhere. So God is a source of light and power.

Now, there is another point upon which you enlarge considerable. Because certain power is manifested through a great variety of agencies, from the huge elephant, walking upon the earth, man, beast, birds, fishes, a power manifest there, you assume that that is a personal God. Now that assumption seems to me nothing more than consummate folly. How do you know that that is a personal god manifest in those ways? Has not God power which He can exert without being personally present. If he has not, He is worse off than I ever supposed He was. I cannot tell, and you say you cannot tell how He does this, or just what is the nature of this power. You cannot say, and I cannot say, that it is the Spirit of God that does it. We do not know what does it, but we know that something does it, and proceeds some way from God. But that does not make God an essence floating through the universe everywhere in general and nowhere in particular. He dwells somewhere, and for aught I know, He came down with Christ on Mt. Sinai, and the Revelator tells us plainly that He will dwell on this earth when Christ does, bye and bye, in the New Earth state.

Now, my good Friend, if I understand your position, it is just this: While you believe in a personal God up in Heaven, which, by the way, I do not see as you have any need of, if he is personally present all through the universe at the same time, it seems to me you have adopted that feature to escape certain conclusions which the Bible presents, and you cannot very well get around, for certainly it is a great incongruity for you to represent a personal god in heaven, actually existent, as really as Christ was when he ascended up on high, and yet say that he is in the form of an essence all through creation.

As I said before, there is a diversity of positions there, mingled together which make an incongruity which you cannot escape.

Your supposition seems to be that God is personally present in Heaven, and is just as really personally present in man in the work of

...eating; in the fish and the fowl in the work of creating; in the tree, where there is vegetable life, and that in every bug and insect this life is manifested - all have a personal god dwelling in them.

You seem to be in quite warm sympathy with the dear Hindoo, who tells you that he bows down before the flower, not to worship the flower, but the god that is in it.

Now, please tell me, my beloved Doctor, if God is really and personally in man, or in the flower, or in the tree, or in the beast, or fish, because life is manifest there, why do you not bow down before them just as the Hindoo does?

I should therefore expect, if consistency was carried out, with your apparent belief in the Hindoo's way of worship, that you would be going around and worshipping the flowers, and the jackasses, and the fish, and the animal creation, and man himself, because God is personally dwelling in them.

I venture to say that it will be some time before our beloved Doctor will carry out the doctrine which he has in sentiment seemed to teach. Why? Because the innate good sense in the man knows that it is an unfit thing to do.

But, if God is personally present all through there, I would like to know why not. I do feel sure, Doctor, that you cannot help seeing, with your wise mind, that there is a great difference between worshipping God in heaven and manifestations merely of life, which come from God, in some way mysterious to everybody in anything in which life is to be found. The heathen idea is utterly false, from beginning to end. It is just as false when Doctor Kellogg teaches it as it is when the heathen teach it.

Now another thing: your method of argument on that point reminds me of the Catholic's argument on the Second Commandment. When you find any good Catholic anywhere who bows down before the image of the Virgin Mary, or Jesus Christ, or St. Patrick, or anybody else, and say to him, "why you are worshipping that image," he will reply, "Oh no! I am not worshipping that image; I am worshipping the Saint, or Christ, that is represented by that image, and hence am not breaking the second commandment."

That is precisely what every idolater, worshipping any image, will say in regard to that, Venus, Jupiter, Mercury, or any of the rest of them, that they do not worship the image, and yet that idolatry is squarely condemned by the Commandment of God. Why? Because there is a false conception, a miserable, Satanic idea which is calculated to lead away minds from the true God. God is in Heaven, the object of worship there, and anything that takes away our worship of God in Heaven, and puts it into another manifestation of life is false, from the teaching of the Scripture, and false from good sense.

I have talked with good Catholics - in fact, we had a good sister who came out at Sigon, Idwa, a very intelligent German lady, rich - she actually came out and kept the Sabbath; we rented a part of the house in which she and her husband lived. She became acquainted with us, and was, in many respects, a most estimable lady, but notwithstanding she had embraced the Sabbath, when it came to taking away the image of the Virgin, and some other images she loved to bow before and pray to, when we remonstrated with her on that idea, stated that it brought up the idea of God so much more fully before her mind that she could not leave it off, and so quit keeping the Sabbath. That idea had been drilled into her mind until the false conception became a reality to her, and she could not draw away from it.

That is the way Satan has ruined the human family. He is willing that people should bow down before a tree, or a flower, an animal, or

thing else. That is why the sacred calf among the ancient Egyptians, the bull apis was selected on the death of his predecessor, and worshipped on the same principle. Because life was in him, therefore God was in him,

And it seems a little surprising to me that our smartest Doctors cannot see that simple principle. Away with the whole brood. God is personally in Heaven, and there He lives and reigns.

You have dwelled, quite at length, upon another point which I will notice. You undertake to make a distinction between the person and the bodily presence. I think your distinction will not stand the test of a true and careful examination. It is rather a difficult matter to enter into it without being too prolix, but I looked at it in Mr. Webster's International dictionary, the latest edition, which I have, and studied every definition where he brings in the words, "person," or "personality," Or "personal," or any of those, and I cannot find one single meaning that could separate between the actual person that is represented and the being himself. The person is the being himself, and any influence that goes out from the person is not the person himself, so far as I could see from a careful study of those meanings in the standard dictionary of our language.

The word, "body," or "bodily" can be used in a different sense, irrespective of the life. When I die, my body is not the same as when I lived. There is an important something that makes a great deal of difference between me when I am alive, though "the body" would cover a dead condition as well as a live condition.

I know there are those who believe in attenuated spirits, sailing around in the air, and think they are real beings, as the great mass of immortal soulists do, though they try to stretch that idea of personal and personality to cover their imaginary existence. That is about all I can see in reference to that use of the "personal" which you try to uphold.

When we speak of the person of God, we speak of Him who is on the throne of God, or in the Heaven of heavens above; that living existence whose power animates all creation; and when you undertake to apply that to a manifestation of life in the vegetable, or the animal, in every being in the universe, you have gone astray. I do not believe in your doctrine on that point at all.

Now, so far as life is concerned, in all its manifestations: I cannot explain it, as I have said before, nor can anybody else. There is not a philosopher under Heaven who can explain or understand what life is, or manufacture it, in any way. They cannot create even a bug, or a piss-mire. They cannot impart it. That is a power which God has reserved in His own keeping, and what the real nature of that power is you nor I, nor any other man can tell. I do not attempt to explain it, and you say you do not; but you draw a conclusion, that the person of God is there - it was brought right out in so many words in your first edition of "Living Temple - personally and actively present in the human body. It is just as actively present in the beast's body. The same processes of nutrition and assimilation go on in every living creature, substantially. It may not be just the same, but it results where growth, the manifestation of life, etc. are sustained by the substances which they appropriate from nature to keep life up.

Now that idea that that life is God Himself is simply an inference, and an unnecessary inference. There is nothing to be found in the Bible that would endorse any such position as that. Neither is there any good sense in it. That you take for granted. You say "therefore," when it is no "therefore" at all." All there is to it that you know, or any philosopher in this world knows is that there is a manifestation of something we call, "life," and what that life is nobody can tell.

There are all kinds of power dwelling in God. We cannot understand it. For example: When the wickedness of the Sodomites was consummated, from some power or other fire and brimstone descended, and those cities were consumed, until they were buried out of sight in the waters of the Dead Sea, very likely. They ceased to be a city, and all the surrounding country is a horrible desert, the most awful in the world almost. There was a power that descended upon them. That power came from God. Was that life? No. It was anything but that, but it was a power that came from God.

So it will be when the world is destroyed with the coming of Christ. ~~What~~ ^{What} powers ^{will} be manifested there that will desolate every temple and every city in the world, and leave our world as blank a void as it was before God created anything. But it is a substance, though without form and void.

As the Prophet Jeremiah says, and as God describes it in the original, when Sennacherib led out his blasphemous host and threatened what he would do at Jerusalem, and blasphemed the God of Heaven, there came down power in one night that laid out one hundred and eighty-five thousand men. That power came from God. You could not call it life; you could not call it a part of God. It was power that proceeded from Him.

If I might stop and reason at length, I could present a great many other powers that are manifested. It does not follow, because there is a power manifested, and because God is the author of that power, that that is He Himself. The inference is entirely the opposite from what you take it to be, Doctor, as I view it. It is the very best evidence that it is not God.

There is life in the angels that fell from Heaven. Satan and all his host, one-third part of the angels of God fell. They have lived for six thousand years at least since they fell. They are preserved. Is God living in the Devil and all his angels, personally. Why, Doctor, that seems to me the most preposterous idea in the world. I must say it honestly.

In reference to the healing influences, with which you are so very familiar, and which are going on in the restoration from diseased conditions to health, and the power which God has exerted and is exerting in harmony with those efforts, I believe this just as much as you do, but I do not believe, because there is a power there which God exerts through these instrumentalities, that it is God Himself. That is where we differ. There you draw conclusions which are not warranted. Your logic, if carried out to its ultimate conclusion, would be that wherever God manifests a power, that that is He Himself personally. I deny that inference. That brings in the heathen conception, rather than the truth of the Bible.

In regard to the miracles which Christ performed when he said, "Thy sins be forgiven thee:" There was power that went forth from Christ which changed those conditions instantly. You change them gradually. No doubt that power that works to help them change comes forth from God, as it did from Christ, when the poor woman came up with the issue of blood and touched his garment, hoping not to be seen, her faith grasping Christ as the real object that could bring her healing. She touched it, and the power went forth from Him; but it was not Christ Himself going forth to the woman.

Now, according to your own reasoning, the power that is exerted in the healing of a person today may be similar to that power. I have no particular objection to that, but it was not God personally going forth, or Christ personally going forth. It was a power derived from Christ and derived from God. There is where you are in the dark, my good Doctor.

Christ wrought many of these miracles. When Ananias and Sapphira lied to the Spirit of God, on a most solemn occasion, there was

power that came forth from God. They were both corpses there in the same way. Was God personally dwelling in Ananias and Sapphira all the time because a power came from Him.

When that medium of the Devil, Elymas the sorcerer withstood Paul, seeking to turn away the deputy from the faith, Paul, filled with the Holy Ghost, set his eyes on him and said, O full of all subtilty and all mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord? And now, behold, the hand of the Lord is upon thee, and thou shalt be blind, not seeing the sun for a season. And immediately there fell on him a mist and a darkness; and he went about seeking some one to lead him by the hand.

There was another power that went forth at the command of Paul, and must have come from God Himself, but it was not God personally dwelling in the poor sorcerer, was it?

Now, there, my Friend, is where I consider you make the departure. You draw the conclusion, because there is some power, in most instances a life-giving power in a man, that therefore God personally dwells there. It is a nonsequiter, Doctor. It does not follow.

You attach too much importance to those powers, claiming that it is just the same thing as God wrought in creation. You have no right to say all that. That it is power derived from God I will willingly grant, but I do not grant that it is the same power that created something from nothing.

The spirit of God goeth forth from God. That is what the expression, "the spirit of God" really signifies. The "of" shows that it is something connected with or proceeding from God. The Scripture says, if the Greek was literally rendered, that that Spirit proceedeth or goeth forth from the Father and the Son.

Now, I would not dare to say that that Spirit of God, which goes forth, was the comforter. That was not in the earth in the same sense before the day of Pentecost that it was afterwards. The promise of the Holy Spirit was given by Christ Himself, when he was to do a great work for the Disciples, to qualify themselves for the ministry, after he had ascended on high. He says, "if I go not away, the Comforter will not come." Now there was a spirit that came in a way that it had not come before. That language necessarily proves that, and that Comforter, the Holy Spirit, was manifested in the soul of man. It is that that dwells in beings who give themselves to God, and thus become the temple of God. It has not an existence in everybody and every creature that lives on earth before that.

There would have been no propriety in the remark of Christ that if I go not away the Comforter could not come, unless his going away was a condition necessarily precedent to his coming.

Now, you are not authorized to say, and no other man is authorized to say that that spirit which came forth as a comforter and manifested itself in tongues of flame, sitting on the heads of every one of the one hundred and twenty present was the same thing that is working in man, in beast, in insects, and fishes and fowls, to keep them alive. Nobody is authorized to say that, and nobody has any certainty that if they should say it, they would be telling the truth.

Now, there is a sense in which God was in Christ that is not true of any other person. He was made of the same substance as the Scripture declares. He was in the express image of His Father's person. He was in the form of God. So God had a form. They were alike.

You quote that Scripture which says, "If you see me, you see the Father." I understand that to be used simply in this sense: There is a perfect resemblance between God the Son and God the Father.

I had a pair of twin sisters, Mary and Martha - Mrs. Andrews and Mrs. Washburn. When they were little children, there was not one in forty who could tell them apart. Suppose Mary had been in some place and

said to her: "I wish I did know how your sister looked?" "Why," she says, "you see me, you see my sister, because there is a perfect resemblance."

Christ says, in another place, "My Father is greater than I," which shows that they were distinct persons. And yet he said this also, "If you see me you see the Father," in that sense, and only in that sense, as I understand it, because if there is anything in this world made plain in the Bible it is that the Son and the Father are separate and distinct persons.

In the 7th of Daniel you read that one like the son of man was brought before the Ancient of Days, and a kingdom and dominion was given unto him. That is not yet fulfilled, but soon will be, when the kingdoms of this earth become the kingdoms of our Lord Jesus Christ, and He comes to dispossess His enemies of it, one of the things we as Seventh-Day Adventists are looking for. They are perfectly distinct; and yet, in a certain sense, the body of the Godhead was dwelling in the body of His Son, because he was made, in some way inexplicable, from His substance.

So your logic in regard to Christ here upon the earth, and the Father being with Him, in a certain sense does not apply to the human family. There is a great difference.

Again, there is a sense in which God and Christ dwell with every one of us. How so? Because the Spirit of God, the Comforter, is the gift of God to every believing child who will accept Him truly. That spirit cometh forth from the Father and the Son, and dwells in the Christian. That spirit witnesses with his spirit that he is a child of God. If a child with God, he is an heir with God, and a joint heir with Christ, to an inheritance incorruptible. That is a high honor God gives to those who accept him; believe in Him; partake of His Spirit, but that is not the case with everybody, by a long ways, Doctor, for the Scripture says, as Christ said to the Jews, "ye are of your father the devil." They were not even children of Abraham in the true sense, for the true child of Abraham does as Abraham did. That is the true doctrine, my Friend, which the Bible teaches, and which Seventh-Day Adventists have always held.

Now, you ask if God was present in the Tabernacle in the wilderness. He was present in this sense, and only in this sense: That the shekinah of glory was there. It appeared in the form of a pillar of cloud by day and a pillar of fire by night. That glory of God enshrouded that temple with such power that at times nobody could go into it and live. In that sense God dwelled there more or less according as they lived near to him or otherwise, during all the years, until that spirit took its flight. When Christ hung upon the cross, and said, "It is done?" the veil of the Temple was rent from the top to the bottom, ~~and~~ that great and wonderful rich curtain, showing that God had departed from that place. His representative had been there for a time, but had departed, and that temple was no more of God than any heathen temple was really, from that time on, though they came up and worshipped there, because God's presence had been there.

In reference to your text concerning Davids calling upon the Lord, and his answering by fire upon the altar of burnt offerings: His answering by fire from Heaven shows that God was up in Heaven, and the fire proceeded from his presence as it will proceed and consume this earth, but God was not in the fire.

Let me give you another Scripture, to balance that up: When Elijah stood upon Mt. Sânai, having fled away from the presence of Jezebel, he asked that he might die. The poor man was discouraged, as you and I get sometimes, Doctor. God saw fit to manifest Himself to him in a peculiar way. A terrible tornado of wind blew, but God was not in

wind. A fire swept by. It must have been of God's manufacture surely but he says God was not in the fire. And a terrible earthquake fell, but God was not in the earthquake either.

But, there was a still small voice, and when the Prophet heard that still small voice, he covered his face with reverence. You seem to be confused, and I am astonished that you are, Doctor, between the manifestations of the power of God in various ways, as He chooses to manifest Himself, calling that God Himself. It is strange to me that you do not see that plain distinction. I think your mind has become a little confused on that point.

Yes, and Solomon's prayer, and I was surprised that you should quote that! In that beautiful prayer which he offered at the dedication of the Temple, calling upon God to help the worshippers who should come to that temple and pray toward that temple, he says, "Hear thou from Heaven, from thy dwelling place." The very language shows where God was. He was up in Heaven, but He also had a representative here on the earth, the shekinah in the temple, which, when that temple was dedicated, was filled with the glory of God, showing God's acceptance of it, but that does not necessarily prove that God came down and got into it personally, by any means. Your quotation seems to me to prove just the opposite to what you quote it for. "But heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain thee." Now there is a thought that may seem to you to help your position, but it does not, to my mind. There is nothing surer than what the Bible says, which you believe, that God's habitation is in Heaven, and He dwells in a temple in Heaven; that He has a throne there; that the earthly sanctuary was made as a representation of that temple, in all its apartments. That temple is the place where God finally carries out the last great assize of the Judgment.

Gibbon, in speaking of the Roman Emperor, dwelling in Rome, writes: "my power reaching over the known earth, almost." He represents his power as being everywhere, all over that great empire, just as the Pope's power is reaching out into all the parts of the great dominion, working through agencies, not that he is personally everywhere, but his power and command affect all creation.

We use words in the same accommodating sense. We speak of the sun rising. Everybody speaks about it, and yet everybody knows that the sun does not rise, in the technical sense. The earth turns over. We speak of Mr. Vanderbilt, and the wonderful house he built in New York City, and yet I venture to say that he never put a brick in it, and never drove a nail in it. It might also be said of the architect that he built that house, and of the carpenters and brick layers that they built it. Everybody understands the meaning. I understand that in the sense that while God dwells in Heaven, his power extends all over His universe. That does not mean that God Himself is personally present all over His universe.

I could not help being a little amused, Doctor, when you presented before me that touching incident of the poor heathen from Calcutta, and your interview with him. I am so thankful you did talk with him, and use the best efforts at your command to make him see the true light. It seems you did not have much difficulty in making him see what you regard as the true light about the personal presence of God. I think, Doctor, in short, your position has gone over to his doctrines, instead of bringing him over to ours. That seems to be very easy for you, to fall in with the ideas that are taught by the Buddhists and the Brahmans, and by the heathen generally. That is rather a suspicious circumstance to me, Doctor.

Now, I do not know whether or not I have taken up every Scripture that you presented, but I have given you my idea in regard to their

ing, and think I am right.

My last letter, which I have not received an answer from yet, at which will probably come along in due season, was of a more general character. It related especially to the position which you seem to have settled down solidly upon. Hiley, I see, is settled upon it. All the medical fraternity are settled upon it.

In other words, you all stand on the idea that Sister White is wrong; that you do not accept her statements and Testimonies embracing a large part or all of her recent writings; that she is mistaken, and you are right. And yet you call yourselves believers in the Testimonies.

Now, Doctor, I love you, and always expect to. If you are lost at last, I expect to love you for the many precious qualities of mind and heart which you possess, but I feel just as certain that you are taking steps that will only result in - what shall I say? In drift. I presented those thoughts before you in that letter, and I reiterate them. You think you are settling down on a solid position. There is nothing solid in this world. It is about as solid a position as it would be to get a big man of war out in the ocean; furl its sails, and close down its engines, and say, we are going to stay in a stable condition. Would they? You know better. In a day they would perhaps be scores of miles away from where they were. Why? Because there is a power underneath them that will carry them hither and yon. I tell you that power of drift is a mighty thing. You may set down your stakes and hold fast to your doctrines, but you will find, in the outcome, that you are getting further and further away from this body.

You say you are right, and your positions are right and you are all going to hold to them. You will lose ground in a way that you do not dream of. That is just the way I view it, Doctor, and it makes me feel awful sad when I say it. And to see my own flesh and blood doing the same thing, dear Hiland; I love him as I do my life. He is a noble boy, but I tell you he is losing spirituality. No man in this Cause believing as he is believing, and as you have believed, can take your stand right against what the Testimonies say and maintain your spirituality. You think you can, and D. M. Canright thought he could; and Snook and Brinkerhoof were sure they could. They were going to have the loud cry in a little while, if they could only get rid of the visions, but they were in Unaversalism in a little while. Poor Canright, where is he? If ever I pitied a man, I do him. He looks to me like a poor, seedy, used up old man, and yet I thought he was going to do grand missionary work.

And, Doctor Kellogg, you are a dear man, but if you take that same position he did, you will find yourself in the same boat after a while. Oh! I feel so sorry; so sorry that I cannot express it. I shall love you, and shall continue writing to you; I shall be a friend to you. You have asked me to write; you have really forced me into making these statements. I am not conscious of having said an unkind word, but have told you just how things really look to me. I have tried to meet some of those points you think you are right upon, but which I think are a great error. You cannot say that I have not. I believe I have done it successfully.

Because of the prosperity of the Sanitarium, you feel that you have a great work, and are going to carry it on. The whole Jewish nation, with several millions every year going up to their feasts, felt that their work was all right; they were going to carry that on, and they did carry it on. But they did not come out any better because they carried it on, and thought they were all right. There was another truth they despised and rejected. They seemed to have prosperity and power, but Gamaliel told them some truth when he said, "If this thing is of God, they cannot overthrow it."

We are standing on the Testimonies of God, which have been in existence ever since this Cause commenced. You are taking your stand against them, Doctor, whether you realize it or not, and it will not be sufficient for you to believe that they have been all right, but that now Sister White is mistaken.

I read your nice little piece of poetry. It is very nice, and very pretty, but there are, in my judgment, some errors in it. I will not stop to tell you what they are.

Doctor Hayward is doing very well. I suppose he believes your positions. He does not have much to say about it, and I do not bother him with it. I should not to you if you did not draw me out on it, and call upon me to speak out. So I have spoken out.

I did not suppose Hiley really meant what he said. I thought he was trying to tantalize me a little, as you express it. This good Brother of whom you speak, A. R. Henry, and several others, have not, as you say, any religious life. They did have once. They took pretty nearly the same ground you are taking in regard to the Testimonies some time ago. They are there, and if you do not look out, you will find yourself in the same position.

I think poor Brother Henry will very likely come to an awful end. That awful temper which he is now exercising upon you as he did on some of our leading men in the Cause while connected with the Review Office, will doubtless be very detrimental to his best good. I doubt not he did take twenty thousand dollars, or more than that, right out of the Review Office. It was a wicked thing to do. Now, because some of you have offended him, and because you did not support his son, etc., as Hiley told me all about it up at the Fair, you are coming into some of the same thing.

I greatly fear the man will go distracted bye and bye, or something will happen to him, because he is on the wrong track, and a lot more of them are there in Battle Creek.

Now, you can rely upon the friendship, the love and esteem of Brother Haskell and myself. We do love you dearly, both of us. We do greatly desire your salvation, but we feel sure you are wrong in some of the positions you are taking.

I am pained to see you throw out little feelers concerning Willie, Sister White, and all that. Doctor, it is not worthy of you to talk that way. I heard when I was up to Battle Creek, rolling through the air, "Oh, that is Willie's testimony." Such things as those, I believe, dear Doctor, are unbecoming, whoever they are derived from. I do not know as it was you that said it. Perhaps it was; I cannot tell, but they are not conducive to spirituality in one's own soul, or a benefit to others.

My dear, dear friend, think of these things I have said. Think them over in the fear of God. It does seem to me that they are the truth. At any rate, I expect to stand on them as long as I live. I always have stood on them. It is the doctrine of the body. It is the doctrine the Testimonies teach.

You attach a meaning to some Scriptures, and I think some Testimonies of Sister White's which she never would admit for a moment she ever meant. When error is laid along side of truth, there is a line of demarkation where the two come very close together, and it is a very easy thing to get over a little on the wrong side, and hardly know it. There is where, as I view it, your danger commenced. You are a man of great versatility; of great powers of mind, and great knowledge of argument, but your positions are wrong. So good bye for this time, my dear brother. I love and shall pray for you, but regard you as standing upon dangerous ground. May the Lord help us to live where we can meet His approbation and be saved together in His Kingdom.