

Ellen White Condemns Trinitarian Reasoning

by Terry Hill

Part A: The early 1900's crisis	Page 2
Part B: Ellen White's testimony regarding Kellogg's beliefs	Page 4
Part C: Divine counsel ignored	Page 8
Part D: The official beliefs of Seventh-day Adventists	Page 10
Part E: The trail of the serpent	Page 12

Ellen G. White

Testimonies Volume 8 page 279, 'The Essential Knowledge', 1904

"The revelation of Himself that God has given in His word is for our study. This we may seek to understand. But beyond this we are not to penetrate. The highest intellect may tax itself until it is wearied out in conjectures regarding the nature of God; but the effort will be fruitless. This problem has not been given us to solve. No human mind can comprehend God. Let not finite man attempt to interpret Him. Let none indulge in speculation regarding His nature. Here silence is eloquence. The Omniscient One is above discussion."

First published 26th April 2020
Last edited 18th January 2021

Website: <https://theprophetstillspeaks.co.uk>

Part A: The early 1900's crisis

Between 1903 and 1913, Ellen White published a series of pamphlets known as *Special Testimonies, Series B*. This series was given the title of *Testimonies for the Church Containing Messages of Warning and Instruction to Seventh-day Adventists Regarding Dangers Connected with the Medical Missionary Work*. In one of these articles she penned what has now become a very well-known statement.

“There are three living persons of the heavenly trio; in the name of these three great powers—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit—those who receive Christ by living faith are baptized, and these powers will co-operate with the obedient subjects of heaven in their efforts to live the new life in Christ....”
(*Ellen G. White, Special Testimonies Series B, No 7, page 63, 'Come out and be separate'*)

Understandably, trinitarian SDA's use this statement to uphold the belief that (a) Ellen White was supporting the trinity doctrine, and (b) that she was a trinitarian. Is this true though? Was she a trinitarian – and was she promoting a belief in the trinity doctrine?

If we are to answer these questions intelligently, we need more than just a superficial understanding of her words. We need a background knowledge (a context). We need to understand *why* she wrote these testimonies. When this is understood, a clearer picture will be seen of her purpose in making the above statement.

The early 1900's was a time of very serious crisis within the SDA Church. This came about when John Harvey Kellogg, the church's chief physician (also a very influential person), published a book called *The Living Temple*. Ellen White condemned what Kellogg was teaching in his book. This was particularly concerning the personality of God. It was this book, along with Kellogg's influence, that led to her issuing, in 1906, what is known as Testimonies Series B No. 7. As Arthur L. White, Ellen White's grandson, explains

“Its fourteen articles dealt with the very serious situation existing in Battle Creek, and sounded a warning to those who might contemplate placing themselves under those influences, or following in the lead of the medical superintendent who had departed from the way of the Lord. A thousand copies were printed and the tract was used judiciously where there seemed to be a need for it.” (*Arthur L. White, Special Testimonies Series B, Series B No. 7*)

Kellogg taught that God, apart from being everywhere, was personally present in the things of nature. He even claimed that Ellen White believed the same. Both these claims brought about a great deal of condemnation from Ellen White. Kellogg was

not teaching pantheism, but it was akin to it. He was making God appear to be a non-entity.

The same year that Kellogg's book was published, Ellen White wrote a letter to the teachers at Emmanuel Missionary College. She warned them about what Kellogg was teaching.

“Perilous times are before us. Every one who has a knowledge of the truth should awake, and place himself, body, soul, and spirit, under the discipline of God. Wake up, brethren, wake up. The enemy is on our track. We must be wide awake, on our guard against him. We must put on the whole armor of God. We must follow the directions given in the spirit of prophecy. We must love and obey the truth for this time. This will save us from accepting strong delusions. God has spoken to us through his Word. He has spoken to us through the Testimonies to the church, and through the books that have helped to make plain our present duty and the position that we should now occupy. The warnings that have been given, line upon line, precept upon precept, should be heeded. If we disregard them, what excuse shall we offer?” (*Ellen G. White Letter 212 1903 to the Teachers at Emmanuel Missionary College, September 23rd 1903, 'A Warning of Danger'*)

What excuse indeed? Here we are told that for our own sakes (to save us accepting “strong delusions”) we need to heed the Scriptures, also God's testimonies to the church. She continued

“The new theories in regard to God and Christ, as brought out in "The Living Temple", are not in harmony with the teaching of Christ. The Lord Jesus came to this world to represent the Father. He did not represent God as an essence pervading nature, but as a personal being. Christians should bear in mind that God has a personality as verily as has Christ.” (*Ibid*)

Notice that Ellen White makes a clear distinction between God and Christ. She says they are two distinct personal beings. Interestingly, she said nothing about the Holy Spirit.

In attempting to justify himself for his views of God (as written in his book), Kellogg said he had come to believe in the trinity. We are aware of this because of a conversation that took place, in 1903, between himself and A. G. Daniells. Consequently, Daniells, who was then the General Conference President, relayed this conversation to Willie White (Ellen White's son).

In a letter, Daniells explained to Willie White what Kellogg had told him. After saying that Kellogg had claimed to be in harmony with the Testimonies, also in harmony with that which Alonzo Jones and Ellet Waggoner taught (although Kellogg said he personally believed that none of them had expressed the matter correctly), Daniells told Willie White

“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.” (*A. G. Daniells, letter to W. C. White, October 29th 1903*)

Up to this time, Kellogg had been a non-trinitarian (his former view). Along with other leading SDA's, he had even spoken out against the trinity doctrine. Now though, in 1903, he was confessing that “within a short time he had come to believe in the trinity”. This allowed him to believe, at least according to his own reasoning, that it was the Holy Ghost (the Holy Spirit), not the Father, that “filled all space and every living thing”.

The belief generally held by SDA's was that the Holy Spirit is the presence and the power of God. In keeping with Scripture, also the spirit of prophecy, they believed this to be the omnipresence of the Father and the Son (see John 14:18, 23). They did not regard the Holy Spirit as a divine being who existed separately from God. This was even though Ellen White had said that the Holy Spirit is a person. As G. I. Butler explained to Kellogg in a letter

“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*)

Butler, then president of the Southern Union Conference, had two tenures as General Conference President. His view of the Holy Spirit was standard amongst SDA's. In complete contrast to this view, Kellogg, in his new-found understanding of ‘the trinity’, had managed to separate the Holy Spirit from the Father (see Daniells' remarks above). It seems that Kellogg now viewed the Holy Spirit as a divine being in His own right.

The terminologies Kellogg is said to have used are trinitarian terminologies (God the Son and God the Holy Ghost). No such terminologies exist in Scripture or in the writings of Ellen White.

Part B: Ellen White's testimony regarding Kellogg's beliefs

In *Special Testimonies Series B, No 7, Come out and be Separate* (this is where it says there are “three living persons of the heavenly trio”), Ellen White, in condemning Kellogg’s beliefs, quoted from what was then a very popular book. In fact it was a was a major international success. It was called *The Higher Christian Life*. It had been written by the Rev William Boardman (1810-1886). He had ministered in the Presbyterian and Congregational churches. It is said that Boardman’s book was the inspiration for the ‘Holy Living’ evangelical conventions that began their life at Keswick (UK) in 1875. These conventions continue to be held there today.

In his book, Boardman had given support to the trinity doctrine. In so doing, he had used the type of three-in-one illustrations that trinitarians use to describe God as depicted by the trinity doctrine. As we shall now see, not only did Ellen White quote these illustrations, but she also condemned them, as she did all such representations.

First though, before we see how she accomplished this, it is important to note that in this same testimony, she said that SDA ministers were being drawn in by, also deceived by, Kellogg’s “science” - which according to her, he was employing to “create a division between the medical work and the ministry of the word”. She then wrote

“This large work and its sure results are plainly presented to me. I am so sorry that sensible men do not discern the trail of the serpent. I call it thus; for thus the Lord pronounces it. Wherein are those who are designated as departing from the faith and giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils, departing from the faith which they have held sacred for the past fifty years? I leave that for the ones to answer who sustain those who develop such acuteness in their plans for spoiling and hindering the work of God.” (*Ellen G. White, Special Testimonies Series B, No 7, page 63, ‘Come out and be separate’*)

Notice Ellen White said that God had shown her that Kellogg’s work, also “its sure results”, was “the trail of the serpent”, also that she was so sorry that “sensible men” could not discern it. Notice too she said that those who were following Kellogg were “departing from the faith and giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils”, also that these people were departing from the faith that SDA’s had “held sacred for the past fifty years”. Ellen White therefore did not see anything wrong with what SDA’s were then teaching. What she did see was wrong, was that SDA’s were departing from their denominational faith. This concerned her more than anything else. She believed it to be a God-given faith.

It was shortly following this that Ellen White quoted Boardman’s three-in-one illustrations. She began by saying

“I am instructed to say, The sentiments of those who are searching for advanced scientific ideas are not to be trusted.” (*Ibid*)

This is very important. Ellen White is saying here that what she was about to write was not her message but God’s message. She was simply the messenger. She refers to “advanced scientific ideas”. Remember she said it was Kellogg’s “science” (see above) that was causing division in the church. She continued (quoting the three-in-one illustrations from Boardman’s book)

“Such representations as the following are made: “The Father is as the light invisible; the Son is as the light embodied; the Spirit is the light shed abroad.” “The Father is like the dew, invisible vapor; the Son is like the dew gathered in beauteous form; the Spirit is like the dew fallen to the seat of life.” Another representation: “The Father is like the invisible vapor; the Son is like the leaden cloud; the Spirit is rain fallen and working in refreshing power.” (*Ibid*)

Trinitarians use this type of three-in-one illustrations (such as shell + albumen + yolk = 1 egg) to depict God as in the trinity doctrine.

Boardman, in his book, after listing these three-in-one illustrations, wrote the following

“These likenings are all imperfect. They rather hide than illustrate the tri-personality of the one God, for they are not persons but things, poor and earthly at best, to represent the living personalities of the living God. So much they may do, however, as to illustrate the official relations of each to the others and of each and all to us. And more. They may also illustrate the truth that all the fulness of Him who filleth all in all, dwells in each person of the Triune God.” (*Rev W. Boardman, The Higher Christian Life, page 105*)

Notice Boardman’s references to the “tri-personality of the one God” and “the Triune God”. Boardman was using these three-in-one illustrations to explain how the one God comprises three persons as depicted by the trinity doctrine. Ellen White wrote of these three-in-one illustrations

“All these spiritualistic representations are simply nothingness. They are imperfect, untrue. They weaken and diminish the Majesty which no earthly likeness can be compared to. God can not be compared with the things His hands have made. These are mere earthly things, suffering under the curse of God because of the sins of man. The Father can not be described by the things of earth.” (*Ellen G. White, Special Testimonies Series B, No 7, page 63, ‘Come out and be separate’*)

According to Ellen White, God condemns these three-in-one illustrations. She said

that they are not only untrue, but also that they weaken and diminish God's majesty. Unfortunately, in recent years, in order to describe how the Father, Son and Holy Spirit have their existence together as the one God, trinitarian SDA's have taken to using this type of illustration. This is in support of their Fundamental Belief No. 2 (The Trinity). We shall see this later.

Boardman freely admitted that these illustrations were imperfect, but he did say that they serve to depict the official relationship of each divine person to the other two. God obviously disagrees with him. Boardman followed on from these illustrations by saying (as quoted here)

“THE FATHER is ALL THE FULNESS OF THE GODHEAD INVISIBLE.

THE SON is ALL THE FULNESS OF THE GODHEAD MANIFESTED.

THE SPIRIT is ALL THE FULNESS OF THE GODHEAD MAKING MANIFEST.” (Rev. W. Boardman, *The Higher Christian Life*, page 105)

Ellen White elaborated on Boardman's words by writing

“The Father is all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, and is invisible to mortal sight.

The Son is all the fulness of the Godhead manifested. The Word of God declares Him to be “the express image of His person.” “God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” Here is shown the personality of the Father.”

The Comforter that Christ promised to send after He ascended to heaven, is the Spirit in all the fulness of the Godhead, making manifest the power of divine grace to all who receive and believe in Christ as a personal Saviour.” (Ellen G. White, *Special Testimonies Series B, No 7, page 63, ‘Come out and be Separate’*)

Notice Ellen White said that the Father is “all the fulness of the Godhead **bodily**”, the Son is “all the fulness of the Godhead **manifested**”, and that the Comforter “is the Spirit **in all the fulness** of the Godhead”. Notice too she did not say, as did Boardman, that the Father was “invisible” (see above). She said that the Father was “invisible to mortal sight”. This is saying two different things. Boardman continued by saying

“The persons are not mere offices, or modes of revelation, but living persons of the living God.” (Rev. W. Boardman, *The Higher Christian Life*, page 105)

This is trinitarianism. It goes further than saying there are three divine persons. It says that together they constitute the one “living God”.

It was at this point that Ellen White did something that is very important to note. Instead of saying, as did Boardman, that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit were “living persons of the living God”, which is a decidedly trinitarian statement, she wrote

“There are three living persons of the heavenly trio;” (*Ellen G. White, Special Testimonies Series B, No 7, page 63, ‘Come out and be separate’*)

Did you notice what Ellen White did? She deliberately removed from Boardman’s statement the trinitarian aspect of it. Instead of saying, as did Boardman, that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are “living persons of the living God” – which is trinitarianism - she wrote that there are “three living persons of the heavenly trio”. She deliberately removed the words “the living God” and replaced them with “heavenly trio”.

If Ellen White had been upholding and teaching the trinity doctrine, she could have quoted Boardman verbatim. Instead, she deliberately removed from his statement the very thing that had made it trinitarian. To those who are seeking the truth concerning the present trinity controversy within the SDA Church, this should be of paramount importance.

It must be remembered that Kellogg – the person whom this testimony concerned - confessed he had come to believe in ‘the trinity’ (at least his understanding of it). We must also remember that in this testimony condemning Kellogg’s views of God, Ellen White purposely quoted three-in-one illustrations from a book that was upholding the trinity doctrine – and then condemned them. This should tell us that Ellen White, although not using the word ‘trinity’, was condemning trinitarian reasoning. She condemned the idea that all three, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, constituted the one living God as depicted by these three-in-one illustrations.

Ellen White could not (as some have suggested) have simply been addressing Kellogg’s God in nature idea. If she had been, why quote the three-in-one trinity illustrations from Boardman’s book? These were illustrations that he had used in upholding the belief that the one God was a trinity of persons.

Part C: Divine counsel ignored

Enough has been said above to show that God condemned the type of illustration that makes Him appear to be three-in-one as professed by trinitarians. Yet as we shall now see, Seventh-day Adventists, in order to explain their understanding of God being a trinity of divine persons (as in their Fundamental Belief No. 2), have completely ignored this counsel. In the 2nd quarter’s Sabbath School lesson study of 2006 it said

“What analogies—such as a triangle or a three-pronged fork — can help someone understand the idea of how one God can be composed of three equal Persons? What other examples might help us better understand this deep truth?” (*The Seventh-day Adventist Lesson quarterly, 2nd quarter 2006 Sunday March 26th page 7*)

This is how SDA’s world-wide were taught to imagine God. It was like “a triangle or a three-pronged fork”. Note it says that the one God is said to be “composed of three equal Persons”. This is basic trinitarianism.

The next year, in an article called *A Picture of God*, Trudy Morgan-Cole wrote

“In an attempt to make it easier for us to understand, the Trinity has been compared to many things: a braided rope, a three leafed clover, even a banana!” (*Trudy Morgan-Cole, Signs of the Times April 2007, ‘A Picture of God’*)

The footnote at the end of the article says

“If you'll look at a slice of banana carefully, you'll see that it has three sections.” (*Ibid*)

God is like a banana? It is no wonder that God instructed Ellen White to condemn these three-in-one illustrations – and when you come to think about it, what would this trinity God look like anyway? Certainly not like us.

In the same year (2007), in the *Review*, which is the flagship journal of the SDA Church, Linda Mei Lin Koh wrote an article explaining how to put across the Fundamental Beliefs of the SDA Church to children. Regarding Fundamental Belief No. 2 (The Trinity) she explained

“If you're trying to explain the doctrine of the Trinity, show them an egg and ask them to break it open to look at its composition. Ask them, 'How many parts make up this egg?' Talk about the shell, the yolk, and the white and how they form one unit.

Or you may give children three colored strands of yarn—red, yellow, and blue. Ask them to braid them together. The three colors blend together to form a complete braid. Explain that the red piece of yarn is like God the Father, who loves us and forgives our sins; the yellow color is like God the Son, who created the world and died on the cross to save each one of us; and the blue is like God the Holy Spirit, who comforts us when we are discouraged and helps us enjoy a happy life by teaching us right from wrong. Three different strands,

but they work together as one whole.” (Linda Mei Lin Koh, *Adventist Review*, November 22nd 2007, ‘Growing God’s love in our children’ sub-title, ‘Kid-friendly ways to teach our fundamental beliefs’)

What sort of picture of God is this painting for children? It is certainly not depicting God as a personal being.

We can see from the above that the counsel, given to us by God, has been completely ignored. In our official publications, God, as a trinity of persons, has been likened to a three-pronged fork, a triangle, a banana, an egg, and strands of coloured yarn.

So what are SDA’s attempting to explain? We shall see this now.

Part D: The official beliefs of Seventh-day Adventists

In their official list of Fundamental Beliefs, Seventh-day Adventists have 4 beliefs that pertain to the Godhead. These are belief No’s. 2, 3, 4 and 5.

Belief No. 3 concerns the Father. Belief No. 4 concerns the Son, Belief No. 5 concerns the Holy Spirit. It follows therefore that if we find everything in the Bible concerning these three divine personalities, this can be placed under these three beliefs. When this is done, everything that the Bible says about the Father, Son and Holy Spirit will be contained within these three beliefs.

What then is belief No. 2 all about? It cannot be about the individual persons of the Godhead. This is because this covered under beliefs 3, 4 and 5. Belief No. 2 says

“2. The Trinity

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.) (*The 2015 SDA Church Manual, ‘Fundamental Beliefs of Seventh-day Adventists’, page 162*)

Notice here the *threeness* and the *oneness*. Without these two factors in place, there is no trinity doctrine.

This same trinity belief, by the theologians of the SDA Church, is explained this way (my emphasis in red)

“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, Andrews University, May 2015, page 3, ‘God in 3 Persons — in the New Testament’)

“There is only one God (Deut. 6:4), however, Father, Son and Holy Spirit are all called God (Matthew 27:46, John 20:28: Acts 5:3-4). Consequently, we do not worship three Gods, but one God who reveals Himself in and consists of three “persons”. The three persons share one indivisible nature. Each person of the Godhead is by nature and essence God, and the fullness of the deity dwells in each of them. On the other hand, each person of the Godhead is inseparably connected to the other two.” (Ekkehardt Mueller, Biblical Research Institute, Reflections newsletter, July 2008, Page 8, ‘Scripture Applied, - A Bible Study’)

“Trinitarianism is the orthodox belief that there is but one living and true God. Nevertheless this one God is a unity of three persons, who are of one substance, power and eternity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.” (Gerhard Pfandl, Associate Director, Seventh-day Adventist Biblical Research Institute, ‘The Doctrine of the Trinity among Adventists’, 1999)

“In Scripture God has revealed His transcendent nature as Trinity, namely three distinct divine Persons who act directly and historically in history and constituting the one divine Trinitarian being.” (Dr Fernando Canale, Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist Theology, SDA Bible Commentary series, Volume 12, page 138)

“The three persons of the Trinity, however, must be inclusive and not independent of one another. Because there is but one true God, by nature we have to conclude that He is plural as to persons but single as to substance.” (Max Hatton, Understanding the Trinity’, page 20, 2001)

“Therefore, we must confess that the Trinity is one indivisible God and that the distinctions of the persons do not destroy the divine unity. This unity of God is expressed by saying that he is one substance. Nevertheless, in the divine unity there are three co-eternal and co-equal persons, who, though distinct, are the One undivided and adorable God. This is the doctrine of Scripture.” (Raoul Dederen, Reflections on the Doctrine of the Trinity, page 16, Andrews University Seminar Studies)

Notice in each of these statements the *threeness* and the *oneness*. Notice too it says that “each person of the Godhead is inseparably connected to the other two” (Mueller). This is crucial (pivotal) to trinitarianism.

It is this metaphysical (ontological) ‘oneness’ that makes the teaching of a tri-personal Godhead trinitarian. Without it there would not be a trinity doctrine. In this

sense (the ontological oneness), the SDA version of the trinity doctrine is in harmony with the orthodox trinity doctrine held by the Roman Catholic Church, also as held by much of Protestantism. As the *Catechism of the Roman Catholic Church* renders it

“266 "Now this is the Catholic faith: **We worship one God in the Trinity and the Trinity in unity, without either confusing the persons or dividing the substance;** for the person of the Father is one, the Son's is another, the Holy Spirit's another; but the Godhead of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit is one, their glory equal, their majesty coeternal" (Athanasian Creed: DS 75; ND 16).

267 **Inseparable in what they are, the divine persons are also inseparable in what they do.**" (*Catechism of the Roman Catholic Church, Profession of Faith, No.'s 266 & 267*)

This is no different than the SDA trinity doctrine. In this respect (how the three divine personalities constitute the one God) it is identical. As already noted, without this type of *oneness* there is no trinity doctrine.

Whilst it would be too much to go into here, trinitarian reasoning (as above), denies that a divine person died at Calvary. It also denies that in the making of the decision for the divine Son of God to become incarnate, a risk was taken concerning His eternal existence. This is because together they comprise the one God, therefore none of the three, under any circumstances, can ever become separated from each other. Ellen White repudiated this idea. This would be another reason why she did not agree with orthodox trinitarian reasoning. She firmly believed that the divine person of the Son of God did die at Calvary, also that there was a risk of Him losing His eternal existence. This can be seen at the following two links

[Ellen White's comments concerning the incarnation and the death at Calvary of the divine Son of God](#)

[Ellen White's comments on the incarnation of Christ and the risk taken concerning His existence](#)

Part E: The trail of the serpent

On the website of the SDA Biblical Research Institute (BRI), there is an article that is said to have been *Prepared for the dialogue with representatives of the Roman Catholic Church*. It was written by George Reid, then Director of the Institute (1984-2001). After detailing our beliefs, Reid then says (with respect to the doctrine of God)

“A reading of the above statements will show that with respect to their doctrine of God Seventh-day Adventists are in harmony with the great credal

statements of Christendom, including the Apostles' Creed, Nicea 325), and the additional definition of faith concerning the Holy Spirit as reached in Constantinople (381).” (George Reid, *Seventh-day Adventists: A Brief Introduction to their Beliefs*, 2000, https://adventistbiblicalresearch.org/sites/default/files/pdf/adventist%20beliefs_0.pdf)

It was at the Council of Nicaea in AD 325 that the basis of the orthodox (traditional) trinity doctrine was formulated. This is when it was deemed that God and Christ were of the one and the same substance. Fifty-six years later in AD 381 at the Council of Constantinople, the Holy Spirit was also included in this one substance – hence the trinity doctrine was ‘officially’ formulated. The Roman Catholic Church revere these councils.

Notice that this document, written by the Director of the BRI, was said to have been prepared for “the Dialogue” with the Roman Catholic Church. This sounds like a specific dialogue. George Reid appears to be saying that regarding the ecumenical councils that formulated this one substance idea, we, as SDA’s, are now in harmony with them – as is the Roman Catholic Church. How else can this be interpreted?

This is where the trinity doctrine has eventually led us. We are now able to ‘dialogue’ with the Roman Catholic Church. Before we accepted the trinity doctrine, we could not. This all began with Kellogg. It is an integral part what Ellen White referred to as “the trail of the serpent” (see page 5).

“The Lord has pronounced a curse upon those who take from or add to the Scriptures. The great I AM has decided what shall constitute the rule of faith and doctrine, and he has designed that the Bible shall be a household book. The church that holds to the word of God is irreconcilably separated from Rome. Protestants were once thus apart from this great church of apostasy, but they have approached more nearly to her, and are still in the path of reconciliation to the Church of Rome. Rome never changes. Her principles have not altered in the least. She has not lessened the breach between herself and Protestants; they have done all the advancing. But what does this argue for the Protestantism of this day? It is the rejection of Bible truth which makes men approach to infidelity. It is a backsliding church that lessens the distance between itself and the Papacy.” (Ellen G. White, *Signs of the Times*, February 19th 1894, ‘Romanism the Religion of Human Nature’)

End of article