

(COPY of communication written by Elder W.W.Prescott to Dr. J.H. Kellogg.)

222 N. Capitol St., Washington, D.C.,

June 9, 1904.

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

Dear Brother:---

In harmony with your request and my promise to write you concerning your new book, "The Miracle of Life," I will submit the following for your consideration:

I shall make no attempt to review those portions of the book which deal purely with physiology and hygiene, as these are not the subjects which have caused difference of opinion concerning the correctness of ~~me~~ your teaching.

It may appear to you that my suggestions are destructive rather than constructive, but I suppose that your real purpose in asking me to say anything about the book was to learn what objections, if any, I had to the teaching contained in it.

You will remember that one of my criticisms on "The Living Miracle" touched upon your use of the word "miracle" as applied to the ~~work~~ regular working of God's power. I find that the same thing is emphasized in this book, both in the title and in the sentences as may be found on pages 33, 34, 77, 88, and 91. The logical conclusion from this application of the word "miracle" would be, that the ~~work~~ work wrought by Jesus when He was here on the Earth were in no sense different from the work which ~~we~~ we wrought about us in daily life. The habitual use

of the word "miracle" in this way prepares the mind for the arguments and conclusions of those theologians who are now denying the miracles of both the Old and the New Testaments. If this interpretation and application of the word "miracle" is correct, I see no force to the scripture found in John 20:30,31.

You will also recall that a fundamental objection which I raised against the teaching of "The Living Temple" was that it regarded the body of every man as a temple of the Holy Ghost, or a temple of the living God, regardless of any personal faith in Christ, thus breaking down the distinction between the believer and the unbeliever. The proofs adduced as supporting this misinterpretation are the wonderful intelligence displayed in the adaptation of all the organs of the body for the uses which they serve, and the constant working of a power in digestion and circulation of the blood, etc.

I have already called your attention to the fact that this line of argument proves just as conclusively that any other member of the animal kingdom, such as the horse, the cow or the dog, is a temple of the living God, inasmuch as there is the same wonderful adaptation of part to part and the same working of power in digestion, circulation of the blood, etc. There must be something faulty in an argument which leads to this conclusion.

There are numerous places in the Bible where the word "temple" is used as applied to the body, but I call attention to the following instances where it is either openly affirmed or implied that every man is a temple of the living God: Psalm 134, 136, 137, 138, 139, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200. Using the expression indiscriminately of the soldiers in an army, "every man a temple of the living God," would seem to me to be a clear case of mistaking the difference between the holy and profane." This general idea

throughout the book, and appears in different places, although it is not made so prominent in certain terms as it was in "The Living Temple."

There is in the book what seems to me to be an unwarranted use of scripture quotations. There is an interpretation placed upon scripture, either in expressed terms or by implication, which appears to me to be entirely different from that intended by the writers. Examples of this may be found on pages 110, 326, 340.

I find in the book what is to me sufficient evidence of a pantheistic tendency in its teaching. Although it protests against pantheism and claims to offer an antidote for this false doctrine, yet there is a general tendency which manifests itself clearly in numerous passages to present God as a universal presence in "everywhere, all-pervading intelligence," which, in view of the fact that the writers by whom it is not believed in a personal God, certainly gives a basis for interpreting your teaching as involving a pantheistic conception of God. I call your attention to the following passages:---

- Page 10: "The one, all-pervading, all-creating, all-sustaining God."
- Page 20: "The universal presence."
- Page 239: "An ever-present intelligence."
- Page 280: "Actual presence and constant indwelling in every cell and every organ of the human frame."
- Page 294: "A divine, ever-present, all-pervading intelligence."
- Page 341: "A grander, all-pervading, all-creating, all-sustaining God."
- Page 371: "There is simply a philosophical name for God."

It is such treatment of the subject as is indicated by these passages, and others where the same general idea is in the undercurrent, which gives a wrong turn to the quotations made from Sister White's writings at the beginning of the book. You can not find in her own writings any such interpretation given to these principles.

This same pantheistic tendency is also revealed in your treatment of the question of flesh-eating, on pages 134--139, and in your claim of "the universal unity of being." (Page 439.) It is upon this very assumption of the universal unity of being that the teachers of pantheism and spiritualism base their argument, and in the instances to which I have referred it seems to me that you have gone over the border-line into their field.

On page 44 you offer an antidote for pantheistic and material philosophy, but your antidote corresponds so closely to the fundamental principles from which pantheistic teachers derive their arguments, that I fear it will not serve its intended purpose.

Your proposed definitions of God, as on page 333 and page 471, are given in such terms as to open the way for the same conception of God as is the basis of pantheistic teaching. Such a statement as is found on page 423: "The sunshine is heaven's light and life and glory, the true Mikinah, the real presence with which the temple needs most to be filled," tends in this same direction. This tendency is explained by such an interpretation of the action of the light as (Page 44) "The light does not simply fall upon the tree--it enters the tree, it becomes a part of the tree." Putting these two together the conclusion is plain, according to your teaching, that "the true Mikinah, the real presence" is found in the tree as well as in man.

But this is pantheistic teaching.

It is the constant emphasis placed upon, and the frequent repetition of, the idea of the all-pervading, ever-present intelligence or power, which over shadows the idea of God as a personal being, and changes the scriptural teaching of the omnipresence of God into a false argument in favor of a pantheistic conception of God.

There is a use of scripture terms in the book which is, to say the least, very loose, and which opens the way for a wrong conclusion. An example of this is found on page 442: "The Spirit of truth, which created man, which dwells in him." According to scripture the Spirit of truth, the Comforter, is the special gift of God to believers through the ministry of Christ, the High Priest, in the heavenly sanctuary. Your use of the term recognizes no distinction between believer and unbeliever, and makes the Spirit of truth an indwelling presence in all men.

There are other points in the book to which I could be compelled to draw attention, but I have certainly said enough. In my first reading of the book, before our recent interview at Bible Week, it seemed perfectly clear to me that you had not made any change in your views on this whole subject since the publication of "The Living Temple," as I recognized the same philosophy running through it. I was, of course, confirmed in this view by your statement to me in our interview, that you had not changed your opinions in the least since you wrote "The Living Temple."

It is very likely that the Editors will on my part be glad to publish your book and other articles,--giving no consideration to your efforts to convince me that the book was tabular--and without recognition of any good in the book; but as I stated in the first, I understood your desire to remove objections to your teaching, if I had any, rather than to secure any amount of approval for those portions of the book which deal with the physiology of physiology and hygiene.

Being compelled with your request according to my best judgment, I can only leave the matter for your consideration.

(Signed) W.W.PRESBURY.