

November 13, 2006
Elder Jud Lake
Professor of Preaching and Adventist Studies
Southern Adventist University

Dear Elder Lake,

Several people have sent emails asking me to listen and respond to your presentation given at the Ellen White Summit 2005 held on November 11 to 12 at the Gladstone Conference Center in Oregon. I have now listened to it twice and am very saddened by your presentation. After prayer and counsel with other believers I feel it now my duty to respond. You stated several times “that Dale Ratzlaff is the fountain head of all the critics” and so if I am the “fountain head” I should probably be the one to respond.

As your presentation was given in a public setting and is posted on the Internet at <http://ellenwhitesummit.foxyresearch.com/> and in your presentation you stated that you receive and read *Proclamation!* I decided that this would be an acceptable venue of response.

I appreciated your counsel to the Adventists in your audience that they should never attack the character of the critics of Ellen G. White, rather Adventists should respond to the issues. I also commend your instruction to them to “never be afraid of open, honest investigation of the writings of Ellen White.” I heartily agree with this statement, and it is upon this foundation that I write.

There were a number of statements and inferences made in your presentation that I felt were misleading. Since I have never met you personally, I will not assume ill-intent in your characterizing me and all the critics of Ellen White as being “burned, mad, relentless, lashing-back and ferocious.” You also stated that the critics of Ellen White—again with a broad brush—(1) have a wrong view of inspiration; (2) ignore the historical context; (3) use fallacious logic; (4) ignore books that uplift Christ; (5) don’t engage the Adventist apologetic books and (6) are dysfunctional with the writings of Ellen White. I did note, however, that you rightly stated that as former Adventist pastors, we used the principles of interpretation we learned in our Adventist schooling and in our reading of Ellen White as we studied our way out of Adventism.

The thing that saddened me the most was that you stated that I and the other critics of Ellen White set out in our study with the goal of proving Ellen White wrong, as if we started with a hatred of her writings. While I cannot speak for all the critics of Ellen White, I know for certain that was not the case with me and also several others. I loved her writings, as my students will attest. Neither do I feel I had a dysfunctional relationship with them. I read them regularly, appreciated them, memorized them, tried to live by their counsel—and yes, read all, or nearly all, of her published works, studied the historical context, and was a strong supporter of Ellen White and her role in the Adventist church.

Another thing that saddened me was your comment about my mention of the Ellen White “tapes that played in my head”. You set these statements in a false context, implying that these “tapes” were quotations of Ellen White that were pointing out open sin in my life—implying that I was harboring known sin that needed to be confessed to Christ—and this is what prompted my statements. I have written four books and numerous articles since leaving the Adventist church, so I do not know the exact context to which you referred in your mention of the “tapes”. However, I wish to clarify that I have used this analogy in two ways: First, I mentioned the “pesky tapes” of Ellen White that played in my head in my latest book, *Adventist to Christian*. The tapes I had reference to were the many statements of Ellen White like the following: “It is

Satan's plan to weaken the faith of God's people in the *Testimonies*. Next follows skepticism in regard to the vital points of our faith, the pillars of our position, then doubt as to the Holy Scriptures, and then the downward march to perdition. When the *Testimonies*, which were once believed, are doubted and given up, Satan knows the deceived ones will not stop at this; and he redoubles his efforts till he launches them into open rebellion, which becomes incurable and ends in destruction."¹ "If you lose confidence in the testimonies you will drift away from Bible truth."² I, and hundreds of thousands of other Adventists who left Adventism, have had to come to grips with these statements. If they are true then those of us who have left Adventism have left salvation. Thankfully, biblical truth and history have proved all such statements to be nothing more than cultic lies. When plagued by these "pesky EGW tapes" one can change channels to the Word of God where the simple gospel of faith in Christ plays the gospel song of good news: "Therefore, having been justified by faith we have peace with God." Rom. 5:1 "He who believes has (present continuous tense in Greek) eternal life" Jn. 6:47. "Truly, truly, I say to you, he who hears My word, and believes Him who sent Me, has eternal life, and does not come into judgment, but has passed out of death into life" Jn. 5:24.

The second way I have referenced these Ellen White "tapes" is in connection with her statements placing her readers under heavy loads of "*false* guilt". Here I am listing only a short summary of this tape set: "It is a sin to forget, a sin to be negligent." "It is a sin to eat between meals;" "cheese is wholly unfit for food." She said that displaying photographs of family pictures was "a species of idolatry." If you let your children play out of doors "upon the Sabbath God looks upon you as Sabbath-breakers." "Upon the purification of our character rests our only hope of eternal life."³

Those of us who have left Adventism for theological reasons, with few exceptions, have found a closer relationship with Christ, a new hunger for the Word of God and yes, most (not all) of us have a more conservative, "higher" view of inspiration. We don't have to pull down the Bible in order to build up Ellen White.

As you stated in your presentation, one should never be afraid of honest investigation of the writings of Ellen White. Most of us "critics", as you call us, have given years of thorough and prayerful study to the writings of Ellen White, and while there are good things therein, there is enough basic error, self-contradiction, disagreement with Scripture and anti-gospel statements that we must in good conscious remove these writings "as a continuing and authoritative *source* of truth" in our walk with God. As Protestants we adhere to the Bible and the Bible only as our source of truth.

When I was an Adventist pastor and Bible teacher I always (with a few possible exceptions) consulted the writings of Ellen White in my study before preaching a sermon, teaching a Bible class or Sabbath School lesson. I left the Adventist church because I could no longer in clear conscience teach Adventism's anti-gospel, 1844 sanctuary theology. After extensive study I knew Ellen White was wrong on this central doctrine, but I still valued her comments on other topics. When starting a new church I made a commitment that I would teach from the Bible and the Bible only. I made a promise to myself that I would not look at the writings of Ellen White for six months. I boxed up all her books—and I had most if not all her published writings—and put them in the garage. Many times in my study I wanted to refresh my mind on what Ellen White had to say on the topic at hand. However, I forced myself to stay with the Bible alone. An

¹ Ellen G. White, 4T 211

² Ellen G. White, 5T 98

³ See Ratzlaff, *The Cultic Cultic Doctrine of Seventh-day Adventists*, p. 229ff. for many more such statements.

amazing thing happened as I started *real* contextual, inductive Bible study and teaching. I began to see a new harmony in Scripture. I began to realize that often my previous Bible study was clouded by interpreting “the greater light” through the foggy lens of the “lesser light”. At the end of the six months I was in love with the Bible as never before. I began to realize that not only was Adventist’s 1844 sanctuary theology in error, but contextual study through the New Testament did not support several of the unique teachings of Adventism.

Since leaving Adventism I have made two profound conclusions. You, and perhaps some readers of *Proclamation!*, may find these very offensive, but I believe they are nevertheless patently true and are of utmost importance, and that is why I share them here:

One cannot understand the Bible correctly when continuing to read the writings of Ellen White. While an Adventist I would have reacted violently to this statement as some readers may now be doing! The concept is more easily acceptable, however, if applied to other religious groups. No Mormon will be able to understand the Bible correctly while continuing to read Joseph Smith’s *The Pearl of Great Price* and *Doctrine and Covenants*. No member of the Christian Science Church will be able to understand the Bible correctly while continuing to read Mary Baker Eddy’s *Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures*. No Jehovah’s Witness will understand the Bible correctly while continuing to read the *Watchtower*. All these groups would argue vehemently they were indeed interpreting the Bible correctly. In fact, they would say that their interpretation was the *only correct interpretation* and other churches were wrong. Why would this be? Because all these groups would be looking at the Scripture through the veil of their modern prophet or the official teachings of their organization. It is my settled conclusion that the same thing holds true in Adventism. The second weighty conclusion I reached is this:

Where the Bible is clear we can and should be certain. Where the Bible is unclear or honestly open to several interpretations we must be tentative. The recipe for cultic teaching is to find some obscure passage, define what that passage means, and then make that interpretation normative for others. For example, Mormons find in 1 Cor. 15:29 an elaborate theology of baptism for the dead. They go to great lengths in tracing their genealogies back as far as possible and then make sure they get baptized for their ancestors. However, other Bible scholars do not find this theology in this passage. Why can only the Mormons find it there? It is because Mormons read into the Bible the theology of their modern prophet. The same could be said for Jehovah’s Witnesses. Using some of the same prophecies early Adventists used, they, after several failed predictions and later reinterpretations, come up with an invisible second coming of Christ in 1914. Herein lies what I have concluded to be the fundamental error of Adventism. Early Adventist theology was built on obscure, apocalyptic, passages, and frequently even these were taken out of context. Ellen White said that Daniel 8:14 is the “central pillar of Adventism.” This text is, without question, one of the most obscure texts in the whole Bible. Like it or not, this is the foundation stone of Adventist teaching. Adventism’s 1844 Sanctuary theology is like an octopus with tentacles around and under nearly every unique teaching of Adventism⁴ as admitted by Adventist scholars.⁵ This tendency to find doctrinal “truth” in obscure apocalyptic passages continues to this day as seen in Adventism’s many “Revelation Seminars”, “Amazing Facts Seminars”, etc.

Most former Adventist pastors—at least the ones I know—have found that once they took the Bible as their only source of truth, they found a number of the unique teachings of Adventism

⁴ See *Cultic Doctrine*, p. 263–272

⁵ From a tape of Angel Rodriquez in a meeting for Adventist pastors held in Washington several years ago to discuss how to stop the influence of *Cultic Doctrine*.

fell away because they could not be supported in contextual Bible study. In other words we believe that historic Adventism stands or falls with the acceptance of the writings of Ellen White. It is my personal conclusion this is so, and that is the reason why the Adventist church is now promoting her writings with such vigor. Without her writings the church will unravel because it is not truly Bible based in its theology.

My study leads me to hold and defend a *few* foundational, Christ-centered truths that spring from clear, contextual, inductive study from the Gospels and Epistles. Then I leave room for private interpretation on peripheral issues.⁶ It is my settled conclusion that the gospel truth I teach today must be the *same* gospel truth taught by the Apostles of Christ as recorded in the New Testament⁷. To add or subtract from the New Testament Gospel is to move away from the truth as it was once and for all delivered to the saints.⁸

You mentioned Dirk Anderson and the web site, www.EllenWhite.org he developed. I felt your comments about him were not in harmony with the facts. Dirk was a strong supporter of Ellen White and used to pass out *Steps to Christ* and other books of Ellen White to his neighbors. When he started www.EllenWhite.org he upheld her writings as inspired of God. He and I exchanged emails a few times, and in so doing I began asking Dirk questions about some of Ellen White's statements. He agreed to read *Cultic Doctrine*. He followed your advice and was not afraid to consider her writings openly and honestly. He set out to show that the book was wrong and that I had taken things out of context. He later told me that he looked up *every EGW reference*—there are over 650 footnotes—and concluded I had not taken the statements out of context, and Ellen White was the one in error. He did not set out to prove Ellen White wrong as you accuse the critics of doing, and it was not his dysfunctional relationship to her writings that caused him to give them up. Rather it was his sincere, diligent and prayerful study that caused him to make the change.

I had to smile as you told Adventists to be sure and not send emails to me or write to *Proclamation!* as we might print their letters. You made it sound as if there was some evil in us for printing letters to the editor that were written by Adventists!

You mentioned that we critics do not engage the SDA apologists. I do not speak for all the critics but I owned and read many of the SDA apologist's books. I read the articles in *Ministry* and the *Review*, regarding the "issues" before I left the church. From my study, however, I found that often SDA apologists and administrators were not honest and objective in their comments. As you listen to *Adventist to Christian*, I name names and places where the duplicity of Adventist leaders was patently evident to me. Therefore, I decided that I should do my own research, look at the evidence myself and draw my own conclusions based upon the evidence and not how someone wanted to spin that evidence.

For example, I read as much as I could find on the "shut door". Yes, I read the statements that Ellen White later wrote stating that she with the others right after 1844 did believe in a shut door of mercy but that view was soon corrected in a "vision" she received. However, my research found that many in the "Advent band" or "Little Flock" as they called themselves, had given up the shut door of mercy and then were persuaded to *again* accept the shut door of mercy because of a vision of Ellen White supporting the shut door.⁹ These two statements stand in direct contradiction to each other. Which is correct? I found that when the early works of both

⁶ See Rom. 14.

⁷ 1 Cor. 15:1-5.

⁸ Jude 1:3.

⁹ See *Cultic Doctrine*, p. 115-134.

James and Ellen White were reprinted the statements supporting a shut door of mercy were left out. I was shocked to find that Ellen White's first vision clearly taught a shut door of mercy for all those who rejected Miller's message. I was also shocked to find out that these statements supporting the shut door were later edited out of this "vision" from the Lord. I encourage the readers to go to the following website and read for themselves these early statements and draw their own conclusion. Truth can stand the test of investigation. Error cannot.

<http://www.ellenwhite.org/egw2.htm#letter3>

You paint all Ellen White critics as "burned, mad, relentless, lashing-back and ferocious." I realize that castigating those who leave Adventism has been the norm in Adventist history. I noted that you even called Canright a "heretic" even though he continued to believe in Christ, the Bible and mainstream Christian doctrine. I know many of the so called "critics" and former SDA pastors and I can say that the ones I know are kind, honest, loving, and gentle and demonstrate that they have a personal relationship with the living Christ. I would encourage you and the readers to visit the 700 member Damascus Community Church in Damascus, Maryland and meet the kind Dr. Richard Fredericks. Visit the 1,000 member Grace Place in Berthoud, Colorado and meet Clay Peck who is leading his dynamic bible based church. Visit Dr. Jerry Gladson's, First Christian Church Disciples of Christ in Kennesaw, Georgia and experience his sweet spirit. Visit Greg Taylor's Hempfield Brothern Church in Williamsport, Maryland and greet this man of prayer and faith. Visit Mark Martin's 10,000 plus member Calvary Community Church, Phoenix, Arizona and meet Mark and get a sense of this healthy, dynamic church. Meet the soft-spoken and sincere Dirk Anderson, meet Richard and Colleen Tinker who have stepped out by faith, trusting God to supply their needs. Visit their website, <http://FormerAdventist.com> or better yet, visit their Former Adventist Fellowship that meets every Friday night at the Trinity Evangelical Free Church in Redlands, California. Yes, I hope when we meet that we will great each other as brothers in Christ.

It is my understanding that approximately 300,000 Adventists now leave the SDA church every year.¹⁰ There must be good reason why so many are choosing to leave what they have been taught to be the true "remnant church of Bible prophecy." Could it be that the extensive research that has been done on the writings of Ellen White, the dozens of available books that detail these findings, and the presence of many Internet sites allow members all over the world to do their own independent research?

As a book publisher, I have been surprised at how many former Seventh-day Adventists contact me wanting me to publish their books exposing the errors of Adventism. A number of new ones are in the pipeline. Why is this? People leave one Evangelical church and go to another church all the time. Few books are written against most Christian churches. Why are so many books printed and circulated against Adventists, Mormons and Jehovah's Witness? That Ellen White prophesied that many of Adventism's "brightest lights would go out" is not surprising. Could it be that the "brightest lights" knew the facts, wanted to be true to their consciences and were willing to sacrifice their reputation and livelihood in standing for truth? Have Adventists ever considered who is going to be left in the church after their "brightest lights" go out?

Could it be that the reason so many former Adventists feel a calling to expose the errors of Adventism is that they feel they were deceived, kept in the dark as to the real facts, told half-truths and often placed under heavy loads of *false* guilt? I was nearly through my Doctorate of Ministry work at Andrews University when I left. Why was I never told about Miller's "many

¹⁰ Based upon an average of the 1.5 million members who left between 2000 and 2005 as reported at the last General Conference.

lines of prophecy”, his 15 *utterly ridiculous* proofs that Christ would come in 1843, that Ellen White endorsed?¹¹ Why was I never told about the top secret committee that met for five years trying to solve Adventism’s 1844 Sanctuary theology, could not, disbanded and left no minutes proving there were no answers? Then, after the committee disbanded, the pastors were told to keep teaching the Sanctuary doctrine based upon “the traditional assumptions.”¹² Why did the church have to suppress some of the earliest writings of Ellen White? I later found out that many of my professors knew about these things but chose not to reveal them. I, and most former Adventists I know, thought our church was committed to truth and finding and supporting truth was the heartbeat of Adventism. To find that the church was more concerned about its image, preservation and keeping the status quo so there would not be a crisis of faith among the uninformed members came as a sad, disappointing—yes, even bitter pill for me to swallow.

As I read the teachings of Christ and the Apostles I find that truth is associated with light. “Then Jesus again spoke to them, saying, ‘I am the Light of the world; he who follows Me will not walk in the darkness, but will have the Light of life’” John 8:12. “I have come as Light into the world, so that everyone who believes in Me will not remain in darkness.” John 12:46

Why not open wide the dark vaults housing the early writings of Ellen White and other early Adventist writers to the light of investigation? Why is it that the work of Dr. Walter Rea who has spent more time researching the sources of Ellen White’s writings¹³ than any other person are simply brushed aside with a few negative remarks?

Yes, and why is it that the church continues to allow *The Clear Word* to be sold and now sells the *The Clear Word for Kids* knowing that there is *purposeful and blatant deception where the views of Ellen White and SDA theology are read right into the text without any manuscript evidence whatsoever?*¹⁴ How does the church expect intelligent, informed and honest people to go along with this kind of *purposeful deception*?

You mention how we critics first leave the 1844 Sanctuary doctrine, then “the Spirit of Prophecy” then we give up the Sabbath. Yes, that is what most of us have done. Why? Because we have found that these Adventist doctrines do not spring from contextual study of the Gospels

¹¹ See *Cultic Doctrine*, p. 51-81 or on the web at: <http://www.ellenwhite.org/egw11.htm>. Scroll down and click on “15 proofs” under point No. 4.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 195-199.

¹³ Dr. Walter Rea has found sources for almost every page of *The Great Controversy*, sometimes, every paragraph.

¹⁴ Here are just three examples. In Dan. 8:14 in *The New American Standard Bible* reads, “He said to me, ‘For 2,300 evenings and mornings; then the holy place will be properly restored.’” Now compare this to *The Clear Word Bible* (CWB). My copy does say “Bible” but I understand now it is just *The Clear Word*. “He said to him, ‘After two thousand three hundred prophetic days (or two thousand three hundred years), God will step in, proclaim the truth about Himself and restore the ministry of the Sanctuary in heaven to its rightful place. This is when the judgment will begin, of which the cleansing of the earthly sanctuary was a type.’” In Jn. 8:58. NASB reads: “Jesus said to them, ‘Truly, truly, I say to you, before Abraham was born, I am.’” *The Clear Word* reads, “Jesus said, ‘Because I existed before Abraham was born.’” The CWB omits the “I AM” which shows that Jesus is indeed the Divine Lord, the YHWH (Jehovah), the eternally existent One mentioned in Ex. 3:4-13. The CWB makes the “Bible” agree with many of the Arian statements in the writings of EGW. A third example is found in Rev. 1:10. The NASB reads, “I was in the Spirit on the Lord’s day, and I heard behind me a loud voice like the sound of a trumpet.” Even though the term “Lord’s day” was used for Sunday in the early church (See *Sabbath in Christ*, p. 315-330.), The CWB twists Revelation 1:10 to read, “One Sabbath morning when I had gone to the rocky island shore to meditate and worship, I suddenly heard a voice behind me that sounded as loud as a trumpet.” I encourage the reader to go to: <http://www.ratzlaf.com/corrupt.htm> where you will find 22 pages of documented places where CWB has added, deleted and twisted the wording of numerous texts to help them line up with the unbiblical teachings of Ellen White and Adventism. Why would anyone want to twist the Bible like this? Why would a church continue to allow such a book to be sold? The answer should be obvious to any seeker for truth. See also *Cultic Doctrine*, p. 303-324.

and Epistles. They are not apostolic doctrines. They were never taught in the New Testament church as recorded in the Epistles.

You mentioned that the church has always answered the critics of Ellen White. For the record, several years ago I sent the General Conference President a registered letter asking if the church still believed a number of the statements of Ellen White. Some long time later I received a letter from one of his assistants stating that the President did not have time to answer my letter and that it was well known what Adventist believe. Perhaps now you could answer some questions about Ellen White.

1. Do you believe, as Ellen White taught, that an angel from God guided William Miller in his study of the prophecies?
2. Do you believe, as Ellen White taught, that William Miller discovered a “perfect chain of truth”?
3. Do you believe, as Ellen White stated, that Miller’s 1843 chart which had his fifteen lines of prophecy pointing to 1843, was directed by God’s hand, and no part of it should be altered because the figures were just as God wanted them?
4. Do you believe, as Ellen White was shown in vision, that God held His hand over the mistake in Miller’s chart and the errors in his time reckoning? Right here do you see the cognitive dissonance? In one statement Ellen White says Miller’s chart is exactly as God wanted it and it should never be changed, then in the next she says it contained error and blames God for the deception.
5. Do you believe, as Ellen White taught, that the pastors of Christian churches who rejected Miller’s date-setting message “had the blood of souls on them” and Jesus “turned his face from” those churches? These pastors, as Ellen White admitted, had no problem with the preaching of the second coming of Christ but rejected Miller’s date setting. They rejected miller’s date setting in harmony with the teachings of Jesus.¹⁵ Who then, is right, Jesus who said no man knows the day nor the hour or Ellen White who said that Jesus turned his face away from those who refused to do date setting?
6. Do you believe, as Ellen White taught, that Miller’s 1843 message was a “saving message”?
7. Do you believe, as Ellen White taught and as she was shown in her first vision, that those who had accepted Miller’s message and then after 1844 rejected it, were “left...in perfect darkness,” and it was “impossible” for them to get back on the path toward heaven?
8. Do you believe, as Ellen White taught, that the prayers of Christians who rejected the 1844 sanctuary message were “useless”?
9. Do you accept the following clear statement from Ellen White that condemns the very thing that the early Adventists, including Ellen White herself, and Miller supported and taught: “Those who so presumptuously **preach definite time**, in so doing gratify the adversary of souls; for they are **advancing infidelity rather than Christianity**. They produce Scripture and by false interpretation show a chain of argument which apparently proves their position. But **their failures show that they are false prophets**, that they do not rightly interpret the language of inspiration.”¹⁶ To me this cements my conclusion that Ellen White, by her own statement, not only admits but proclaims that she is a false prophet!

¹⁵ Mt. 24:36; 24:50; 25:13; Mk. 13:32; Lk. 12:36.

¹⁶ Ellen G. White, 4 T. p. 307

10. Do you believe, as Ellen White taught, that “no sanctified tongue” will say, “I am saved”?¹⁷ I noted in your presentation that you stated you were saved. Does this mean you are now fully sanctified? Has your name already come up in the Investigative Judgment? Have you proven you can endure test and trial and shown that you can overcome temptation?¹⁸
11. Do you believe, as Ellen White taught, that the death of Christ on the cross did not completely vindicate God’s character of love and justice before the universe?
12. Do you believe, as Ellen White taught, that Sabbath observance “was of sufficient importance to draw a line between the people of God and unbelievers”?
13. Do you believe, as Ellen White taught, that “the mark of the beast is the opposite [of Sabbath observance]—the observance of the first day of the week.”
14. Do you believe that the writings of Ellen White should continue as an “authoritative *source* of truth”?

Elder Lake, I am sending you my newest book, *Adventist to Christian*, which is on four audio CDs. There I have recorded the events, information and study that caused me to leave Adventism. You will find that my discovery of the simple new covenant gospel of God’s grace through faith in Christ as taught in the epistles of the New Testament was the underlying reason behind my leaving the Adventist church. My diligent research convinced me that Adventism’s Sanctuary theology, as taught in the writings of Ellen White, could not be reconciled with the clear statements of Scripture. I chose to follow Scripture. I am also sending you *Sabbath in Christ*, *Cultic Doctrine* and *The Truth About Seventh-day Adventist “Truth”*. You can find about twenty-five books, CDs or tapes at <http://www.ratzlaf.com/Qstore/Qstore.cgi>

If you are ever in the Phoenix, Arizona area you have a standing invitation to come with me to the 10,000 plus member Calvary Community Church pastored by Former Adventist pastor and Ellen White critic, Mark Martin, and listen to the sound of the pages of Scripture turning as he teaches through books of the Bible. Visit his children’s ministries which requires about 350 adult teachers every week! Listen to his messages live at <http://www.calvaryphx.com/>. As you may know, the SDA church brought legal action against Mark’s www.SDAOutreach.org. Now his material can be found at <http://www.ExAdventist.com>.

Carolyn, my wife of 49 years, and I would also like to invite you and your wife, if she is with you, for lunch.

We at Life Assurance Ministries, Inc., LAM Publications, LLC and Former Adventist Fellowships pray for the Adventist church on a regular basis. We pray that it will be true to the New Testament Gospel and become a “Bible only” church. I hope you receive this letter in the same spirit in which it was sent

In His joy,
Dale Ratzlaff

¹⁷ Ellen G. White, *Review and Herald*, 1890-06-17.

¹⁸ Ellen G. White, *The Kress Collection*, p. 120; See also, *Cultic Doctrine*, p. 317ff.