

The Enduring Legacy  
of Ellen G. White and

# Social Justice

JONATHAN A. THOMPSON, DMin



**Pacific Press®**  
Publishing Association

Nampa, Idaho | Oshawa, Ontario, Canada  
[www.pacificpress.com](http://www.pacificpress.com)

# Inspiration and Authority as They Relate to the Ministry and Writings of Ellen G. White

## In the past, God spoke through prophets

**G**od, loving His wayward and sin-filled people with an everlasting love, continuously drew them to Himself with His unfailing loving-kindness (Jeremiah 31:3). It is that constant love that prompted God to call and then send prophets with warnings for His people.

## Points to consider as we begin

The prophets of God were sent to minister to people who were generally disinclined to listen to them and who were easily provoked to abuse them. In addition to God apprising the prophets of the peoples' sinful condition, the prophets were urged to be faithful and warned to expect rough treatment (Ezekiel 1:6–8). Rough had been the path of the prophets who came before Christ; and rough would be the path of those coming after Him. (See Matthew 23:29–35.) Yet, they would come; because they were sent. No faint-hearted person could have survived the stiff challenges associated with the prophetic calling.

## Decision time

When Christ did not come as expected in October of 1844, Ellen Harmon was among a group of Millerites who were disappointed but not disheartened. She emerged from the midst of this group of disappointed Millerites to play a major role in leading them out of fanaticism and disappointment into establishing the Seventh-day Adventist Church.<sup>1</sup> From October 1844 onward, the “Disappointed Millerites” had to decide what to do with the visions of Ellen Harmon. Some chose to doubt that the visions were of God. Others chose to believe. One hundred seventy-one years later, while we are faced with the same decision, the question is now larger: “What shall we do with both the visions and writings of Ellen White?”

## “Doctrinal jungle”

After October 22, 1844, “the mood and structure of Millerite Adventism” can be

---

characterized as disoriented and in disarray.<sup>2</sup> With regard to doctrines, how should we characterize Adventism by the summer of 1845? It was fast “becoming a doctrinal jungle.” There was the continual setting of new dates for the second coming of Jesus, new emphasis on foot washing, charismatic gifts, holy kissing, the seventh-day Sabbath, soul-sleep, the millennium as a past event, and others; plus hot debates as to whether anything of significance had occurred on October 22.<sup>3</sup>

### **A chaotic mass of Adventist controversy**

Historian Sydney Ahlstrom, referring to the period between 1835 and 1845, correctly noted that “within a decade the once grand movement was reduced to a disorganized welter of Adventist controversy.”<sup>4</sup> Thus, in a short space of time, the Millerite movement had become a chaotic mass of Adventist controversy.<sup>5</sup> Ahlstrom reports that Ellen Harmon emerged out of this chaotic environment as an agent of reorganization.<sup>6</sup> She would play a major role in leading the shut-door, antimission sabbatarian Adventists out of this morass.

### **They came to believe that ...**

Those early Sabbatarian Adventists came to believe that they were the remnant predicted in Revelation 12:17 (which kept the commandments and had the “testimony of Jesus”). They came to understand the “testimony of Jesus” to be “the spirit of prophecy.” “They came to regard the restoration of the prophetic gift as part of God’s plan for His last-day ‘remnant’ people....”<sup>7</sup> In keeping with that plan, they came to believe that that gift was revealed in the visions and work of Ellen Harmon. It was their thinking that God had selected Ellen White “to help keep their feet on the solid rock of Scripture.”<sup>8</sup>

### **In 1874, General Conference President George I. Butler wrote the following concerning the impact of the ministry and visions of Ellen White:**

“As the Scriptures are designed to ‘thoroughly furnish’ the man of God unto all good works, we can rely upon them in this case. We believe these visions because the Bible teaches them. We use the rules given in that holy book and are forced to the conclusion that these manifestations are the work of the Spirit of God. ‘Instead of our setting up these visions above and outside of the Scriptures as another rule of authority, as our opponents pretend, we claim that none can really take the Bible and fairly apply its teachings without accepting these visions as from God.’

“The Bible is the supreme authority in deciding this as well as other questions. When it tells us to ‘try the spirits,’ to ‘prove all things,’ and ‘hold fast that which is good,’ it is our duty to do this. We find by so doing that these visions harmonize perfectly with the Scripture, and that they in no case contradict

themselves or the Bible. They everywhere teach the purest doctrine, and even their bitterest enemies admit that a person will be saved if he will obey them.

“We have tested them as a people for nearly a quarter of a century, and we find we prosper spiritually when we heed them, and suffer a great loss when we neglect them. We have found their guidance to be our safety. They never have led us into fanaticism in a single instance, but they have ever rebuked fanatical and unreasonable men. “They everywhere direct us to the Scriptures as the great source of true instruction, and to the example of Jesus Christ as the true pattern. They never claim to be given to take the place of the Bible, but simply to be a manifestation of one of those spiritual gifts set in the church by its divine Lord; and as such, should have their proper weight.

“We admit that their influence upon S. D. Adventists during their past history has been weighty, but it has always been for good, and always had a tendency to make us a better people.”

He concluded with these words:

“Having been in exercise for so many years among us, we are certainly prepared to judge by this time in regard to the nature of their teachings.”

### **Profound impact**

Ellen White’s impact on Seventh-day Adventism was truly profound. Even so, let us not be so romantic as to imagine that all was well all the time in her interaction with the “Brethren.”

In his book, *Messenger of the Lord*, Herbert Douglass opines:

When the institutionalized church is confronted by the prophet, certain human dynamics are in motion that often treat the prophet as “unwelcome.” The prophet perceives the possible inhumanities of bureaucracy and the inherent rigidities and possible irregularities in institutionalism. For those within the institutional structure, the prophet is often perceived as exasperating with his/her vigorous challenges, searching counsel, or frank reproof. For those within who are motivated by other than the purest principles, the prophet is always unwelcome.

Throughout Ellen White’s seventy-year ministry, many listened to her voice gladly. Her counsel proved self-authenticating. When the prophet’s disturbing voice ruffled unconsecrated feelings, relatively few leaders and members found excuses to turn away. When church leaders listened to the voice, the Advent movement prospered.<sup>9</sup>

### **Questions regarding authority**

The current disengagement of Adventists from the *Testimonies* of Ellen White is rooted in questions regarding her authority. By 1848 the Sabbatarian Adven-

---

tists, before they officially became the Seventh-day Adventist Church in 1863, recognized “God’s special supernatural enlightenment through Ellen White.”<sup>10</sup> The denomination’s endorsement of Ellen White as prophetess has officially gone unchallenged. The delegates at the recently convened General Conference Session voted a Statement of Confidence in the Writings of Ellen G. White. It reads, in part:

“As delegates to the 2015 General Conference Session in San Antonio, Texas, we express our deep gratitude to God for the continuing presence of various spiritual gifts among His people ((1 Cor 12:4-11; Eph 4:11-14), and particularly for the prophetic ministry of Ellen G. White (1827-1915).

“On the centennial of her death, we rejoice that her writings have been made available around the globe in many languages and in a variety of printed and electronic formats. We reaffirm our conviction that her writings are divinely inspired, truly Christ-centered, and Bible-based. Rather than replacing the Bible, they uplift the normative character of Scripture and correct inaccurate interpretations of it derived from tradition, human reason, personal experience, and modern culture.” (*Adventist Review*, GC Session Bulletin 7, page 42).

However, when we consider the legacy the founding fathers inherited from the Millerites, it is not surprising that the nature of Ellen White’s authority and the authority of her Testimonies is, and has been, disputed from the beginning within the membership of the church.<sup>11</sup>

### **Millerite reliance on rational study**

A strength of Millerism was the rational development of its major doctrine regarding the second coming of Christ,<sup>12</sup> which reflected Miller’s personal approach to Bible study. According to Miller’s rule of interpreting the Bible, any person could prayerfully study the Bible and arrive at truth. Understanding the Bible required two things: diligent, prayerful reading and collating the various portions read.<sup>13</sup>

### **The Millerite legacy**

The Millerite legacy laid a foundation of careful, reasoned Bible study, disregarding any need for visions and private revelations in determining the meaning of Scripture.<sup>14</sup> William Miller called the Bible a “feast of reason” and “a system of revealed truths” that was so simply presented that not even a fool need err in interpreting it.<sup>15</sup> Biblical interpretation was not so simple a matter for Adventist church founders.<sup>16</sup> It seems to be common knowledge by now that they often met for long Bible study sessions and ended many of those sessions with no agreement as to the proper interpretation of the texts under study. At such times Ellen White reports that she was taken off in vision and given a clear explanation of these passages that were the center of study and confusion.<sup>17</sup>

## **An unseen shift**

Ellen White's rise to prominence among the faithful remnants of the Millerites is unquestioned.<sup>18</sup> The direct communication she received from God was important to this group inasmuch as the Disappointment had convinced them that the more established channels were flawed, especially human reason.<sup>19</sup> When those early Adventists accepted Ellen White's pronouncements as divinely inspired, they revealed that they understood God to have "two authorized channels of revelation: the Bible and the Testimonies."<sup>20</sup> To avoid any misunderstanding regarding the primacy of the Bible, Adventist publications were replete with official statements proclaiming the Bible to be the Word of God and the only rule of faith by which to test everything, including the visions of Ellen White. These official proclamations camouflaged the unseen shifts that were taking place in the balance of authority. The visions of Ellen White gradually became the expounder of Scripture and, according to Malcolm Bull and Keith Lockhart, "reason was disregarded."<sup>21</sup>

## **In spite of ...**

Thus, in spite of the fact that the leadership of the church discouraged the tendency to believe that Scripture could only be understood through the writings of Ellen White, a segment of the membership persisted in that belief.<sup>22</sup>

## **Is there an explanation?**

How could this happen while Ellen White was still alive and actively involved in the church? In 1900, she wrote that

"It seems impossible for me to be understood by those who have the light but have not walked in it. What I might say in private conversations would be so repeated as to make it mean exactly opposite to what it would have meant had the hearers been sanctified in mind and spirit.

"I am afraid to speak even to my friends, for afterwards I hear, Sister White said this, or, Sister White said that. My words are so wrested and misinterpreted that I am coming to the conclusion that the Lord desires me to keep out of large assemblies and refuse private interviews. What I say is reported in such a perverted light that it is new and strange to me. It is mixed with words spoken by men to sustain their own theories (Letter 139, 1900).

She began to think that God wanted her to stop speaking to large assemblies and avoid all private interviews because her counsel was being so grossly perverted.<sup>23</sup> Thus, even during her lifetime, she was losing the battle against the legalistic/proof-text use of her counsel. Picking and choosing was one issue.

There was a second issue: Equally damaging was the practice of using the *Testimonies* to interpret Scripture.

### **Interpreter of Scripture**

To avoid any misunderstanding regarding the primacy of the Bible, Adventist publications were replete with official statements proclaiming the Bible to be the Word of God and the only rule of faith by which to test everything, including the visions of Ellen White. These official proclamations camouflaged a shift that was taking place in the balance of authority.<sup>24</sup> While Adventists officially advocated the primacy of Scripture, by the time of her death in 1915, Ellen White's writings were the acknowledged interpreter of Scripture for many Adventists.<sup>25</sup>

In spite of the fact that some of the leaders of the church discouraged the tendency to believe that Scripture could only be understood through the writings of Ellen White, a segment of the membership persisted in that belief. They used her visions and writings to clarify and elaborate the Scriptures, thus completing a shift in authority from the Millerite total reliance on Scripture and “no confidence at all in private revelations, dreams, and visions” to a belief that only through the *Testimonies* could Scripture be understood.<sup>26</sup>

### **The ultimate authority?**

In effect, the *Testimonies*—the oral and written counsel that Ellen White gave to the church—were now the ultimate source of authority for these members.<sup>27</sup>

“In the years following Ellen White's death veneration for her work and her writings increased among many Seventh-day Adventists. . . . Whatever the reasons, the situation was such by 1919 that A. G. Daniells could frankly admit: ‘I am sure there has been advocated an idea of infallibility in Sister White and verbal inspiration in the testimonies that has led people to expect too much and to make too great claims, and so we have gotten into difficulty.’ ”<sup>28</sup> W. W. Prescott complained: “If a man does not believe in the verbal inspiration of the Bible, he is still in good standing; but if he says he does not believe in the verbal inspiration of the testimonies, he is discounted right away. I think it an unhealthful situation. It puts the Spirit of Prophecy above the Bible.”<sup>29</sup>

### **1919–1950s**

This structure of authority, the emphasis on verbal inspiration and the bad habits of picking, choosing (or “proof-texting”), and viewing Ellen White's writings as the ultimate source of authority, prevailed within Adventism from before 1919 until the mid-1950s (some say into the 1970s). According to Adventist writer, A. Leroy Moore, during this period the church had an unchecked, unbalanced focus upon the law.<sup>30</sup>

In the mid-1950s, the Adventist Church tried to rid itself of its legalistic image and to correct certain misconceptions regarding it. The church tried to confirm its standing as a Christian church and not a heretical cult. It did so, in part, through a series of meetings with Donald Barnhouse, a Presbyterian minister from Philadelphia and editor of *Eternity Magazine*, and Walter Martin, a specialist on non-Christian cults who was preparing to write a book about Adventists. Barnhouse and Martin were especially anxious to know if Adventists put Ellen White's writings on the same level as the Bible, an accusation that Adventist scholars forcefully denied.<sup>31</sup>

According to church historians Bull and Lockhart, Moore, and Knight, the implications of this denial alarmed many Adventists.<sup>32</sup> Many church members were alarmed when Adventist scholars denied that Ellen White's writings were on the same level as the Bible.

### **Why the alarm?**

The fact that so many members were alarmed to hear Adventist scholars openly declare that the *Testimonies* were not on the same level as the Bible clearly indicates several things: that the general church membership was unmindful of the official denominational position that the *Testimonies* were subordinate to the Bible. Take note of this 1883 statement by George I. Butler, president of the General Conference. He spoke for his generation and for Adventists to this day:

We do not hold them [Ellen White's writings] to be superior to the Bible, or in one sense equal to it. The Scriptures are our rule to test everything by, the visions as well as all other things. That rule, therefore, is of the highest authority; the standard is higher than the thing tested by it. If the Bible should show the visions were not in harmony with it, the Bible would stand, and the visions would be given up. This shows plainly that we hold the Bible the highest, our enemies to the contrary, notwithstanding.<sup>33</sup>

Ellen White referred to her writings as "a lesser light." "The Lord has sent his people much instruction, line upon line, precept upon precept, here a little, and there a little. Little heed is given to the Bible, and the Lord has given a lesser light to lead men and women to the greater light" (RH, January 20, 1903 par. 9).

As stated earlier, many church members were alarmed when Adventist scholars denied that Ellen White's writings were on the same level as the Bible. Another thing that this surprise indicated is that some unhealthy practices in the use of Ellen White's writings that began in the post-1888 years were still in use.

### **Practices influenced by A. T. Jones**

During the 1890s, the influential A. T. Jones advocated four false views—views

---



that contradicted the position of both the founders and Ellen White herself on the authority and use of the modern gift of prophecy.

1. The writings of Ellen White are an “infallible” interpreter of the Bible, hence subordinating the Bible to her writings.
2. Ellen White’s “writings were inerrant or beyond factual error.”
3. “Historical and literary contexts of a statement are not important in understanding Ellen White’s writings.”
4. That Ellen White’s writings were verbally inspired.<sup>34</sup>

Jones, in an 1894 article on the purpose of Ellen White’s writings, put them forth as an “infallible” interpreter of the Bible.

- He claimed that the proper use of Ellen White’s writings was “to study the Bible *through them*.”
- Such an approach, he suggested, “will make us all ‘mighty in the scriptures.’”<sup>35</sup>

There is but a short step between belief in verbal inspiration and believing that the writings of Ellen White are infallible. The next step is shorter still: using Ellen White’s writings as the “official” interpreter of the Bible.

### **An “infallible interpreter”**

George Knight informs us that while Ellen White claimed that she wrote from the vantage point of one enlightened by the Holy Spirit, she did not claim that we should take her writings as the final word on the meaning of Scripture. By way of contrast (as indicated earlier), A.T. Jones, in an 1894 article on the purpose of Ellen White’s writings, put them forth as an “infallible” interpreter of the Bible. Jones claimed that the proper use of Ellen White’s writings was “to study the Bible *through them*.” Such an approach, he suggested, “will make us all ‘mighty in the scriptures’ ” (HM Extra, December 1894).<sup>37</sup>

Thus, in spite of the official position of the church, Jones’s suggestions set the course for many twentieth-century Adventists in that the “inerrantist and verbalist positions on inspiration would provide the general approach to the topic by most Adventists up to the 1970s.”<sup>38</sup>

### **An “inflexible prophet”?**

In the years since 1888, Adventists have witnessed the rise of the myth of the “inflexible prophet.”<sup>39</sup> Years ago, Ellen White complained about the tendency to view her *Testimonies* in a legalistic, inflexible manner.

### **“Deceptive misrepresentations”**

She spoke of some people who were inclined to “deceptive misrepresentations” of her *Testimonies*. She accused these people of using false reasoning and twisting and turning the *Testimonies* to vindicate their personal positions.<sup>40</sup> Ellen White called attention to certain ministers who caused the *Testimonies* to be despised by their injudicious use of them.

She said that these pastors made the *Testimonies* an iron rule for others and that they took the extreme meaning of the *Testimonies* and pushed them so hard that church members lost faith in the *Testimonies*.<sup>41</sup> Ellen White said that there were others who tried to strengthen their own personal positions on certain subjects by selecting and exaggerating statements from the *Testimonies* which they thought would support their views while at the same time ignoring *Testimonies* which opposed their views.<sup>42</sup>

### **The warning ignored**

In spite of her warning, the trend continued and the myth was created. George Knight reports that this myth “views Ellen White as an unbending interpreter of her own writings and implies that her true followers will be just as inflexible and rigid as she in their application of the ‘straight testimony.’”<sup>43</sup> This myth of the “inflexible prophet” has played a major part in bringing us to the current disengagement from Ellen White and her writings.

### **General principles**

Ellen White was never an inflexible, legalistically minded prophet. She reminded the church that she had been commissioned to place general principles before the people, while, at the same time, she might have to deliver specific and cutting messages to individuals if directed to do so by God.<sup>44</sup> She spent years placing principles before the people and begging ministers not to interpret the *Testimonies* in such a way as to turn the people from them.<sup>45</sup>

### **Trying to win debates**

Ellen White cautioned church members to be careful how they constructed arguments in defense of fundamental articles of faith. She put forward a principle which I believe applies to her writings as well as to the Bible. She instructed them to avoid using arguments that are not truly sound. Such arguments may silence the opposition for the time being, but they will dishonor the truth in the long term. Any argument advanced should be strong enough to stand the most exacting scrutiny. Ellen White was afraid that many Adventists had become so accustomed to trying to win debates that they were guilty of not properly interpreting and using biblical texts.<sup>46</sup>

## **The Testimonies and unbelievers**

Ellen White urged Adventists not to use her *Testimonies* to support or defend their beliefs when talking with “unbelievers.” She advised church members to use the Bible to support doctrines and beliefs since using the *Testimonies* to prove a point to non-Adventists would be counterproductive as these people had no reason to accept her messages as inspired.<sup>47</sup>

### **“Sister White has said ...”**

Perhaps I should follow the counsel that Ellen White gave in 1901 and let her speak for herself. She wrote,

I know that many men take the testimonies the Lord has given, and apply them as they suppose they should be applied, picking out a sentence here and there, taking it from its proper connection, and applying it according to their idea. Thus poor souls become bewildered, when could they read in order all that has been given, they would see the true application, and would not become confused.

Much that purports to be a message from Sister White, serves the purpose of misrepresenting Sister White, making her testify in favor of things that are not in accordance with her mind or judgment. This makes her work very trying. Reports fly from one to another regarding what Sister White has said. Each time the report is repeated, it grows larger.

If Sister White has anything to say, leave her to say it. No one is called upon to be a mouth piece for Sister White. . . . Please let Sister White bear her own message. It will come with a better grace from her than from the one who reports her.<sup>48</sup>

### **“Picking and choosing”**

Ellen White saw the dangers associated with picking and choosing statements (proof-texting) from her *Testimonies* to suit the user. It was this legalistic use of her writings that she tried to prevent. In spite of cogent appeals, church workers and leaders allowed her to become, in the minds of future generations of church members, an inflexible prophet.

### **An enemy within**

After the 1888 General Conference session, Ellen White told the membership of the church that it did not need to fear the opposition of the world. The enemy was already at work from within. She explained to the membership that “the influence that grew out of the resistance to light and truth at Minneapolis tended to make of no effect the light that God had given to His people through the Testimonies.”<sup>49</sup>

Her appeals for the leaders to “let the law take care of itself” and for the people to “trust in the merits of Jesus”<sup>50</sup> went unanswered. The denomination’s long-term legalistic use of Ellen White’s *Testimonies* failed to keep faith with her expressed counsel and it allowed church members to go on assuming that she was verbally inspired. This failure is critical and I believe that it has contributed significantly to the current disengagement by Adventists in general, and youth in particular. Ellen White prophesied that “it is the way that the standard is carried now [in her time] that will determine the future.”

### **She resisted**

Ellen White, while living, resisted the tendency to use her *Testimonies* in a proof-texting fashion. She could only hope that after her death the church would be responsible in its use of her writings. It was not to be. However, Ellen White ought not be held responsible for the image of herself as an inflexible prophet; she ought not be held responsible for the way in which her *Testimonies* have been abused.<sup>51</sup>

1. Ellen G. White, *Life Sketches of Ellen G. White* (1915; reprint, Boise, ID: Pacific Press® Publishing Association, 1943), 20, 21, 44, 61.
2. George R. Knight, *Millennial Fever and the End of the World* (Boise, ID: Pacific Press®, 1993), 245.
3. Knight, *Millennial Fever*, 233.
4. Sydney E. Ahlstrom, *A Religious History of the American People* (New Haven: Yale University Press®, 1972), 480. The decade that Ahlstrom refers to began in 1835 when William Miller first published his lectures on the Second Coming and ended in April 1845 when Miller and others met in Albany, New York, to discuss a series of new beliefs being advocated by several former colleagues in “an attempt to maintain harmony, unity, and orthodoxy.” R. W. Schwarz, *Lightbearers to the Remnant* (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press®, 1979), 54.
5. *Ibid.*, 480.
6. *Ibid.*, 481.
7. LeRoy Edwin Froom, *The Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers: The Historic Development of Prophetic Interpretation*. 4 vols. (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald® Publishing Association, 1954), 4:970.
8. *Ibid.*, 972.
9. Herbert E. Douglass, *Messenger of the Lord: The Prophetic Ministry of Ellen G. White* (Nampa, ID: Pacific Press®, 1998), 236.
10. Schwarz, 69.
11. Ellen G. White, *Life Sketches of Ellen G. White*, 88, 89; and “Wrong Use of Visions” (*Testimony* 9, 1863), *Testimonies*, 1:382.
12. Knight, *Millennial Fever*, 332.
13. *Ibid.*, 37, 38.
14. Malcolm Bull and Keith Lockhart, *Seeking a Sanctuary* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1989), 23.
15. William Miller, “Wm. Miller’s Apology and Defense,” in *1844 and the Rise of Sabbatarian Adventism*, comp. and ed. George R. Knight (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald®, 1994), 53, 50.

16. Bull and Lockhart, 25, 26.
17. Ellen G. White, "The Firm Foundation of Our Faith," in *Selected Messages From the Writings of Ellen G. White*, compiled by the Trustees of the Ellen G. White Publications, 3 vols. (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald®, 1958), 1:206, 07.
18. Catherine L. Albanese, *America: Religions and Religion*, 2nd ed. (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing, 1992), 231.
19. Bull and Lockhart, 24.
20. *Ibid.*, 23. The counsel White gave to the church, whether oral or written, is called Testimonies.
21. *Ibid.*, 31.
22. F. M. Wilcox, "The Position and Work of Mrs. E. G. White," *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald*®, March 31, 1927, 3–6.
23. White, "The Reception of the Messages," in *Selected Messages*, 3:82, 83.
24. Bull and Lockhart, 26, 28; George R. Knight, *Anticipating the Advent: A Brief History of Seventh-day Adventists* (Boise, ID: Pacific Press®, 1993), 106, 07; A. Leroy Moore, *Adventism in Conflict: Resolving the Issues that Divide Us* (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald®, 1995), 127–30.
25. Schwarz, 418, citing W. W. Prescott, "Transcript of the 1919 Bible Conference," 7/30/19. R. W. Schwarz, *Lightbearers to the Remnant* (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press®, 1979), 69.
26. Bull and Lockhart, 26, 28; George R. Knight, *Anticipating the Advent*®, 106, 07; A. Leroy Moore, *Adventism in Conflict*, 127–30.
27. Schwarz, 418, citing W. W. Prescott, "Transcript of the 1919 Bible Conference," July 30, 1919.
28. *Ibid.*
29. *Ibid.*
30. A. Leroy Moore, *Adventism in Conflict*, 81, 127.
31. Bull and Lockhart, 28, 29; Schwarz, 544, 45.
32. *Ibid.*, 29; Moore, 83; Knight, *Fat Lady*, 27.
33. Douglass, 418.
34. George R. Knight, *A Search for Identity: The Development of Seventh-day Adventist Beliefs* (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald®, 2000), 98, 99.
35. HM Extra, December 1894; Reference from George R. Knight, *From 1888 to Apostasy: The Case of A. T. Jones* (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald®, 1987), 231; George R. Knight, *Reading Ellen White: How to Understand and Apply Her Writings* (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald®, 1997), 26.
36. Referenced from George R. Knight, *From 1888 to Apostasy*, 231.
37. Knight, *A Search for Identity*, 138.
38. George R. Knight, *Myths in Adventism: An Interpretive Study of Ellen White, Education, and Related Issues* (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald®, 1985), 17.
39. Ellen G. White, "Correct Views Concerning the Testimonies: A Reply to an Inquirer," *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald*®, September 6, 1906, 7.
40. White, "Wrong Use of the 'Testimonies'" (*Testimony* 33, 1889), *Testimonies*, 5:669, 70.
41. White, "An Unwarranted Distinction" (*Testimony* 33, 1889), *Testimonies*, 5:688.
42. Knight, *Myths*, 17.
43. White, "Personal Testimonies" (*Testimony* 33, 1889), *Testimonies*, 5:660.
44. White, "An Unwarranted Distinction" (*Testimony* 33, 1889), *Testimonies*, 5:691.
45. White, "The Mysteries of the Bible a Proof of Its Inspiration" (*Testimony* 33, 1889), *Testimonies*, 5:708.

46. White, "Parental Responsibility" (*Testimony 1*, 1855), *Testimonies*, 1:119, 20.
47. White, "Manuscript 21, 1901," *Selected Messages*, 1:44, 45.
48. Ellen G. White quoted in A. Leroy Moore, *Adventism in Conflict*, 81.
49. Knight, *Anticipating the Advent*, 75, 76.
50. A. Leroy Moore maintains that White did not have a legalistic bias and that the problem is with those who use her Testimonies. Moore, 127.

## BIOGRAPHICAL STATEMENT

### **Craig H. Newborn, PhD**

Craig Newborn, born in Seven Springs, North Carolina, completed his college education at Pacific Union College in Angwin, California, earning a BA in history and religion and an MA in history with a secondary education emphasis. Thereafter, he spent four and a half years as a Bible teacher at San Diego Academy before accepting a call to overseas missionary work. He served more than fourteen years in Kenya, Iran, and Lebanon in varying capacities, including church pastor, Bible teacher, evangelist, field president, departmental director, and university chaplain.

After returning to the U.S., he accepted a teaching position at Loma Linda Academy and also earned an MA in theology and a PhD in theology and personality from Claremont School of Theology. In 1997, Dr. Newborn moved to Huntsville, Alabama, where he became the vice president for Student Services at Oakwood University.

From January 1999 through August 2006, he was the founding director of the Oakwood Branch Office of the Ellen G. White Estate and was also a professor in Oakwood University's Department of Religion and Theology. From August 2006 through July 2011, he served as the senior pastor of the Oakwood University Church. From August of 2011 through the end of July 2014, he served as director of the Gift of Prophecy and Sabbath School Departments for South Central Conference. In August 2014, he retired. He is married to Janis Stephens Newborn (now retired former) director of Institutional Effectiveness at Oakwood University. They have two adult children, a daughter-in-law, a son-in-law, and five grandchildren.