

# Focus on the Kingdom

Vol. 10 No. 1

Anthony Buzzard, editor

October, 2007

## The Trinity, Logic and Language How Many Is God?

It is frequently asserted that “Jesus is God,” in fact that Jesus is Yahweh. But do those who hold to that view see what they *imply* with this confession: “Jesus is God”?

Many Christians have not thought this through. Where does that statement “Jesus is God” or “Jesus is Yahweh” lead us? What does it reveal about our thinking, which may be hidden even from ourselves?

In our language, if we say “this is a chair” and then (pointing to a different one) “that is a chair,” we tell ourselves and everyone else that there are two chairs. This is the simple principle of logic, governing rational discourse, that one X and another X makes 2 X’s. There is no way of avoiding this.

But notice what happens when churchgoers say “Jesus is God.” They usually do not remind themselves that *at the same time* they believe that “the Father is God.” If the Father is God and Jesus is God (X in our illustration) then we are committing ourselves to belief in **two Gods**. “This one is God and that one is God” makes two Gods. Yes, two Gods! Is that a biblical confession? Hardly. But churchgoers seem to be quite unaware of the fact that once they say “Jesus is God,” while believing as we all do that the Father is God, they are talking about two Gods.

Is it not dangerous for Christians to ally themselves with this proposition that there are *two who are God* and thus two Gods? This sounds very much *unlike* Jesus whom we claim to be following. Jesus said of the Father, “You are the **only one** who is truly God” (see John 17:3). He then carefully distinguished himself from that one and only true God by defining himself as “Jesus Christ whom You [the Father] commissioned” (John 17:3). Jesus said that eternal life is summarized under that major theological heading, that the Father is “the only one who is truly God” (John 17:3).

### How “Theology” Attempts to Avoid Belief in Two Who Are Equally God, i.e. Two Gods

“Theology” tries to save the situation like this: Jesus is God and the Father is God *in one sense*, but putting them together still amounts to one God, *but in a different sense*. Thus one X and another X makes one Y. This is logically possible, of course. It is not a contradiction. But is it anything like the monotheism of the Bible?

The all-important question is: what do you mean by the X and the Y in this equation (above)? In what sense is God one and in what *different sense* are Jesus and the Father each and both God? This is where Christians fall into a great muddle.

It is our determined objective to encourage a public inquiry on this critical issue of *how many the God of the Bible is*. The great world religions are all at loggerheads on this central issue. At present churchgoers are unable to define consistently the X and the Y of that proposition — that the Father is God and Jesus is God and together they amount to ONE GOD, *in a different sense*.

More muddle and vagueness: They say there are three “Persons” in one God, but they cannot tell us what they mean by person. They shrink from saying that “person” means “individual” (as it obviously does to us all in ordinary speech). But by not telling us clearly what is meant by “person” they really do not tell us anything intelligible. So their creedal statement has no discernible meaning.

Many in churches shy away from contemplating these issues. Or they retreat into “mystery” and say that God is beyond comprehension. But should believers be uncertain as to what that “umbrella” Trinity doctrine means, since they gather week by week as creedal Trinitarians (just look at the statement of faith in your church)?

A minority of Christians over the ages have not believed in the Trinity (including Sir Isaac Newton, John Milton, John Locke and hymn writer Isaac Watts) for the simple reason that the propositions it makes about God have no discernible meaning. In fact the Trinity appears to be belief in two or three Gods. It sounds like belief in two or three Gods on the basis of everything that you and I have learned about the meaning of plain language. “Jesus is fully God and the Father is God” evidently makes two Gods!

### Evangelical Apologists and the Meaning of the One God

So, again, what do some theologians say about the Y in the equation two X’s = one Y? Jesus is God (X), the Father is God (X), but that makes one God (Y). How do they propose to define the one God (Y)?

What does Walter Martin claim (confessed apologist for the Trinity and author of *The Kingdom of the Cults*)? “The God of the Bible and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is a personal Being, a personal Spirit. This Almighty *Person* performs acts that only a Personality is

capable of: God hears, sees, knows...This is the God of Christianity: an omnipotent, omniscient and omnipresent *Personality who* manifests every attribute of a personality.”<sup>1</sup>

Amazingly Martin disagrees with his fellow apologists. Note that Martin, as a professed Trinitarian, has given us a purely non-Trinitarian, unitarian definition of God! God is a single “who” — a Person, a personality, the Father of Jesus. He is the “I am that I am” of Exodus 3:14.

But now consider the chaotic state of contemporary attempts to define how many God is. What does James White say (*The Forgotten Trinity*)? “I have chosen my words very carefully...[The Trinity] insists that there are **three divine persons**. Note immediately that we are not saying there are three Beings that are one Being, or three persons that are one person. Such would be self-contradictory. I emphasize this because, *most often*, this is the misrepresentation of the doctrine that is commonly found in the literature of various religions that deny the Trinity...Hank Hanegraaff...has often expressed this point in a wonderfully simple and clear way: when speaking of the Trinity, we need to realize that we are talking about one *what* and three *who*'s. The one *what* is the Being or essence of God [or is it the BEING that *is* God? He equivocates]; the three *who*'s are the Father, Son and Spirit. We dare not mix up the *what*'s and *who*'s regarding the Trinity...Each is fully God, coequal with the others.”<sup>2</sup>

I see. God is a WHAT and not a WHO. The three Persons are WHO's but together they comprise the one God, and that one God is a WHAT, an ESSENCE. 3 X's amount to one Y. But White immediately contradicts his own definition. How can White refer to this “What” God as “He”? “*He is unique*” (p. 169).

How can HE be a WHAT? I thought “He” was a pronoun describing a person. Would not “It” describe a “What”?

What has happened here? In the sentence “each is fully God” Hanegraaff and White make their view sound illogical. They say that each is fully a Person and they call each one God, but they have already insisted that “**God**” is the name of the divine Triune Being with which (whom?) the three must not be confused. But they do in fact confuse them, once they call each Person “God” and then call *all three of them together* “God.”

Later White says that the word “God” in the Bible can refer to the Father, the Son, to the spirit, or *to all three at the same time* (p. 71). If that is so then 3X's after all do mean 1X, and White undermines his own warning against muddling the terms.

The Bible gives no hint whatever that knowing how many God is presents an enormous problem, requiring hair-splitting definitions. God in the New Testament is the Father of Jesus.

### Biblical Data

We invite readers to inspect the Bible and tell us of a single example (12,000 chances) in which GOD or LORD means all three Persons together.

The real issue is this: how does this amazing talk about “three Who's and *one What*” correspond in any possible way with the Bible? Which verse (of 12,000) in the Bible containing the word “God” means a “WHAT-God”? Indeed which of those 12,000 occurrences of “God” could possibly mean a triune God? None does, and this should prove to the open-minded that no Bible writer believed in a triune God. If he did, would he not have named that triune God at least once? White gives us no example of the word “God” in Scripture meaning the triune God — all three Persons together.

Hans Küng was right to complain: “Why is there never talk of the Triune God, where some theologians say the central mystery of Christianity is to be discussed? Where is the mention of the Trinity in the New Testament?”<sup>3</sup>

### More Impossible Language

All Bible readers know that Jesus is the begotten Son of God. When it comes to the relationship of Son to Father, White requires us to *forget the actual meaning of the word “beget.”* This is how he warns us away from understanding the dictionary meaning of “beget”: “We use the term begotten of the relationship of Father to Son...Automatically we place this relationship within time and think of the Father *originating* the Son at a point in time” (*The Forgotten Trinity*, p. 173).

But of course we automatically do this, because the word *beget* in Greek (in the Bible and outside it) and English *means* to originate! If the Bible says “beget” when it describes the origin of the Son, why should it not mean what it says? This is the heart of the Trinitarian “problem.”

White then tells us that we “most definitely” **must not believe that to beget means “to originate”!** What sort of pressure is this? We are to discard the dictionary meaning of a very simple clear word in the Greek and English languages and we are not to be permitted to believe what it actually means? We are not to believe the biblical word “beget”? We are not to believe what the Bible says about the Son being begotten? We are forbidden to use the grammatical, historical method claimed by Protestantism, which insists that words have their proper historical meaning.

<sup>1</sup> *The Kingdom of the Cults*, p. 284.

<sup>2</sup> *The Forgotten Trinity*, pp. 26-27, emphasis added.

<sup>3</sup> *Christianity: Essence, History and Future*, p. 94.

Experts on how to read the Bible intelligently rightly say: “A new language was not made for the authors of Scripture; *they conformed to the current language of the country and time*. Their compositions would not have otherwise been intelligible...The great object to be ascertained [in good Bible study] is the *usus loquendi* [the universal usage of words], embracing the laws or principles of universal grammar which form the basis of every language...A fundamental principle in grammatical-historical exposition is that words and sentences can have but one significance in one and the same connection...We must attend to the definitions and constructions which an author puts upon his own terms, and never suppose that he intends to contradict himself or puzzle his readers.”<sup>4</sup>

But James White abandons these principles in order to explain his Trinity. He says, “Automatically we place this relationship [the begetting of the Son by the Father] within time and think of the Father *originating* the Son at a point of time.” White forbids us to think like that. “The term [beget, or begotten] *as we use it* here speaks of an eternal, *timeless* relationship. It had no beginning, it will have no ending. It has always been...This is what *we mean when we speak* of the Father *begetting* the Son. The *relationship* of the first person of the Trinity to the second is that of *begetting*” (*Forgotten Trinity*, p. 173).

Yes, but that is not what “beget” actually means. It means “to originate, to cause to come into existence.” But when it comes to understanding who Jesus is “the Church” prohibits us from accepting the word “beget” in its proper meaning. According to the Trinity theory, God the Son had no beginning. According to the Bible the Son of God was caused to come into existence, begotten.

Can our readers see what has happened to precious language here? It has been retooled into a form of “church-speak” and its biblical and lexical meanings have been violated. This is a serious issue. Our understanding of who Jesus is in relation to the Father is profoundly affected by our understanding of “beget.”

So what does “Church language” tell us “beget” means? According to the rules of “church-speak” to beget means “to relate to.” It does *not* mean to originate or bring into existence. **If it did, then all would have to admit that the Son of God came into existence and the Trinity doctrine does not allow for this. The Council of Nicea in 325 issued a damning anathema against anyone who would dare to say that “there was a time when [the Son] did not exist”!**

Luke and Gabriel would have been unwelcome in that environment. In Luke 1:35 Gabriel provided a key, the biblical meaning of the Son of God — as a supernaturally procreated person, who came into existence some 2000 years ago. The Son, in other words,

was begotten *in time* and thus came into existence in the womb of his mother.

The One God of Israel, the Father of Jesus, just as He had promised in 2 Samuel 7:14-16, became the Father of His uniquely generated Son. “I will be his Father and he will be My Son” (2 Sam. 7:14; Heb. 1:5; Luke 1:35). This happened not in eternity (as the Trinity maintains) but in recorded human history, some 2000 years ago.

Alas, the precious laws of communication and the accepted grammatical method have been abandoned by popular Trinitarian expositors here. James White, supporting the Nicene Trinity, has invented a new meaning for a simple word. “Beget” means, in reality, *to cause to come into existence*. It means that the one begotten did not exist before he was begotten, brought into existence. To say that “beget” does not mean what it in fact does in Greek and English is to authorize unbelief of biblical words. It is a kind of cheating on language to tell us that “beget” does not mean “beget.” It puts the authority of White and Church tradition over the actual lexical facts about biblical words.

This must be declared inadmissible, if we are to believe what God inspired in the Bible. The student of Scripture will protest any such sabotaging of ordinary words in the interest of some theological, ecclesiastical theory. White says, “This is what *we mean when we speak* of the Father *begetting* the Son” (*The Forgotten Trinity*, p. 173, my emphasis). Tragically it is not what the Bible and language mean by “beget.” One’s decision on the proper meaning of “beget” will affect one’s whole theology and understanding of who Jesus, the Son of God is. And we should keep in mind Jesus’ complaint about the religious teachings of his day: “You are experts at setting aside the commandment of God in order to keep your tradition” (Mark 7:9).

### C.S. Lewis as Part of the Trouble

It was C.S. Lewis who popularized the idea that the Son of God has had an endless and timeless relationship with the Father — in other words that “beget” means “to have a relationship with” rather than to “give existence to.” Lewis said that the relationship of Father and Son had no beginning, like two books which have been resting on each other for eternity.

But this is to interfere with language, in this case biblical language. Scripture reveals that the Son of God was brought into existence, generated, “begotten” in the womb of his mother. This ensures that he is really a member of the human race. And all “high priests are chosen from among men” (Heb. 5:1). They are not God. They mediate between God and men. Paul described his own creed: “There is one God, and one mediator between that one God and men, Messiah Jesus, *himself*

<sup>4</sup> Milton Terry, *Biblical Hermeneutics*, pp. 102-103.

man” (1 Tim. 2:5). Is that really so difficult to understand?

Matthew had not heard of C.S. Lewis and his invented theological definitions of simple words. Matthew recorded the angel as saying to Mary, “That which is **begotten** in you is from the holy spirit” (Matt. 1:20). Note how the Greek word is “begotten” here and not just “conceived” which refers to the mother. “Begotten” describes the activity of the Father in *causing the existence* of or generating the Son. The RV of 1881 corrected the KJV in the margin by telling us that the Greek word in Matthew 1:20 means “begotten.”

It has been an embarrassment to church tradition that the Son was **begotten** (= brought into existence) by the Father some 2000 years ago. The creeds said that it was forbidden to think that the Son had a beginning! The anathemas attached to the Council of Nicea cursed anyone who dared to say that there was a time when the Son was not in existence!

### God Is Alone as a Single Person

Using the Old Testament as the guide to the New, we find the Old Testament definitions of God, as “alone,” with “no one besides Him” “by Himself,” defined in the New Testament as *the Father* as distinct from Jesus, the Son. Thus, as Paul taught, “There is to us *one God, the Father and no other besides Him...only one God*” (1 Cor. 8:4-6). Jesus had expressed the same unitary monotheistic view of God: “You, Father, are the only one who is truly God” (John 17:3). This is echoed by Paul: “There is one God and one mediator between God and man, the man Jesus Christ” (1 Tim. 2:5).

“God is **only one Person**” (Gal. 3:20, Amplified Version). “The Lord God is one Lord” (Mark 12:29).

These descriptions of God refer to a single Person in the Old Testament and this is demonstrated by the fact that:

1. They are statements involving the singular personal pronoun, which in language denotes a single person.

2. The New Testament One God phrases borrowed from the Old Testament are applied *to the Father*, who we all agree is one Person. They never mean three Persons together.

A leading evangelical scholar trying to support the Trinity seems very unsure of himself and makes some extraordinary concessions. Note the impossible struggle of Professor Millard Erickson. He has to admit the failure of logic and language as a guide to truth: “So it is with the objects of religious language, and for our purposes specifically, with the meaning of the Trinity. **It simply is not possible to explain it unequivocally...**It may also be necessary, in order to convey the unusual meaning involved in this doctrine, to utilize...‘logically odd language.’ This means using language in such a way

as *intentionally to commit grammatical errors. Thus, I have sometimes said of the Trinity, ‘He are three,’ or ‘They is one.’* For we have here a being whose nature falls outside our usual understanding of persons.”<sup>5</sup>

Erickson discusses the logic of saying that God is a triune being, somehow three and somehow one. He cites the findings of a logician Stephen Davis and concludes: “The doctrine has never as yet been shown to be coherent” (p. 256). “Davis insists that although we do not have apt categories for explaining how God can be three-and-one, we can legitimately describe God as being one when considered as a certain sort of thing and three when considered as another sort of thing” (p. 257). “If Davis’s analysis is correct (and I believe it is), then this is the same problem as saying that God is one and God is three but *without knowing just what is being referred to in each of these references*” (p. 255, my emphasis).

Erickson finally concedes: Davis “has perhaps been more candid than many of us, who when pressed may have to admit that **we really do not know in what way God is one and in what different way he is three**” (p. 258). In other words, we cannot tell you what we mean by personal being (the “what” of White’s definition) as different from person (the three “who’s” of White’s definition) and much less how those terms fit into the thousands and thousands of biblical references to God with a single personal pronoun. Single personal pronouns signify a single person.

### Simple Words

No one has any difficulty with this sort of statement: Ahimelech said to David, “Why are you alone and no one with you?” (1 Sam. 21:1). This makes an intelligible statement. But exactly the same language describes the God of the Bible. Note that the statement in 1 Samuel does not tell us everything about Ahimelech and David, but what it *does* tell is utterly clear. Why does not exactly the same language about God not communicate equally clear truth? “God is alone and no one is with Him.” He is obviously one Person.

The only way that we can communicate at all with each other is by agreeing to use words in fixed ways. The Bible cannot communicate if we refuse those fixed ways. Erickson even admits that the Trinity has not been *revealed*: “To say [as Davis does] that the doctrine has been revealed is a bit too strong, however, at least with respect to the biblical revelation. This is a point at which Davis really should offer some specific indication of...that revelation” (p. 258).

The Trinitarian definition of God proceeds as if there were no Bible! It tells us that God is a single essence and no Bible verse ever says that God is an

<sup>5</sup> *God in Three Persons*, pp. 268, 270, emphasis added.

essence. Out of 12,000 samples none can be cited which calls the One God an essence. Where is the God of the Bible ever described as a substance? A “what”? It appears that White is presenting us a one God not described or located anywhere in Scripture.

### Psalm 110:1

Psalm 110:1 is quoted in the New Testament more than any passage from the Old Testament. Hence its monumental importance for defining God and Jesus. Yahweh, in this verse, addresses ADONI (pronounced “adonee”), meaning “my lord.” Jesus and the scribes knew that that second lord was the Messiah, as prophesied for the future.

Firstly, we can all see that Yahweh is not the Messiah. Yahweh speaks to the Messiah. The Messiah is given the designation ADONI, my lord (*note the lower case, misleadingly capitalized in some translations giving the impression that the word is ADONAI=Lord God!*). That title (ADONI) appears 195 times in the Old Testament and is a form of the Hebrew word for “lord” (ADON) which *never means Deity*. ADONI always means a human, occasionally an angelic superior. It never refers to God. If it did you would have God speaking to God in Psalm 110:1. This of course would contradict the creed of Israel and of Jesus which states that “The LORD our God is one LORD” (Mark 12:29). One lord speaking to another lord, adds up to two lords and we know that God is a single Lord. The Jewish scribe was no Trinitarian! And nor was Jesus who enthusiastically agreed with the scribe about how many God is (Mark 12:28-34).

Astonishingly some exponents of Scripture have long misinformed the public about that word ADONI, the second lord of Psalm 110:1. They have promoted a complete error of fact by saying that the second “lord” of Psalm 110:1 is ADONAI. This is simply untrue. If the word were ADONAI, then there would be two in the Godhead.

Happily some other Trinitarians have been thorough and honest enough to point out the misinformation of their fellow Trinitarians. The Trinitarian William Kilgore wrote:

“For instance, one of my favorite Bible teachers writes: ‘In the most commonly quoted Old Testament passage in the New Testament, Psalm 110, David says, “The Lord said to my Lord” or “Yahweh said to my Adonai” (Ps. 110:1). The New Testament application of this verse saw it stressing the **divinity**, authority, and sovereignty of Christ when Yahweh, the Father, addressed Adonai, the Son’ (R.C. Sproul, *Tabletalk*, “Adonai, God is Lord,” December, 1995). **This is simply not true...This idea permeates Trinitarian articles and books, being committed again and again**” (*Thinkmail for Christian Thinkers*, #10, July 20<sup>th</sup>, 1998).

The word is indeed not *Adonai*, the Lord God, but *adoni*, a human superior who is distinguished from the One God. Unitary monotheism is biblical monotheism and a departure from that simple truth has led to a mass of unnecessary argumentation and conflict. ✧

### A Modern Translation Tries to Remove from Scripture the Reality of Supernatural Evil

The inspired New Testament text says that a man encountered by Jesus was under the power of a demon and that demons recognized Jesus. Rewriting the Bible to make it “palatable” produces this (below)! Such mistreatment of Scripture is indeed rewriting the Bible while pretending not to.

“There was a man there in a confused mental state, **which people thought was caused by an evil spirit**. He shouted out, ‘Why are you pestering me, Jesus of Nazareth? Are you going to kill me? I know who you are — God’s Chosen!’ Jesus quickly dealt with him. He said, ‘Calm down, and **be yourself!**’ After rolling about on the floor and a lot of noise, the man calmed down. All the people there were stunned and kept asking one another, ‘What’s going on? This is something new — a teaching that really works! He can even **heal someone’s mind** with his words!’ The fame of Jesus began to spread around the region of Galilee...That evening after sunset, they brought to Jesus all who were unwell or **mentally disturbed**...Jesus cured lots of people from various diseases, including people **who were disturbed**. He was able to quiet them down because they knew by instinct who he was” (Mark 1:23-34 from *Good as New: A Radical Retelling of the Scriptures*, 2004).

## Defining the Kingdom of God

The Christian Gospel is about the Kingdom of God (Mark 1:14, 15). A popular but mistaken and much too vague definition of the Kingdom of God goes like this: “A realm in which a king, namely Christ, exercises his power to act and control.”

Jesus commanded, as his first imperative, that we repent and *believe* the Gospel about the Kingdom (Mark 1:14, 15). The way to investigate the meaning of “Kingdom of God” is to start in Daniel, the background to Jesus’ teaching. Then work through every appearance of the word **Kingdom** in Mark’s Gospel. Then proceed to the other accounts of Jesus’ Kingdom Gospel preaching. The results: the Kingdom is *that revolutionary new world order and government to be inaugurated with headquarters in Jerusalem by the future return of Jesus in power and glory to put the Devil out of commission for 1000 years*.

Joseph of Arimathea who was a Christian was still waiting for the Kingdom of God (Mark 15:43), even after Jesus had completed his ministry in Israel. Joseph would certainly have seen the power of God manifested

in Jesus' ministry but he did not think that the Kingdom had come. He was *waiting* for it. Luke 19:11-27 is a beautiful and easy passage of Scripture defining the Kingdom of God. When it comes, Jesus will reign in Jerusalem. He is not doing that today. Anna the prophetess, a model servant of God, knew what the Kingdom was. "She came along just as Simeon was talking with Mary and Joseph, and she began praising God. She talked about the child to everyone who had been waiting for the promised King *to come and deliver Jerusalem*" (Luke 2:38). Has Jesus ever done that yet? The Gospel centers on that future arrival of the Kingdom as the solution to all the world's problems. ✧

## Comments

"Your 2-hour video presentation *The Human Jesus* ([www.Jesusishuman.com](http://www.Jesusishuman.com)) is absolutely wonderful! I've been on your mailing list for a number of years and have read much of your material. I've always been inclined towards being a non-Trinitarian, but have been unclear on certain issues that were clarified perfectly in this video presentation. Thank you for your diligence in this most significant project! Condensing all of the information so clearly in 2 hours was next to miraculous. I must say, however, that I was somewhat surprised that you did not include an explanation of Colossians 1:16 when you were addressing the issue that God was the Creator, not Jesus. Some may think that you avoided it intentionally. I don't believe that to be the case. Regardless, would you mind offering me your explanation of this verse, since 12 translations that I have studied do not shed any light on it for me. (If one says that everything was created 'through' Jesus, rather than 'by' Jesus, the problem of his 'pre-existence' still remains.)" — *Washington*

*The text in context is about the new creation, the Kingdom of God (Col. 1:13) and about the hierarchy of power in that Kingdom. Paul says that all things (the context defines what he means by "all things") were created IN Jesus, not "by" Jesus, which probably means "with him in view." Jews thought that God had Israel in mind at the creation. Jesus in Colossians 1:15 is the visible image of the invisible God, and so Paul did not imagine a Jesus who was invisible, existing before he was born (which would make his begetting, coming into existence in Mary impossible). When he speaks of the creation "through" Jesus (Col. 1:16) he has in mind the present new creation of which Jesus is the supreme head under God. In Colossians 1:18 Jesus has been promoted to his supreme position at the ascension, which proves that he did not have that position before that time and that he therefore could not have been eternally God.*

"I was baptized in a Chinese Methodist church in Malaysia in 1996 before I moved to England in the same

year to do a degree in electronic engineering. Then I joined a Chinese Trinitarian church. In 1999, I came across two Jehovah's Witnesses and had some Bible studies with them regarding the subject of Trinity. I felt that their arguments were strong and convincing; however I couldn't accept some of their teachings such as their blood policy and that Jesus was an angel before his incarnation as a man.

"Later, I brought the subject of the Trinity to the Chinese Trinitarian church leaders in 2001. To my dismay, after a few discussions, the church leaders threatened to disfellowship me if I didn't accept the Trinity. I was afraid, since I felt that I would be lonely if I left the church, as I didn't want to join JWs. When I looked at the modern-day (Universalist) Unitarian church, I felt that they are not biblical anymore. I was young and inexperienced at that time and I was misled to believe that the only unitarian faith left in the current world are the JWs and the Unitarian Universalists (UU's). Hence, I suppressed myself and accepted the Trinity in 2002. However, I felt that God became further and further away from me. In early 2006, I felt that I was at the edge of reaching death spiritually. I mean I had almost become an atheist.

"In mid 2006, I realized that church disfellowship is nothing compared to spiritual death. Then I entered a unitarian church for the first time to find out in details about their faith. I also looked at the internet to find more details about unitarian faith. Then I came across the unitarian article on the Wikipedia website. I was so surprised to find that apart from JWs and UU's, there are other non-Trinitarian groups, such as the Spirit and Truth Fellowship (STF), the Christadelphians (CAs), the Restoration Fellowship (RF) and the Church of God General Conference (CGGC). In early 2007, I came across Anthony's book *The Doctrine of the Trinity: Christianity's Self-Inflicted Wound* and Greg's book *They never told me this in church!*

"During the same period, i.e. early 2007, the local Chinese Trinitarian church underwent a few major changes. The pastor and the leaders, who had threatened to disfellowship me when we discussed the Trinity, have all gone away one by one for various reasons. The current leaders are more tolerant but they stick to the mainstream theology whenever there is a disagreement. I have given a copy of Greg's book to a friend from this church and I am waiting for him to finish reading it; then we will have a discussion. Two of my friends from the local Anglican Church also expressed their interest to read Greg's book, and I will give them copies. I bought three copies of Greg's book since I found it to be very useful." — *England*

"I happened to land at your website and had gone through a few articles. Very interesting. One article in particular regarding your view on the Trinity being

unbiblical. I do agree for the most part. Being a Trinitarian for most of my Christian life, I will be honest. I just accepted most of what Christendom taught me even though a lot didn't make sense. Things like free will, the doctrine of eternal hell, and many more doctrines taught by the church which to me is apostate today. Anyway that is another subject. But I now don't believe in the Trinity. The Holy Spirit is not the third person of the Godhead. I say this because the Holy Spirit is left out of Paul's writings in his greetings to the church. Paul at the beginning and the end of his epistles refers to God the Father and Jesus Christ. He hardly mentions the Holy Spirit, thus not giving equal mention to the third person. And one of many points to me is if Jesus was conceived by the Holy Spirit, why wouldn't Jesus be referred to as the Son of the Holy Spirit rather than the Father?

"What is confusing to me and I hope you do respond is that you say that Jesus is not God. Didn't Jesus say 'Before Abraham was I am'? Didn't he talk of his preexistence? He did say, 'Father, give me the glory that I once had with you.' And yet you say that Jesus didn't exist before. I don't have my Bible in front of me but there is a Scripture that says that he is the image of the invisible God. And that no one has seen the Father at any time. So Jesus is the God of the Old Testament [*That would make two Gods!*]. Another Scripture says that Jesus came out of the Father. Does that mean he has a beginning so therefore he did not exist forever? [*Of course, but when was his genesis? Matt. 1:18, 20*]. Plus the verse in the New Testament says that Jesus emptied himself as God and entered the physical realm being born of woman. I was looking to see if you addressed these problem verses for your stance but I couldn't find them. [*We have discussed all these passages in our books and would ask you to have a look. But note that Paul is talking about Messiah Jesus in Phil. 2 who was in the form of God, but behaved as a servant. Top-rank scholars have also not thought that Paul thought Jesus was alive before birth, notably F.F. Bruce in correspondence with us.*]

"So I hope to hear from you and hopefully I can clear this up. Because I don't believe in the Trinity doctrine, the church has labeled me a heretic. And now my belief is that there is God the Father and God the Son Jesus Christ. Who is Jehovah of the Old Testament? [*Yahweh is the one who speaks to the Messiah in Psalm 110:1 and the New Testament reports that the Messiah is at the right hand of GOD now. Thus Yahweh is and always will be the One God. God did not speak in a Son in the Old Testament (Heb. 1:2). God sometimes spoke through angels in the Old Testament in whom He placed His name (Exod. 23:21). And the Holy Spirit is the Spirit that comes from God, as His operational presence and power, and not a third person of the Trinity.*]

"But if you believe that Jesus is not God then what you believe goes against most theologians and modern-day teachers such as Norman Geisler, James White, Robert Morey, and of course past theologians such as Luther, Calvin, Spurgeon, etc. who have defended the Trinity. And I am just searching for the truth." (*There are scores of Bible experts past and present who do not believe that the God of the Bible is the Trinity.*)

"The *Focus on the Kingdom* August issue was very beneficial for me. It made me understand: 1. The focus on preaching about the Kingdom is very important and the primary motive of every Christian. 2. The article on Christ's 2nd coming was also very informative." — *India*

"I was just wanting to thank you for all your work on the documentary at [www.Jesusishuman.com](http://www.Jesusishuman.com). I have found it extremely helpful and would love to be able to use it as a tool for discussing the topic with people who have Trinitarian views." — *Australia*

The *Human Jesus* two-hour documentary (on the web at [www.Jesusishuman.com](http://www.Jesusishuman.com)) is available also on DVD (\$12). Please call 800-347-4261 or 404-362-0052 to order.

We thoroughly recommend as a learning tool and "tract" for sharing the Kingdom Gospel a short movie entitled "The Kingdom of God." Dan Cain, a Bible College student, prepared this excellent resource as part of a course on the Kingdom. It is available at our website [www.restorationfellowship.org](http://www.restorationfellowship.org), which has been recently redesigned and updated.

The **17th Theological Conference** will be Sunday through Wednesday, **April 27-30, 2008** at Simpsonwood Conference Center, which one of this year's participants called "the most beautiful conference center I've ever stayed in"! People gather from far and wide to share a common delight in the One God of Israel and of Jesus. The Gospel of the Kingdom will be celebrated as the center of the Christian Gospel, and about a dozen speakers will prepare significant presentations to encourage us in the Christian journey. We will again hear fascinating "faith stories" from those who give an account of their discovery of truth, often via much struggle. This is definitely not a meeting for professional scholars only, but a convention of inquirers of all sorts. You will be guaranteed new insights from Scripture and the assurance that there are many around the world in quest of a simpler and kinder form of the faith, which resonates with the faith of early believers. Please do join us for this conference. Details about how to register will appear later in the *Focus* magazine.