

Focus on the Kingdom

Vol. 10 No. 7

Anthony Buzzard, editor

April, 2008

What Happens in the Future?

The Crucial Words “immediately after” (Matt. 24:29)

Paul, the intrepid Apostle whose writings have been vastly influential for believers for the past nearly 2000 years, had a clear and decisive message about what Christians are to expect *before* the Second Coming of Jesus. It is plain to us all that when Jesus comes, he will arrive in power and visible glory to inaugurate his Davidic Kingdom in Jerusalem, with effects across the globe. The world will finally experience uninterrupted peace. “They will break forth into shouts of joy” (Isa. 14:7). The final King of Babylon (Isa. 14:4ff), the Antichrist-Beast, will be eliminated (Rev. 19:19-20).

In that future amazing day, which will forever alter the course of society and world history, Jesus will rule, assisted by the saints of all the ages. Sane government and a just society will be the order of the day. Satan, the supernatural and immensely powerful deceiving “god of this age” (2 Cor. 4:4), will have been arrested and imprisoned for 1000 years. A new era of marvelous life on earth will begin when as Micah 4:8 says of the future Jerusalem: “You, O tower of the flock, the hill of the daughter of Zion, to you it will come, yes, the former dominion shall **come**, the **Kingdom** of the daughter of Jerusalem.” This text gave rise to the petition so well known to us all and commanded as our necessary prayer: “May your Kingdom come” (Matt. 6:10).

It was from the famous last words of the disciples of Jesus that we learn what was uppermost in their yearning for the “good time coming.” They asked Jesus, “Has the time now come for you to restore the Kingdom to Israel?” (Acts 1:6) Jesus clearly stated that it is impossible to set dates for the arrival of the “time when the saints possess the Kingdom” (Dan. 7:22; Acts 1:7; Mark 13:32).

My point in what follows is this: Paul instructed his converts in the matter of what is going to happen *before* the Kingdom to be established by Jesus at his return. In 2 Thessalonians 2:2-4 Paul urged his converts “not to be quickly shaken in mind or alarmed, either by a spirit or a spoken word, or a letter seeming to be from us, to the effect that the **Day of the Lord** has come. Let no one deceive you in any way. For that day will not come, unless the rebellion comes first, and **the man of lawlessness is revealed**, the son of destruction, who opposes and exalts himself above every so-called god or

object of worship, so that he takes his seat in the temple of God, proclaiming himself to be God.”

This teaching had been a fundamental factor in Paul’s establishment of new churches: “Do you not recall that when I was with you I used to tell you these things?” (2 Thess. 2:5). Paul made it a habit, as part of his Gospel teaching and church-founding activity, to instruct his converts on what the Bible says about events *prior to* the Second Coming.

This is the situation which had arisen in Thessalonica: Someone or some persons had suggested that the Second Coming was very close at hand, even that it had already happened. This caused, naturally enough, an enormous agitation among the church members. It was to restore peace and calm to his congregations that Paul expressly said that certain events must *precede* the Second Coming. Jesus could not return until some definite events had happened, which would be signs of that coming. There would be definite indications that the return of Jesus was about to happen. Paul explained that there must *first* occur a “rebellion” and along with it the emergence of the antichristian figure he calls the Man of Lawlessness or Man of Sin, “son of destruction” (2 Thess. 2:3). Readers would think of a single individual, since Judas had been given the same title “son of destruction” (John 17:12). Paul called his readers’ attention to the need to recognize that this evil personage would be *revealed*. That word is important. He would make some sort of spectacular appearance, and this would be the sign that the end of the age was rapidly approaching.

Paul went on to explain. He said that prior to the revelation of the Man of Sin, the *mystery* of wickedness, the underground and subtle influence of wickedness, would be at work (2 Thess. 2:7). How long that insidious activity would continue he did not say, nor did he know. Finally, that Man of Sin would be revealed, and his career would be short-lived. He would be destroyed by the dazzling brightness of Jesus’ appearance at his Second Coming (2 Thess. 2:8). Paul was citing a verse about the Assyrian (Isa. 11:4; cp. Mic. 5:6).

It is crucial to see that the mystery of lawlessness is to work gradually for an unknown length of time and then result ultimately in the revelation of the Man of Sin, whom Jesus will eliminate (2 Thess. 2:8) at his Second Coming, i.e. his *Parousia*, the Greek word for the Second Coming.

Paul was familiar with the Old Testament's and Jesus' teaching about the final wicked person. Jesus had interestingly given a parallel account of events which must precede his arrival in power and glory to set up the Kingdom on earth. On the Tuesday before the crucifixion on Friday (the preparation day, *paraskeue*, for the weekly Sabbath), Jesus delivered one of his longest discourses. This was in response to the excellent question of the disciples: "What will be the sign of your coming and the end of the age?" (Matt. 24:3). The disciples associated that future coming with a time of trouble in Jerusalem in connection with a temple or holy place (see Mark 13:4 and Luke 21:7). They wanted information about the "sign" which would indicate the near approach of the end-time and the Kingdom.

Jesus, in direct response to their question, gave an answer which was based on the scheme of end-time events already laid out by Daniel and other prophets. Daniel was of critical importance for God's program for the end. Daniel himself had inquired about **the last stage** (Dan. 12:6, 8: *acherit* = last stage) of the final vision he had just received (Dan. 11). In that vision a wicked King of the North was to "come to his end," i.e. be destroyed in Israel (11:45). Thereupon the resurrection of the dead would occur (Dan. 12:2). The resurrection of the dead, as we know from the New Testament, will happen when Jesus comes back and the seventh trumpet blows (1 Cor 15:23, 52; Rev. 11:15-18). Jesus himself was deeply impressed with the time when the righteous will shine like the sun (Matt. 13:43, quoting Dan. 12:3).

In a debriefing session with the interpreting angel, Daniel asked for an indication of time in connection with the *last stage* of the vision (12:8). In reply the angel said that a period of 1290 days would elapse from "the setting up of the abomination of desolation" (12:11) until the end of the vision, the resurrection mentioned in Daniel 12:2. The final discussion of this vision is critically important as truth concerning the end of the age (see Dan. 12:7-11). Jesus was very much aware of the program of the end.

What information did Jesus supply as he lectured his students on end-time events? He first warned of general religious deception and persecution and spoke of the Gospel of the Kingdom (the Christian Gospel) as being announced worldwide to the nations (Matt. 24:14). Following this worldwide announcement of the Kingdom Gospel "the *end* will come" (v. 14). Jesus then began to give specific details. "When you see the abomination of desolation standing where **he**¹ ought not to" (Mark 13:14), flee to the hills. Matthew added that

¹The participle modifying the abomination is most interestingly *masculine*, referring to a single person. Commentaries point this out.

disciples in Israel should pray that their sudden flight not be on a Sabbath day (24:20). It would be harder to escape from Israel on that day, since Jews would be keeping the Sabbath. It would also be harder if that sudden, urgent escape were to be in winter. Conditions would be doubly difficult for pregnant mothers or mothers with small infants (24:19). Jesus explained, referring to Daniel 12:1, the end part of the vision of Daniel 11: "those days will be a tribulation such as has never occurred and never will occur again" (Mark 13:19; Matt. 24:21). This time of trouble will be an event never to be repeated. It will be the fitting climax to the birth pangs, about which the Jews knew well, leading to the birth of the new age of the Kingdom on earth.

Now we come to a verse which should be underlined and emphasized by all Bible students. Speaking of that time of great tribulation (Matt. 24:21), Jesus said, "**immediately after** the tribulation of those days, the sun will be darkened" (Matt. 24:29). Note carefully that there is no interval between the end of the agonizing great tribulation and the heavenly signs which will precede and accompany the arrival of Jesus in power and glory.

It cannot be too strongly emphasized that Matthew reports Jesus as saying that the Great Tribulation is to be followed without interval by the second coming of Jesus. The phrase "immediately after" is perfectly clear and involves no complexity of language at all. There is to be no time gap at all between the *end* of the great tribulation and the cosmic signs pointing to the coming of Jesus.

Tragically much commentary on the Bible has disliked those words "immediately after." Mark's version repeats Matthew's emphasis on the immediate chronological connection between the end of the Great Tribulation and the second coming. Mark wrote, "In those days [the days of the Great Tribulation he has just mentioned] after **that** tribulation [the same one and only Great Tribulation just described] the sun will be darkened" (Mark 13:24).

Why would anyone find the phrase "immediately after" objectionable? Simply because some readers have imagined that the awful events of AD 70, when Jerusalem was destroyed by the Roman armies, were the fulfillment of Jesus' prediction about the Great Tribulation. The huge problem was, How is it that Jesus did not return *immediately after* (Matt. 24:29) the tribulation of those days in AD 70?

Misunderstanding Jesus has led some to the extraordinary idea that Jesus did in fact return invisibly in AD 70! That view is called "preterism" (meaning "past-ism") and it is held by a considerable number of Bible readers, some of whom have written books to defend this position. Their "belief," for many of us,

amounts to unbelief. Language has ceased to have meaningful significance, if Jesus came back to this earth in AD 70. What happened to the resurrection of the dead? (1 Cor. 15:23; Rev. 11:15-18). It was apparently an invisible event, as was the arrival of Jesus! Preterism is an impossible way of viewing the Second Coming of Jesus, which is described in Scripture as a tremendous display of visible glory, as the Messiah returns to eliminate the incorrigibly wicked and produce peace throughout the world.

Let me now alert you to the verbal tricks which have been employed to dissolve Jesus' classic words "immediately following the tribulation of those days" (Matt. 24:29). Here are the words of Jesus as reported by Matthew: "For then there will be **great tribulation**, such as has not been from the beginning of the world until now, no, and never will be. And if **those days** had not been cut short, no human being would be saved. But for the sake of the elect **those days** will be cut short. Then if anyone says to you, 'Look, here is the Christ!' or 'There he is!' do not believe it. For false christs and false prophets will arise and perform great signs and wonders, so as to lead astray, if possible, even the elect. See, I have told you beforehand. So, if they say to you, 'Look, he is in the wilderness,' do not go out. If they say, 'Look, he is in the inner rooms,' do not believe it. For as the lightning comes from the east and shines as far as the west, so will be the coming of the Son of Man... **Immediately after the tribulation of those days** the sun will be darkened, and the moon will not give its light, and the stars will fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens will be shaken" (Matt. 24:21-29).

Every reader will understand from this passage that the Second Coming follows **immediately** on the heels of the Great Tribulation, those days in which it is hard for pregnant women, and that period which if not cut short by God would result in no one surviving.

Let me now show you two examples of the techniques which have been used to suppress this plain information. In an otherwise expert commentary by the Cambridge Regius Professor of Divinity, Dr. H.B. Swete, who was chaplain to King George, we find this reference to Matthew 24:29. The professor is keen for us to understand that there is in fact *a long interval* between the Great Tribulation and the Second Coming. In an uncharacteristic stroke of the pen, he asks us to believe that Matthew wrongly understood Jesus!

He comments: "Matthew interpreted the Lord's words by the conviction which possessed the first generation and prefixes the word 'immediately.'" In other words, Matthew misunderstood Jesus *and added the word "immediately" to the word "after."* So Matthew was wrong, and of course it would follow, although the professor would not say this, that the Scripture and Jesus were wrong!

It is important to remember that we are not arguing some abstruse academic point here. If Christians are to live from every word that comes to us from God, as Jesus said in Matthew 4:4, it follows that we are to believe and teach those words of Jesus. A very large amount of the Bible refers to events preceding and following the return of Jesus. The words "*immediately after the tribulation of those days*" ought to have prevented anyone from imagining vast tracts of time between the Great Tribulation and the Second Coming. The excision of the word "immediately" as being an alleged mistake of Matthew does violence to the faith as Jesus taught it.

The same word trick is played on Matthew and Jesus by the otherwise excellent *Word Biblical Commentary*. The commentator says, "In verse 29 Matthew adds the very problematic initial 'immediately,' seemingly to tie this [section] more closely with what precedes."² He then remarks that the Great Tribulation would fit well the events of AD 70, "were it not for the decidedly complicating presence of Matthew's added 'immediately'" (p. 711). The writer has decided that "immediately" is Matthew's editorial insertion! He agrees that Matthew means "immediately (not simply 'very soon after') after the destruction and desecration of the temple the parousia is to be expected," and that the "inserted 'immediately' necessitates seeing the intended tribulation as a *yet future one*" (p. 712).

Note that despite his efforts to rid the text of the word "immediately" the professor acknowledges that as the words of Jesus stand they teach us that **the Great Tribulation will be followed immediately by the Second Coming and thus, of course, the Great Tribulation was not the event of AD 70 and the fall of Jerusalem at that time.**

Far more honest was the work of the commentator in the *Century Bible*, Dr. S.D.F. Salmond. Commenting on Mark's "in those days after that tribulation" (13:24), he observes that "the tribulation is the sign of the end." A great tribulation in AD 70 was, as we now know, no sign of the immediate return of Jesus. Salmond continues with a comment on Matthew: "The relation of the fall of Jerusalem to the Second Coming is most definitely given as one of immediate sequence — 'immediately after the tribulation of those days.'"³

Salmond also notes that "**the disciples connected the second coming of Christ and the end of the world [age] with the destruction of the holy city and its temple.**" Not only did the disciples make that connection based on such texts as Daniel 12:11, but Jesus obviously did also. There is not a hint in his

² *Matthew 14-28, Word Biblical Commentary*, p. 710.

³ *Century Bible* on Mark, p. 302.

answer to suggest that he thought the question of the disciples to be in any way mistaken. He answered a plain inquiry about trouble in the temple and Jerusalem, and the Second Coming which would follow. He answered with plain words. Matthew and Mark make those two events follow in immediate sequence. This is prophecy for us today and an important part of our faithful belief of the life-imparting words of Jesus (John 6:63).

The text of Scripture should not be assaulted by unsupported theories about editorial insertions by Matthew — theories which alter the meaning of Jesus' instruction. We lose our grip on sound understanding when, like Zechariah who "did not believe my words which will be fulfilled in their time" (Luke 1:20), we refuse simple communication like "immediately after." Jesus informs us that "immediately after the great tribulation" he will return. On that basis we can successfully face the future with confidence, knowing the warnings of Jesus about events which must still happen before the Messiah returns. "Look," said Jesus, "I have told you in advance" (Matt. 24:25). ✧

A Voice for Biblical Prophecy from the 1800s

Earnest ministers of the Bible knew long before 1948, when the modern state of Israel was founded, that Israel had to become a nation if Bible prophecy was to be fulfilled. One such expert on the Bible was (Pastor) Andrew Bonar, born in Edinburgh in 1810. He and his forebears provided ministers in the Scottish Church for 300 years. In 1853 he penned the now reprinted (by Sovereign Grace Advent Testimony) *The Development of Antichrist*.

Bonar noted very sensibly that "there cannot be two unequalled great tribulations any more than there can be two Second Comings" (p. 27). He could clearly see even in 1853 that "Scripture indicates a return of the Jews again as a nation, although in unbelief (Ezek. 22:19-22), when the final 'week' of years in Daniel 9:27 will be fulfilled...The coming of the Beast is declared to be with all 'deceivableness of unrighteousness.' The Beast will adapt himself, just as Napoleon did, to the prevailing system of godless times he appears in, and especially to the prejudices of the Jewish people, who probably by his help in their own land once more as a nation with great wealth will rise to importance there. In this 'deceivableness' also he will make a covenant with the Jews for the remaining 'week' [seven years] of Daniel's prophecy...At first all seems to prosper. All the world is seen (Rev. 13:3) to marvel at the Beast and also to worship him and the Devil who gives him his power. How fearful to think of such an apostasy as this. Well may it be called 'the apostasy,' connected as it is with this prince who will have come and shown himself to be

'that man of sin, son of perdition.' In the midst of the 'week' (although the covenant had been made for the whole week) he throws off the mask and shows himself to be 'God' (2 Thess. 2:4) with a false prophet too, working miracles before him in the power of Satan himself. The last half of the seven years, when the covenant has been broken, are the times of unequalled tribulation so often referred to already and of which so much is said in Scripture. God has mercifully shortened those days and told His people in every different mode of expressing it what the limit is: the midst of the week, that is three years and a half, the 1260 days, the forty-two months, the time, times and half a time, all expressing exactly the same duration, and all, if taken with the context, pointing distinctly to the same dreadful period" (pp. 34-35).

Bonar spoke of the Second Coming of Jesus as "undoubtedly to be expected, if words are to have any meaning at all, as well as a time of unequalled tribulation *immediately* to precede it (Matt. 24:29). The Apostle speaks of antichrists [plural] in his day but the maturity of antichristian evil is distinctly postponed till 'that man of sin be revealed, the lawless one' who after a permitted triumph is to be destroyed by the 'brightness of Christ's coming'" (p. 14).

Bonar expresses his disapproval of a contrary system of prophecy introduced around 1240 AD, which claimed that the Pope was the "little horn." Bonar wrote: "That Luther and his companions in tribulation should have gone along with such imagination seems far less wonderful than that so many in these days [1850s] should still be arguing that the Pope is the 'man of sin.' The tribulation is to be terminated not as some would have it by the *gradual* decline of the Pope or the papacy but by the coming of the Lord himself to destroy the wicked one...Those who adhere to the prevailing mode of figurative interpretation regard the 'darkening of the sun' as metaphorical language, maintaining that the sun and moon [in Matt. 24:29] are political emblems. Thus they dispose of these solemn predictions of the Lord Jesus" (p. 15). ✧

"There was a saying of one of the ancient Rabbis, 'A prayer in which the Kingdom is never mentioned is no true prayer'" (p. 92).

"The hope of the Kingdom was for [Jesus] the essential element in prayer" (p. 92).

"So the Lord's prayer all turns on this one petition for the Kingdom. We ask for daily bread that we may wait for the Kingdom; for God's forgiveness that we may be worthy to enter it; for power to resist temptation that we may never wander from the road that leads to it" (p. 92).

— From *The Lord's Prayer* by E.F. Scott, contributed by Brian Wright

A Letter to Dave Hunt, editor of *The Berean Call*

Dear Dave Hunt,

You rightly complain about so much which goes under the name of orthodoxy (that awful Calvinism which makes God a monster). But where would you be without your friends to suggest that some language is really nonsense? I refer, gently, to your “Urgent Call,” where you say “Without ceasing to be God, He would become a man through a virgin birth...He would die for our sins.”

One of those really easy, simple pieces of biblical data is that God is immortal (1 Tim. 6:16). Happily words *do* have meaning; the Bible is not a mystery, riddle book which requires a special theological spin on its words! If we cannot agree that immortal means incapable of death, God’s revelation becomes pointless. God *cannot* die, or lie: that is one thing we can know for certain, based on the plain, inspired word of Scripture.

Then Charles Wesley was in the grip of that awful Roman Catholic (inherited by Protestants) system of dogma: “’Tis mystery all: the immortal dies” (which you quote with approval). I would hate to arrive at the judgment day, and be assessed as a teacher more strictly than others (James 3:1), presenting that sort of statement to the public. Hot ice cubes, married bachelors, indeed “same-sex marriages” are just as much a violation of logic and language as God *dying*!

God did not die and cannot die. The Son of God died (Rom. 5:10). There was a human person on the cross who died for us. If the Son *is* God, he cannot have died.

May I humbly suggest that the virginal begetting tells of the *origin* (Matt. 1:20: *genesis*) of the Son of God, and Luke 1:35 is lucidly simple as a full description of how, why and where the Son of God came into existence.

The Reformation was very partial, and I am sure you are helping it along, but it will not do to copy the dogmas of the church fathers (and the Catholics) who were philosophers, largely, and not believers in the creed of Jesus (Mark 12:28-34).

In hope of getting your ear,

Sincerely, Anthony Buzzard

P.S. On the Gospel, I humbly suggest you have not given the Gospel the *label* given it by Jesus and Paul: **The Gospel of the Kingdom of God**. There are *thirty chapters* of Gospel preaching from Jesus (i.e. the Synoptics) in which the death and resurrection is not

even mentioned! That also is Gospel, but you have reduced the Gospel to a Gospel minus what Jesus preached as Gospel (we all know he added the death and resurrection, but he did not begin there, Matt. 16:21). You quote only part of Hebrews 2:3 which tells us that Jesus is the original preacher of *the* Gospel, but you insist on starting with Paul, who did not disagree with Jesus, and who defined the Gospel of the grace of God as the **Gospel of the Kingdom** (Acts 20:24, 25) You leave out that defining verse 25. It proves that Paul preached the same Gospel of the Kingdom as Jesus did.

The Trinity [“Out of the Mouth of Babes”—ed.]

by Casey Hixon, 12 years old

The Trinity is a very debatable topic. Most people believe that the Trinity is the truth. Some people believe that the Trinity is not the truth. I am one of those people who do not believe that the Trinity is the truth. I am going to try to convince you that you should not believe the Trinity, because it is not true. My four points of discussion are: God cannot die, Jesus himself was not a Trinitarian, God is unchangeable and God cannot be tempted.

My first reason is that God cannot die. He is immortal, as the Bible says. If Jesus was God, then he could not have been crucified on the cross for our sins. If Jesus was the *human* form of God, who was doing God’s job when He was dead? The answer is, no one! If your reply is God was, then you have created two Gods. No one could have been doing His job if God was dead (which the Bible says is impossible!). If [as Modalists say] Jesus and God are the same person, how could he resurrect himself from the dead? When you are dead, you are asleep and you don’t know anything, as Ecclesiastes 9:5 says: “For the living know they will die; but the dead do not know anything, nor have they any longer a reward, for their memory is forgotten.”

If you ask a person to explain the Trinity to you, they will say, “Well, it’s just a mystery.” If you do not have an answer, then you should start looking in your Bible. But when you look in your Bible, it says nothing about the Trinity. The word Trinity is not in the Bible. It is not even hinted at in the Bible. [When the Bible says “God” it never means the Trinity. There are 12,000 instances of the words for “God” in the Bible and none of them means the triune God. — ed.]

My second point is that Jesus himself was not a Trinitarian. Jesus was a Jew. If you ask any Jewish rabbi what the word *echad* (the Hebrew word for one) means he will tell you it means one, not three or three forms of one, but simply one.

Jesus in the book of Mark (Mark 12:28-29) was talking to a scribe. The scribe asked Jesus what the

greatest commandment was. Jesus answered by reciting the *Shema* (the creed of Israel): “The greatest commandment is this, ‘Hear O Israel, The Lord our God is one Lord.’” This means that God is one Person, not three as many today believe. Jesus never even dreamed of putting himself on the same level as God. He always called God his Father. Jesus also prayed all the time to his Father, God.

My third point is that God is unchangeable. This means that God cannot change into a human. The Bible states that Jesus, right now, is sitting at the right hand of God.

My last point is that God cannot be tempted. When you look at the Bible, it says that Jesus was tempted by Satan. The Bible says that God cannot be tempted in James 1:13: “When tempted, no one should say, ‘God is tempting me.’ For God cannot be tempted by evil, nor does He tempt anyone.” For this to be true Jesus could not have been God because he was tempted by the very evil Satan.

The problem started many years ago when two sides argued about whether God was one or a Trinity. The decision was made at the Council of Nicea that God was a Trinity. Many of the people didn’t understand the Trinity, and the priests said, “We priests understand it and you don’t need to.” That gave the priests power over the people.

As you now see, God cannot be three Persons. It is simply impossible. If you ask people today to explain the Trinity to you, nine out of ten simply cannot explain it. That is amazing. It’s really not that hard. God is one and Jesus is His only Son.

Sources

The Bible

Video – <http://Jesusishuman.com>

My daddy

<http://focusonthe kingdom.org>

Comments

“I just finished reading *The Amazing Aims and Claims of Jesus: What You Didn’t Learn in Church* again — great book. The Kingdom Gospel message is so vital and so ignored.” — *Arizona*

“I have recently discovered your audio and video on the internet and it is with great joy that I have been receiving your teachings. Especially I like the refutation of the Trinitarian view of God, a doctrine which for over 30 years now I have not understood and cannot accept. Your clear and eloquent words give me new insight into the simplicity and purity of the Scriptures and the message that Jesus the Messiah gave concerning the coming Kingdom of God which we are hoping and waiting for.” — *California*

“I spend a lot of time on the CARM.org discussion board, mainly arguing with Trinitarians and attempting to persuade them to see the error of their doctrine — specifically the error of saying Jesus has two natures and only one of those two natures died while the pre-existing ‘God the Son’ did not die. I believe the doctrine of the Hypostatic Union [two natures of Jesus] teaches that Jesus did not really die but instead he merely died ‘bodily’ as they say, since it was his ‘assumed’ human nature that ‘died,’ not the divine person. This is a subtle way of denying our Savior’s actual death. *They give lip service to the ‘person’ of Christ dying but in reality they say he did not die at all. This is the sum of the doctrine of the two natures and the words they use to define it.*

“This single issue led me to question the doctrine of the Trinity in the first place. At any rate I posted a new thread with the simple question, ‘Was there a human person dead on the cross?’ This question agitated them tremendously, judging by the intensity of the replies I received. Then after a day or so the thread mysteriously disappeared. I received no explanation as to what happened nor did I receive any disciplinary sanctions. I had not broken any of the rules of the forum so I posted the same question in a new thread. After just a few hours this thread was removed as well and I received a one month ban from the site. The only explanation given was that I ‘reposted or spammed’ a thread.

“I find it very interesting that of all my threads and all the points I have made exposing the doctrine of the Hypostatic Union as error, this single question seemed to disturb them the most. They are quite fond of explaining the three ‘persons’ in their theology while being careful to maintain that while Jesus was ‘man’ or ‘human’ he was not a human *person*. In fact a week ago I had one of the most prominent of the Trinitarian apologists tell me, and I quote, ‘no human person was born of Mary.’ When he said this I knew I was getting close to asking a question they could not answer even with creative equivocation. They so strongly defend the idea that the divine person who assumed the human nature DID NOT DIE that they have painted themselves into a corner, so to speak. Since the divine person is the only ‘person’ who *is* Jesus, then when asked if there was a *human person* dead on the cross their error is exposed. If the divine person did not die, then there is no dead person at all on the cross. If there is no dead person, then they have no Savior.” — *from email*

“I had short associations with a number of groups who did not worship the Trinity. As a child I was brought up at a Wesleyan Chapel, and attended a Church of England school. At nine years old I was bought my own Bible to read by an uncle who was a Pentecostalist. I read of the need to be baptized instead of christened, but I did not join their church. I had two years of talks with a Jehovah’s Witness, and came to see that the

Trinity was wrong. Then I attended a debate between a J.W. and a Christadelphian; the latter I thought to be the better way, so after some study with them, I was baptized by them. I spent 14 years as a Christadelphian, but not with the local fellowship as I was unhappy with some of the things that some of them believed (not all of one mind). I set up an altar in my own home and received those of like mind. At the end of the 14 years, I found the statement of faith not to be in keeping with the Bible. At that time I was baptized together with my wife at our local outdoor swimming baths, and have not belonged to any group since. That was 39 years ago...

“I have read with great care your book *The Coming Kingdom of the Messiah* and found the case for it set out well. As you said to me, ‘I think you will find your own understanding to be very very close,’ and that is so. I have believed in the Messiahship of my Lord Jesus (Yeshua) since I was 20 years old; likewise I have known about the falsehood of the Trinity. As I expect to be very very close to what you say in your book *Jesus Was Not a Trinitarian*, I will leave that book to last. I am also looking forward to starting reading *They never told me THIS in church!* by Greg S. Deuble, later this evening. Reading your book on the kingdom brought back to me the memory of the last time I ever went into the chapel that I had been brought up in. My mother asked me to go with her to a special service to be given on the Kingdom of God. It was to be given by a Church of England vicar. I had stopped going to chapel as I had just discovered the Trinity to be wrong, but my mother was just widowed and in need of some support. I gave her that support throughout the service, but for myself I would have walked out after the talk had just started. I explained to her later that I could never go with her again. The speaker started his talk (I do not remember his exact form of words) but he announced that he/they could no longer go along with the Apostolic Second Coming of Christ — the Church was continuing his work, he said, and the Church was now God’s Kingdom on Earth. Sincerely yours — in waiting and watching for the Kingdom to come.” — *England*

“Just felt called to write and say again how indebted and grateful I am for your efforts in speaking out God’s truth. I spend about one hour a day in the car getting to/from work and normally listen to the Bible. Over the last two weeks have been going through your podcasts. Really enjoyed your Revelation series, even though we are not in absolute agreement over the ‘abom’ and futurism/historicism. Also greatly enjoyed your debate with Dr. Fred Sanders. Dr. Sanders is impressive in how he has so convinced himself of a gross error and is able to fairly eloquently promote it! It seems that he is not at all interested in what the Hebrew understanding is/was. To appreciate John’s prologue we clearly need to understand the Hebraic mindset. Dr. Sanders seems

totally uninterested in it. Your patience and approach in this debate is most impressive and reflects the actions of a true believer who appreciates that it is what we *do* that really matters — we must hear (understand) the word of God and do it! I believe Hellenism is one of the greatest problems we face in waking the world to the full truth of our Father.” — *Australia*

“Two years ago I read *The Doctrine of the Trinity: Christianity’s Self-inflicted Wound* and it has utterly changed my life. Thank you. I have bought several copies and given them to friends with some small success.” — *Canada*

“I have watched *The Human Jesus* DVD several times and shared it with a few friends and family...The *Focus on the Kingdom* newsletters keep getting better and better! There is so much ‘meat’ in those publications that I read some of the articles several times. I also frequently share articles with others...I am continually thankful to God for leading me to the discovery of your book (*Trinity...Self-Inflicted Wound*) several years ago, and for allowing me to get connected to Restoration Fellowship...I feel like I belong to all of you there in Atlanta and to the others of like mind around the globe. I look forward to beginning to read your newest book, *Jesus Was Not a Trinitarian*, soon.” — *New York*

“I live in Lagos, Nigeria. I am, by God’s grace and power, one who seeks to do God’s will in all totality and having found the truth of His word, doing all to remain in it and grow, to be found worthy of His Kingdom when fully established. I stumbled across your website in the course of trying to find some more materials on the Kingdom of God. I did take some time out to go through the contents of your site: articles, books etc (I did see your short biography too). I’m convinced in my spirit that you have God’s truth and you are doing well propagating it in your own way and means. I know, it is only my first impressions for now and as such, I would love to get to know more about your beliefs.” — *Nigeria*

2008 Restoration Fellowship National Conference Australia

18th-20th July

Virginia Palms Conference Centre
Sandgate Rd., Virginia
Brisbane, Queensland

Theme: The Creed of Jesus

Keynote Speakers: Anthony Buzzard, Frank Selch,
Greg Deuble (the Christian author whose book was
banned by Koorong!)

Also Peter Barfoot, Steve Cook, Paul Herring

RSVP 9th July

Ph: 0422 099 549 • Email: admin@restorationfellowship.info

www.restorationfellowship.info