

# Focus on the Kingdom

Vol. 17 No. 1

Anthony Buzzard, editor

October, 2014

## Why I No Longer Believe in the Doctrine of the Trinity

by Jose Cervera, WA, [josecervera21@yahoo.com](mailto:josecervera21@yahoo.com)

The doctrine of the Trinity is one of the most central and fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith. The vast majority of Christian denominations and churches fully agree on this doctrine. There are only a few groups out there who are known for their denial of this definition of God: Jehovah's Witnesses, Mormons, and unitarians/Unitarians. It has been taught for centuries, basically since 325 AD. So to deny this teaching is to commit theological suicide. It's really that big of a deal — huge.

But if this is true, if the Trinity is so essential to the Christian faith and salvation, why then have I renounced it? Have I gone mad? Am I no longer a Christian? Have I rejected the teachings of Scripture? The answer is plain and very simple: it's not biblical. I know this may seem like a pretty bold statement considering that the Trinity is the huge majority view. But I ask that you simply hear me out, because many people don't understand what I've gone through and it seems like many people think they know me when they really don't.

Throughout all of my Christian walk I have taught and defended the doctrine of the Trinity with a passion. Back in my earlier walk I would debate Muslims, Mormons, Jehovah's Witnesses, anyone who came to me to challenge this doctrine. It was something that I was so sure about that I never challenged or questioned it; I simply accepted it as pure truth since that is what we are taught in church. I put everything else to the test, but for some reason I left the Trinity alone and thought of it as an indisputable, unarguable fact.

But recently a brother in the Lord offered to have a discussion on this topic. Some background first: this brother sent me a friend request on Facebook because apparently someone recommended me to him. It wasn't long before I noticed from his posts that he didn't believe in the Trinity. And just to make this clear, this brother never once came to me attempting to force his doctrine on me. It was never even brought up. He accepted me as a brother in the Lord just as I was. In fact it was I who approached him seeking answers. The only two views I had ever taken into consideration were the Trinity and the Oneness view. I honestly had never thought of an alternative. And again I had never put the Trinity to the test, but I then thought to myself that if I truly was

someone who believes in biblical truth, I at least should take a look at everyone's point of view, not just my own. In order to find out the truth you need to look at both sides of the argument and adopt the one with the strongest support. So I asked this brother if he could talk to me about his view and if he could answer some of my questions. He didn't ever try to force anything on me. I brought up just about every verse used to support the Trinitarian view and asked for his interpretation.

Truthfully once I took off those Trinitarian lenses I was wearing and started to *think for myself* on this issue, eventually it all became clear. I realized that I had believed a lie. I had never heard of another view, or if I had, I never gave it a chance. As I pondered, meditated, and prayed intensely regarding this issue, the more I leaned towards it. The truth was so overwhelming.

But to be honest, at first I really didn't even want to discuss the topic; I didn't even want to challenge it. I actually had the feeling that I was falling into deception and was going down a dangerous path. But after studying the Scriptures it was like drinking fresh cold water on a hot day when I found out the truth. Once I changed my view I wanted to share it, but at the same time I was concerned. I thought I would be rejected by my brothers and sisters whom I have known for so long. I thought if the news spread I might be looked down upon. I didn't want to be known as a heretic or cult member. I didn't want anyone to think of me in a negative way. But if truth is truth, why be worried, right? It doesn't matter what people think of me; all that matters is what God thinks of me and if I am in the truth and not in falsehood, the awful alternative.

I came out with my change of doctrine, and the response was as expected. I was accused of no longer being a Christian and was called a heretic. The reason I wanted to make a public announcement was so I wouldn't be put in an awkward situation where I was forced to come out, or it caught others by surprise. It's better for people to know. And even though I received negative reactions, they didn't affect me at all. I wasn't going to allow false accusations to get in the way of my sincere search for truth. Whether people approve of me or not will not do anything for my search for truth. I must stand tall and proclaim what I believe even if I'm the only one standing. "Let God be true but every man a liar."

So after much study, meditation, and prayer, I came to the conclusion that the doctrine of the Trinity is both illogical and unbiblical. What then do I believe? I believe

that there is One God, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, who created Adam and Eve and placed them in the garden, who chose Moses to lead the people out of Egypt, who was with David when he defeated Goliath, who protected Daniel in the den of lions, the God who brought into existence His uniquely begotten Son as a sacrifice for our sins. That God who is YHWH is the only true God; there is none besides Him. Jesus Christ is His Son. The Son is not God. The Son is not eternal; he was created (Luke 1:35). Jesus Christ is my Lord and Savior and he's been given power and authority *by* God. Jesus is the Son of God. The Holy Spirit is the very dynamic power and presence of God; it's not a *third* Person. It's God's and Jesus' very power. There are not three Persons who are God. There's only the Father who alone is the one God, and His power and His Son.

Of course I am still learning, as we all are, but so far as I have read the Scriptures, this is the conclusion that I have come to. If you have any questions or concerns please feel free to message me, I will be more than happy to answer any objections you may have or any clarification you may want. I'm also available if you want to debate this issue. But please don't come with a wanna-be prophet attitude rebuking me and calling me a heretic. I will not take you seriously and will avoid engaging in any kind of discussion with you. Be prepared, come ready, and be of a reasonable mind. I have written already many notes, debunking supposed Trinity proof texts and also disproving any Trinitarian concept using the Scriptures. You're more than welcome to take a look at them and attempt to debunk them and or critique them. Again, I'm all ears. ✧

## Have You Heard the Gospel?

by Joshua Smith, South Carolina

**H**ave you heard the Gospel? I am certainly happy to say, yes I have heard the Gospel, because I was blessed to grow up in the truth. The Gospel reminds me, as Rich Mullins sang, we have an "Awesome God"!

The failure to recognize and follow Jesus' very own Gospel has to be the biggest failure of the Church today. How did all this misinformation and lack of discernment start? I cannot understand how the promise of a real physical Kingdom ruled by the Messiah and his saints (Dan. 7:18, 22, 27) disappeared from the faith. Isn't the truth that God will make His dwelling once again with man in His Kingdom the point of *everything*? It is hard to see how far traditional, popular Christianity has fallen away from God's central message and purpose.

I must admit before reading Anthony's article "Have You Ever Heard the Gospel?" that I never realized how much Jesus did and taught before he even spoke of his death and resurrection. He sent out the twelve to preach

the same Gospel about the Kingdom, and Jesus preached the Gospel of the coming Kingdom several years before this!

Also I didn't realize before reading this article how many verses speak of the Kingdom of God. This makes it most shocking that mainstream Christianity has been able to exclude the coming physical Kingdom of God from its Gospel. Is the Kingdom Gospel of Jesus, the twelve disciples, and Paul so easy to explain away that they have been able to exclude it?

It's hard to imagine Christ even recognizing the "Gospel" most now proclaim in his name, as his representatives. That a fully human, fully God man was incarnated to come literally to earth from a preexistence in heaven just to be brutally tortured and killed for the sins of the world. According to "evangelical" tracts this pretty much is the gospel preached by most today. Thankfully we know that this isn't the biblical Gospel.

Could it be the evangelicals are afraid that the coming governmental rule of Jesus will scare some away? The Jesus we read of in his role as King doesn't fit popular ideas of him. The thought of Jesus crushing all his enemies may not suit the image they want portrayed of Jesus. So they just simply decline to be interested in his Kingdom altogether? I'm not sure why or how the Kingdom has lost its place center stage in the Gospel, but that would be my best guess at this point.

As I pondered how the Gospel lost its place it made me wonder what the best way to effectively articulate the message of the Kingdom Gospel is. The presentation of the Old Testament about the Messiah and the coming Kingdom (Dan. 2:44; 7:14, 18, 22, 27) clearly concerns a literal kingdom where the Messiah rules over all the earth. This is the best place to start. Then the parable in Luke 19:11-27. The nobleman must depart and return before ruling the world in his Kingdom.

When I speak to someone about what I believe I rarely even mention the Kingdom. This has been my biggest failure, as it should be my central message. My wrong practice seems to have been, instead, focusing on what we disagree on with other faiths. Now I am going to focus on our positive Gospel message of the Kingdom first. Once this Kingdom foundation is built then you could expand to disagreements on other theology more effectively. After all the Kingdom of God is where Jesus started (Luke 4:43; Mark 1:14-15; and Paul in Acts 19:8; 28:23, 31). Try their method and message.

How sad it is to see how Paul's Gospel has been twisted and pitted against Jesus' own Gospel. This has been done just to fit in with unexamined tradition, just following the crowd. It reminds me of Jesus' own warning in Matthew 12:25: "Every kingdom divided against itself will be ruined, and every city or household divided against itself will not stand." How can the Gospel

stand when fellow Christians twist and divide it against itself?

Always begin with the Kingdom of God and you will sound like Jesus (Luke 4:43; Mark 1:14-15; Luke 19:11-27). ✧

## The Only True God (1 John 5:20): One Person or Three?

Henry Alford, the distinguished British expositor, author of *The Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, exposes an important factor in the history of Bible interpretation when he says of 1 John 5:20: “The [Church] fathers interpreted this verse doctrinally rather than exegetically.” In plain words, they made the verse mean what *they* wanted it to mean. They twisted it to fit the dogma they had inherited from tradition.

“And we know that the Son of God has come and has given us an understanding so that we might know the true one; and we are in the true one, by being in His Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God and life eternal.” There is a crucial point at issue in this verse: Is Jesus called God? Trinitarian doctrine has taught us so to think, but does the New Testament? In addition to some **1300 occurrences** of the word “God” (often with the definite article, *o theos*) to designate **the Father, as distinct from the Son**, Paul’s confession in 1 Corinthians 8:4-6 fences off the term God as meaning **one Person, the Father**. The Son is not included within the term “one God.” **Old Testament monotheism** has not been disturbed by the appearance of Jesus, however highly he is exalted by the New Testament writers.

Long after Jesus had been exalted to the right hand of the Father, Paul still makes his customary, repeated distinction between “the one God and the one mediator between God and man, the **man Messiah** Jesus” (1 Tim. 2:5). These texts prove that Jewish (and early Christian) monotheism has not been infringed. To do so would be to shatter the constitution of the universe!

Note the beautiful simplicity of the creed of Jesus (Mark 12:29) and of Paul in 1 Timothy 2:5, as compared with the brain-breaking complexities and confusions of Trinitarianism!

Writers promoting the idea that the New Testament calls Jesus “God” (in the same sense as the Father) often contend that 1 John 5:20 makes a plain statement about the Godhead of Jesus. It has been argued that Jesus is here described as the “the true God.” This would give us the horrifying idea of **two only true Gods**. Henry Alford maintains that expositors seeking **the plain sense** of the passage, as opposed to those looking for texts to support their doctrinal position, will not see this reference, “true God” as a title of Jesus but of the Father. The question is: Does “this” (*outos*) refer to the nearest noun (Jesus Christ

in this case) or does it point to the Father mentioned just before?

Alford cites two passages from John’s epistles to show that “this” does not always refer back to the nearest noun:

“Who is the liar if not he who denies that Jesus is the Christ? **This** is antichrist” (1 John 2:22).

“Many deceivers went forth into the world, namely those who do not confess Jesus Christ coming in the flesh. **This** is the deceiver and the antichrist” (2 John 7).

From these two examples it is clear that “this” does not necessarily point to the immediately preceding noun. Thus Jesus is not necessarily called God in 1 John 5:20. Moreover there is a very clear parallel text in the Gospel of John which will help us. John is not confused about who **the true God** is! “And this is eternal life: that they may know You [the Father], **the only true God**, and him whom you sent, Jesus Christ” (John 17:3).

### New Testament Creedal Statements

In its formal creedal statements, the New Testament persists in distinguishing the Father, as the “only true God.” from the one Lord Jesus Christ. 1 Corinthians 8:6 reads: “There is no God except one...We hold that there is **one God, the Father...and one lord Jesus Christ.**” Similarly in another formal confession, Ephesians 4:6 states that “there is one God and Father of all, the one who is over all.” God is here described as **numerically one**, just as there is one faith, one baptism and one lord Jesus.

In the light of John’s words in John 17:3, Alford concludes his discussion of 1 John 5:20 by saying: “I admit I cannot see, after this saying of our Lord, ‘You, the only true God,’ how anyone can imagine that the same Apostle can have had in these words [1 John 5:20] any other reference than that which is given in those [John 17:3].” In both passages **the Father only is called God**. Jesus, as everywhere, is His Son.

### Further Evidence

Jesus himself refused to be recognized as God: “Why do you call me ‘good’? There is no one good except God alone” (Mark 10:18). A Roman Catholic writer, himself a Trinitarian, notes that the verse might be rendered, “There is no one good except **the one God.**” He goes on to point out that the “fathers” tried to draw from the verse the implication that Jesus wanted the young man to know that he was God; but “one cannot but feel that such an exegesis is motivated by an **apologetic concern for protecting the doctrine of the Divinity of Jesus...but** this text strongly distinguishes between Jesus and God, and a description which Jesus rejects is applicable to

God. From this text **one would never suspect that the Evangelist thought of Jesus as God.**<sup>1</sup>

Nor would we be likely to think that Jesus thought of himself as God from his words in John 20:17: "I am ascending to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God." Such evidence, even from John's gospel, leads the same writer to conclude that "there was a **strong tendency** to reserve the title 'God' to the Father who is the one true God" (p. 9). A Trinitarian writer who examines the New Testament evidence for Jesus' being thought of as God remarks that many of Paul's statements about Jesus show that "however exalted Jesus may be, **he is not God.**"<sup>2</sup> He observes that Paul teaches that Jesus is subordinate to the Father even after his exaltation and that "the final status of the Son is one of subjection to God." In 1 Corinthians 15:28, "When all things are subjected to him [Jesus] the Son also shall be subjected to Him who subjected all things to him, so that God may be all in all" — "**God is not Father, Son and Holy Spirit, but Father only**" (p. 187). God in the Bible (some 11,000 times: *Adonai, Yahweh, Elohim, theos*), never once means a Triune God!

It is certainly a remarkable fact that there is today a strong tendency to call Jesus God, and to reject out of hand any view to the contrary. By contrast the New Testament confession of faith is that Jesus is lord and Messiah (1 Cor. 12:3; Acts 2:36) and that there is One God, namely the Father (1 Cor. 8:6). **The New Testament never says that there is "one God in two (or three) Persons."** Nor is the Son of God ever called "God the Son" or "the Lord God."

The introduction of the title God for Jesus in post-biblical times is plain evidence of a shift of thinking away from the original New Testament creed. There are no less than 2,570 occurrences of the word God (*Elohim*) in the OT and 1320 times the word "God" appears in the Greek New Testament. None of those thousands of appearances of the word God means "God in three Persons." **The word "God" never, ever means a triune or Trinitarian God.** That evidence appears to be overwhelming and positive proof that the triune God is not the God of the Bible. If He were, is it conceivable that no Bible writer ever meant "God in three Persons" when he wrote "God"?

### John's Prologue

If the New Testament is committed with the Old to "One God in one Person, the Father," and "the Deity of

<sup>1</sup>Raymond Brown, *Jesus, God and Man*, p. 6-7, emphasis added.

<sup>2</sup>Arthur Wainwright, *The Trinity in the New Testament*, p. 185, emphasis added.

Jesus is not a Pauline doctrine,"<sup>3</sup> what of the prologue to John's gospel?

The fact is that most have been reading John's words in the light (or darkness?) of their belief in Trinitarian doctrine. John's readers would not have leapt, as many do, to the conclusion that *logos* (word) was a "second divine Person in the Trinity." The Hebrews were familiar with a manner of speaking by which the **wisdom or word** of God could be poetically described as God's servant, His instrument in creation. This did not, however, imply that it was another **Person**.

When Luke tells us that "the wisdom of God said..." (11:49), he understands wisdom to be an attribute of God, God active in the furtherance of His divine purpose, not another Person. So with the *logos*. It was the word or utterance of God which became a human being in Jesus of Nazareth. It was not a previously existing "second Person" who left his home in heaven to walk the earth. To say that the **logos became flesh** is not the same thing as saying that *Jesus the Son* became flesh. Jesus came into existence at his conception and birth (Luke 1:35; Matt. 1:18, 20: "begotten in her"). He was the embodiment and expression of God's plan, just as the car in the garage is the actual reality of a previous conception in the mind of its designer.

It is customary to speak of the "problem" of the Trinity. The problem is created when we try to read back into the New Testament the Greek philosophical thinking which devised the doctrine of the Trinity in post-Apostolic times. Matthew, Mark and Luke present a Jesus who **begins to exist** from his birth. John speaks of the cosmic significance of Jesus: He is the expression in human form of God's original plan. The Plan, not Jesus, became flesh when Jesus appeared. The "word" prior to Jesus' birth is **not a person but a personification**, like wisdom in Proverbs 8, of God's wise activity.

We must choose to believe with tradition that God is "Father, Son and Holy Spirit" or with Jesus, Paul and the New Testament Christians that "there is one God, the Father, and one Lord Messiah" (1 Cor. 8:6). The difference between these two creeds is vast. ✧

## Please Read This Comment and Spot the Error!

"**Mark 13:3–37.** Jesus' prediction of the destruction of the temple (Mk. 13:2) provoked questions that the four named disciples put to him in private regarding the time and the sign when all these things are about to come to an end (Mk. 13:3–4). The response to their questions was Jesus' eschatological discourse prior to his imminent death.

<sup>3</sup>Professor Peabody, *The Apostle Paul*, p. 160.

“It contained instruction and consolation exhorting the disciples and the church to faith and obedience through the trials that would confront them (Mk 13:5–13). The sign to look for is the presence of the Desolating Abomination (Mk 13:14; see Dan. 9:27), i.e., of **the Roman power** profaning the temple. Flight from Jerusalem is urged rather than defense of the city through misguided Messianic hope (Mk 13:14–23). Intervention will occur only after destruction (Mk 13:24–27), which will happen before the end of the first Christian generation (Mk 13:28–31)” (New American Bible, study notes).

Note how this statement goes wrong! First Jesus was asked about his Parousia and the end of the age (Matt. 24:3). That Second Coming and **the end of the age** absolutely did not happen in AD 70! In Mark 13:4 the disciples were quoting and thus referring to the passage in Daniel 12:7, LXX about events “to be fulfilled” close to the resurrection which was not in AD 70! What Jesus and the disciples had in mind was a disaster in Jerusalem close up to the future resurrection and the Kingdom of God which will be introduced by Jesus on earth at that time.

Note also that in Daniel 9:26b the evil prince predicted there comes to “**his end**” (so the Hebrew) in the flood of judgment referred to in that passage, i.e. **in the 70<sup>th</sup> week**. That prediction absolutely does not fit the events of AD 70, when Titus, the Roman general, positively did not come to “**his end**.” He died naturally 18 years later. Note too that the final King of the North (and the North is not Rome) will come to “**his end**” in the land just at the time of the future resurrection (Dan. 11:45).

The Olivet discourse in Matthew 24, Mark 13 and Luke 21 provides a connected story about future end-time events, following, as Jesus said, the pattern and plot already given by the prophet Daniel. Jesus expressly urged his audience to pay attention to the Abomination of Desolation **as described by Daniel**. Daniel said nothing about events in 70 AD. He spoke of an abominable person standing where *he* ought not to (Mark 13:14) and he gave an express chronological marker by saying that 1290 days (1 month more than 3½ years) would elapse before the resurrection and coming of Christ. We note in passing that there is no pre-tribulation rapture/resurrection. Jesus cannot come back before the Abomination of Desolation appears in Israel. That is the great sign which Jesus announced (Matt. 24:15) and it is surprising how people do not pay attention to the words of Jesus in this regard.

Knowing and understanding all of Jesus’ teachings are essential to our spiritual health. Jesus said that those who obey him and believe his words are the true candidates for salvation (John 3:36; 12:44ff; 2 John 7-9). This is repeated in Hebrews 5:9 where obedience to Jesus

and his words is the essential criterion for gaining salvation, that is immortality in the coming Kingdom on earth when Christ returns.

Nothing in Scripture speaks of going to heaven when we die. The very opposite is true. The dead currently know absolutely nothing (Ecc. 9:5). The popular idea that the dead are now alive as immortal bodiless souls is foreign to Scripture and should be rejected as untrue. What we choose to believe governs our spiritual health, and only those who develop a “passion for truth in order to be saved” are successfully running the Christian race (2 Thess. 2:10). ✧

## Christianity Lost Its Identity

**T**he Church desperately needs reconnection to its Hebrew, Jewish roots.<sup>4</sup> The Church is currently drawing not from those Jewish roots, but from a massive Greek system of theology which makes our Bible reading confused and ineffective. E.F. Scott in a fine study of the Kingdom of God as the Christian Gospel complained about “the long and bitter controversy which led to the definition, in metaphysical terms, of the twofold nature of Christ. *Nothing seems to be more remote from the realities of the Christian faith than this dreary controversy*, but for the Greek mind everything was at stake in it...It is not surprising that modern writers have found a crucial proof that Christianity, in the course of the Gentile<sup>5</sup> mission, had *changed into a new religion*. The Church, *while still calling itself by the name of Jesus, had forgotten or refused to know what he had actually taught.*”<sup>6</sup>

The Church has acted treacherously towards its mother in Judaism in the matter of defining God. It has in some sense become a prostitute by allowing its belief system, at its heart, to be infected by an alien doctrine of God. In addition to entering into a “Constantinian concubinage,” confusing the Church and the world, the Church has devised a view of God to which Jesus could not subscribe. “God is one Lord” (Mark 12:29) is not equivalent to “God is three Persons in one Essence.” That difference needs to be recognized. The result of this

<sup>4</sup>This does not mean, however, a return to the Mosaic Judaism of the Old Covenant in terms of calendar and food laws, etc. Paul labored hard to proclaim the new freedom in Christ which is the heart of the New Covenant. Paul himself was “within the Torah of Messiah” (1 Cor. 9:21), but not under the law of Moses. To make his point Paul spoke of Jesus who “abolished the law of commandments in ordinances” (Eph. 2:15) to create one new united “Israel of God” and spiritual circumcision (Gal. 6:16; Phil. 3:3) in which all nations in Christ are one in Christ.

<sup>5</sup>I.e. beyond the New Testament period.

<sup>6</sup>*The Kingdom of God in the New Testament*, 1931, pp. 159, 160, 156, emphasis added.

recognition can have staggering effects for the future of world religion.

The root of the problem lies in the fact that popular evangelicalism selects its key texts from a very limited number of biblical passages, leaving out those crucial verses which would correct its deficient system. I have in front of me a book entitled *100 Bible Verses Everyone Should Know by Heart*. It is quite evident that the author leaves out those very verses which could correct the evangelical system. The book recommends that we memorize 100 crucial verses in order to learn the way to salvation. Amazingly, 14 out of the 100 are taken from John and 13 from Romans. More than ¼ of the selected “ideal” verses are from John and Romans. There are none from Mark, only one from Luke and three from the very end of Matthew. This means that no attention at all is paid to the Gospel preaching of Jesus himself. Hebrews 2:3 is omitted and this vital verse informs us that Jesus was the first preacher of the saving Gospel (cp. Luke 8:12). You could never get that truth clear by memorizing the suggested 100 Bible verses. There are six verses from Psalm 23. When it comes to defining “the word of God” there is no mention at all of the principal New Testament meaning of “word” as the Gospel of the Kingdom (see Luke 4:43; 5:1, etc).

The point to be learned here is that what one leaves out of one’s presentation of the Gospel can be as deceptive as what one includes. Evangelicalism has rejected Jesus as the preacher and teacher of the essential saving Gospel of the Kingdom. When this happens the death and resurrection of Jesus are presented as the whole of the Gospel, whereas in 1 Corinthians 15:1-3 the death and resurrection of Jesus are *some* of the essential elements of the Gospel, “among first things,” but not the whole Gospel. It is customary for evangelicals to appeal to the Gospel of the grace of God in Acts 20:24. But they seem conscientiously to avoid the very next verse which defines the Gospel of the grace of God as exactly the same as the Gospel of the Kingdom.

If occasionally the Kingdom does get a mention, the “darling” verse for popular religion is Luke 17:21 where the KJV is almost certainly wrong to speak of the Kingdom of God “within you,” i.e. in your heart. It may be that Jesus is saying that he is the king of the Kingdom standing *among* them, or more likely that when the Kingdom comes in the future it will be everywhere and universally visible (v. 23, 24).

See this fine definition of the Kingdom from Oxford Professor W.C. Allen: “The Kingdom — **the central subject** of Christ’s doctrine. With this **he began** his ministry (Matt. 4:17) and wherever he went he taught it as Good News [**Gospel**] (4:23). The Kingdom he taught was coming, **but not in his lifetime**. After his ascension he would come as Son of Man on the clouds of heaven

(16:27, 19:28, 24:30; 25:31) and would sit on the throne of his glory...Then the twelve Apostles would sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel (**19:28**). In the meantime he himself must suffer and die and be raised from the dead. How else could he come on the clouds of heaven? And the disciples were to **preach the Good News [Gospel] of the coming Kingdom** (10:7, 24:14) among all nations, making disciples by [water] **baptism** (28:18). The body of disciples thus gained would naturally form a society bound by common aims. Hence the disciples of the Kingdom would form a new spiritual Israel (21:43; [cp. Gal. 6:16; Phil 3:3])...The scene of the Kingdom would be the present world renewed, restored and purified.”✧

## Comments

“My request for a book with indices to answer friends’ arguments ‘proving the Trinity’ has been answered when I turned up your book *The Doctrine of the Trinity*. It’s just what I’ve been looking for, so thank you, Mr. Hunting and God Himself (singular). I was a member of the Worldwide Church of God for 10 years until the Armstrongs’ immorality came to be proven, so my wife and I ‘hightailed’ it out of there.” — *Arizona*

“I am most grateful to you once again for the continued support and encouragement from your newsletter, *Focus on the Kingdom*, and the two precious books — *Jesus Was Not a Trinitarian* and *They Never Told Me This in Church*. May the Lord continue to enrich you and all your partners in ministry for such a great work in pointing people to the true historical Jesus of the Bible, the one God and the Gospel of the Kingdom. The *Focus on the Kingdom* and the books are being used within our university campus fellowships — groups of young Christian students. They are causing a revolution and a roar of people to go back and check their Bibles. Others see me making the books available as a heretic for encouraging young Christians and Christian students of all the denominations in the campus. I am urging everyone to read the books and look critically at the sincere and honest points raised by the books. So I prayed that the Lord will bless me to be able to give these books to cause a revival back to the biblical Jesus. I plan by God’s grace to give copies to some pastors and leaders of churches and ministries, so that they can re-examine their unexamined assumptions and doctrinal statements of creeds which are contrary to the truth of the holy Scriptures. May the Lord continue to enrich you in all your ways.” — *Nigeria*

“Your writer from England who discovered the ‘squirrel’ (August, 2014) deserves **at least** a Nobel prize in Mathematics, but he also deserves **the highest prize** available in the field of theology. Finally someone has explained the doctrine of the Trinity in a way that even a

child can easily understand! Congratulations to him, and thank you for publishing his article.” — *Canada*

“Thanks for writing *Our Fathers Who Aren’t in Heaven*. I’d say with this book you performed radical surgery to successfully reconnect the Gospel promises made by Jesus in the New Testament to the promises made to Abraham in the First Testament — a connection which had been deliberately severed by the Church centuries before. As a result, you have restored the sole narrative of the Bible and enabled the elect, the seed of Abraham, the body of Messiah to have an unobstructed view of God’s plan of redemption from Genesis to Revelation. And given the Israel of God the ability to once again celebrate the great hope of the coming Kingdom of God on earth with the saints of old.” — *Florida*

A comment on our video “Did Calvin Murder Servetus?” at [youtube.com/user/AbrahamicMovement](http://youtube.com/user/AbrahamicMovement):

“We shouldn’t condone or vote for someone’s murder *no matter* if the laws of our day are in agreement with us or not. The issue isn’t ‘Was Servetus a heretic?’ The issue is *murder is wrong and God never approves of it*. Why not rather suffer the persecution of the heretic than return evil for evil? Where is there to be found even an inkling of ‘turn the other cheek’ in this matter? Calvin was no different from Saul of Tarsus casting his vote for the execution of Stephen — except for the fact that Calvin claimed he was regenerated and Paul clearly was not. Worldly or even so-called ‘Protestant’ governing bodies are *not* our conscience, nor is their approval or disapproval the deciding factor in what is right and what is wrong. And no, I am not an Arminian with an axe to grind. I am merely a Bible-believing saint who can see both sides of the equation from the outside. Calvin was wrong. And so are the people who try to disassociate Calvin from something he was well associated with, even though he didn’t start the fire (Paul never cast a single stone at Stephen either). No, being a murderer doesn’t necessarily mean your doctrine is all wrong. And likewise, *not* being a murderer doesn’t mean your doctrine is all right. But if I knew a local pastor (whose doctrines were *all* right) condoned the executions of those who opposed him, I must say I’d be sick to my stomach over the matter — and I certainly wouldn’t sit under his teaching in *any* capacity. I would much rather sit under the ministry of someone who hasn’t got it all together, doctrinally speaking, but who doesn’t murder those who oppose his ‘perfection.’ Kind of a simple rule to live by, isn’t it? If you wouldn’t sit under the ministry and teaching of a modern teacher who condones murder, why would you sit under the ministry of a man who lived centuries ago who did? But it’s a scary thought to ponder: There are some people living today, who claim to be Christian, who would more than likely have no problem

whatsoever sitting under the teaching and ministry of a murderer, as long as they were Calvinist and had all of their doctrinal ducks in a row.” — *Youtube*

### Mysterium IL-Logicum

Shaun Rufener, Ohio

The Doctrine of the Trinity

A mystery of one in three,

He are three and they is one

But logically how is this done?

The mind of man, or so they say

Cannot grasp this vast array

Of he or they who holds the key

To this unexplained complexity

These him all wise, one what three who’s

Who if you do not choose you lose

Your soul for all eternity, and here is why:

The one “who” chose to crucify

“Himself” who some identify

With he who I refuse to deify

In order he might satisfy themselves

So they could justify

The sinners and then glorify themselves

And rather not deny

Eternal life to those who die

Sweet bye and bye up in the sky

For me it’s very hard to see

How three is one and one are three

It seems not like a mystery

But rather an atrocity

Though questioning this has cost some dear

And religious folk will at you sneer

Man’s nescient threats you mustn’t fear

Hold fast to truth and persevere

While it is true, faith can be blind

God still intends me use my mind

To follow man-made contradicting creeds

Is to take God’s word and far exceed

What he has shown himself “To Be”

That he is one, and one’s not three

**To our international readers:** If you would prefer to receive *Focus on the Kingdom* by **email** each month please sign up at [www.restorationfellowship.org](http://www.restorationfellowship.org) with your name and email address.

## SAVE THE DATE!

**2015 Theological Conference**

April 30-May 3, 2015

Calvin Center, Hampton, GA